

1989

# The Effects of Training Strategies on Assessor Behavior and the Accuracy of Assessment Center Consensus Ratings

Todd A. Baker  
*Old Dominion University*

Follow this and additional works at: [https://digitalcommons.odu.edu/psychology\\_etds](https://digitalcommons.odu.edu/psychology_etds)

 Part of the [Industrial and Organizational Psychology Commons](#)

## Recommended Citation

Baker, Todd A.. "The Effects of Training Strategies on Assessor Behavior and the Accuracy of Assessment Center Consensus Ratings" (1989). Doctor of Philosophy (PhD), dissertation, Psychology, Old Dominion University, DOI: 10.25777/rjrn-cq83  
[https://digitalcommons.odu.edu/psychology\\_etds/249](https://digitalcommons.odu.edu/psychology_etds/249)

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Psychology at ODU Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Psychology Theses & Dissertations by an authorized administrator of ODU Digital Commons. For more information, please contact [digitalcommons@odu.edu](mailto:digitalcommons@odu.edu).

The Effects of Training Strategies on Assessor Behavior  
and the Accuracy of Assessment Center Consensus Ratings

by

Todd A. Baker

B.A. May 1984, The Johns Hopkins University

M.S. August 1986, Old Dominion University

A Dissertation Submitted to the Faculty of  
Old Dominion University in Partial Fulfillment of the  
Requirements for the Degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

PSYCHOLOGY

OLD DOMINION UNIVERSITY

Approved by:

Terry L. Dickinson (Director)

Robert M. McIntyre

Glynn D. Coates

Peter J. Mikulka

## ABSTRACT

Director: Terry L. Dickinson

The purpose of this research was to examine the effects of four training strategies (e.g., part, whole, individual, and team) on the accuracy of performance ratings and the occurrence of interactive behaviors in consensus meetings. The results were analyzed using a 2 x 2 factorial ANOVA design. Part and whole training strategies were directly compared with one another. Team and individual training strategies made up the other direct comparison. Undergraduates (N=108) were randomly assigned to four training conditions. The subjects were grouped into teams of three assessors. In these teams the assessors needed to exchange information about assessee performance across three assessment center exercises and form dimension and overall ratings for four experimental assessees. The rating accuracy results indicated that (a) no differences in rating accuracy existed between part and whole training, (b) team training led to more accurate final ratings than individual training, and (c) the Whole-Team training condition led to more accurate overall assessment ratings than the remaining three conditions. Reasons for the superiority of team training stem from the higher frequency of interactive behaviors observed in the team training condition. Further explanations for the findings and

suggestions for future research are discussed.

## DEDICATION

This work has been dedicated to the greatest two individuals that I will ever meet, Ralph and Ruth Baker. Whenever I need you, you are always there to provide support, guidance, and love. No child could expect to have more caring parents and role models. Mom, Dad, I can only hope that you are as proud of me as I am of you. I love you both.

## Acknowledgments

How do I show my gratitude to all the people who helped and supported me through this journey called graduate school? Well, I'll give it a try here although a few words cannot truly express my heartfelt appreciation.

First, I would like to thank everyone associated with the I/O Program. In addition to providing excellent education, you show real concern for the students as individuals. Because of you I can proudly say that I am a graduate of Old Dominion University.

The individual that have greatest influence on my development was Dr. Terry Dickinson. Terry, who I am as a professional, is a reflection of you. I could not have asked for a more knowledgeable or supportive mentor. Thank you for everything and I wish you the best.

When I first walked into Quant I, I was filled with uncertainty. Fortunately, a savior, Dr. Glynn Coates, was there to lead us. Even after the Quant courses, you were still these willing to lead, assist, and support. This was greatly appreciated. Dr. Coates, you are one cool dude that I will never forget.

Other faculty members that deserve thanks include Drs. Peter Mikulka, Robert McIntyre, Donald Davis, and Raymond Kirby. Pete, your assistance and concern for me was greatly appreciated. Bob, thanks for the discussions concerning research ideas that helped with my professional development. Don, your classes helped me develop a valuable skill, the ability to think. Thank you for providing an arena where this skill could be developed. Dr. Kirby, I am grateful for the genuine interest that you showed towards me over these years.

There are a number of peers that helped make this journey a little easier. Of all these students, three deserve special mention. Steve Cesare, Rick Tannenbaum, and Eric Vanetti, you guys are the greatest. From discussions and debates on VG to paired comparisons, "you got to choose one", to long winters without heat, we survived and progressed. I wish you all the happiness and success in the world.

In addition to Steve, Rick, and Eric, other students have played a part in my development. Coleen Thornton, thanks for being there to listen and putting up with my sometimes cocky attitude. Mic Fedorko, the occasional escapes from school madness to social madness were well needed and appreciated. Mark Teachout, thanks for your

information about the real world and your sense of humor. Kerrie Quinn, taking time to listen to me ramble on about something meaningless while the work was piling up was greatly appreciated. To all of you I wish the best and graduate.

Last, but not least, I need to thank Mary, Ann, Gail, Evelyn, and especially Jackie. Jackie, your laugh and your "you look good" will be missed.

Once again, thanks and good bye. I'll miss all of you.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

|  | <u>Page</u> |
|--|-------------|
| List of Tables.....  | x           |
| I. INTRODUCTION.....   | 1           |
| Assessment Center Overview.....                              | 1           |
| Reading of Exercise Reports.....                             | 3           |
| Recording of behaviors by Assessors.....                     | 4           |
| Generating initial overall<br>dimension ratings.....         | 4           |
| Posting of initial dimension<br>ratings.....                 | 4           |
| Discussing the ratings.....                                  | 4           |
| Consensus Meeting Research Needs.....                        | 11          |
| Can the Consensus Meeting be Considered<br>a Team Task?..... | 13          |
| Team Training Background.....                                | 17          |
| Part versus Whole Training.....                              | 31          |
| Present Study Hypotheses.....                                | 41          |
| Hypothesis 1.....  | 42          |
| Hypothesis 2.....  | 43          |
| Hypothesis 3.....  | 44          |
| II. METHOD.....  | 45          |
| Participants.....  | 45          |
| Design.....  | 45          |
| Stimulus Exercises.....                                      | 45          |
| Dimension and Rating Format<br>Development.....              | 47          |



TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

|  | <u>Page</u> |
|--|-------------|
| Consensus Meeting Process Measure.....                           | 50          |
| Target Score Generation.....                                     | 52          |
| Part Training.....   | 61          |
| Whole Training.....  | 63          |
| Individual Training.....   | 65          |
| Team Training.....   | 70          |
| Procedure.....   | 72          |
| Analyses.....  | 75          |
| III. RESULTS.....  | 82          |
| Overview.....  | 82          |
| Basic Accuracy - Initial Ratings.....                            | 82          |
| Basic Accuracy - Initial Overall<br>Assessment Ratings.....      | 88          |
| Training Conditions - Initial Ratings.....                       | 90          |
| Training Conditions - Initial Overall<br>Assessment Ratings..... | 90          |
| Basic Accuracy - Final Ratings.....                              | 92          |
| Basic Accuracy - Final Overall<br>Assessment Ratings.....        | 98          |
| Training Conditions - Final Ratings.....                         | 99          |
| Training Conditions - Final Overall<br>Assessment Ratings.....   | 107         |
| Correlational Analyses.....                                      | 109         |
| Regression Analyses.....   | 113         |
| Process Analysis.....  | 115         |

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

|   | <u>Page</u> |
|---|-------------|
| Secondary Process Measures.....   | 121         |
| IV. DISCUSSION.....   | 126         |
| Overview.....   | 126         |
| Basic Accuracy.....   | 126         |
| Part vs. Whole Training.....  | 130         |
| Team vs. Individual Training.....   | 133         |
| Part vs. Whole by Team vs. Individual<br>Effects.....   | 139         |
| Limitations.....  | 141         |
| Future Research.....  | 144         |
| Implications.....   | 147         |
| Conclusions.....  | 148         |
| V. REFERENCES.....  | 149         |
| APPENDIX A: Dimension Definitions and<br>Example Behaviors.....   | 171         |
| APPENDIX B: The Dimension Rating Scales and<br>the Overall Assessment Rating<br>Scale.....  | 173         |
| APPENDIX C: Target Score Means, Standard<br>Deviations, and Rationales for<br>the Role-Play, Leaderless Group<br>Discussion, In-Basket, and<br>Dimension Ratings..... | 178         |
| APPENDIX D: Interactive and Inhibitory<br>Behavior Observation List.....  | 187         |
| APPENDIX E: Training Materials Used During<br>Part Training.....  | 191         |
| APPENDIX F: Part Training Script for the<br>Role-Play.....  | 223         |

TABLE OF CONTENTS (concluded)

|   | <u>Page</u> |
|---|-------------|
| APPENDIX G: Training Materials Used During<br>Whole Training.....             | 274         |
| APPENDIX H: Whole Training Script for the<br>Role-Play.....                   | 308         |
| APPENDIX I: Training Materials Common to<br>Part and Whole Training.....      | 374         |
| APPENDIX J: Training Script for Individual<br>Training.....                   | 402         |
| APPENDIX K: Training Materials Used<br>During Team Training.....              | 425         |
| APPENDIX L: Training Script for Team<br>Training.....                         | 431         |
| APPENDIX M: Training Materials Common to<br>Team and Individual Training..... | 471         |
| APPENDIX N: Guidelines for Writing Exercise<br>Narrative Reports.....         | 475         |

LIST OF TABLES

| <u>Table</u>  | <u>Page</u> |
|---|-------------|
| 1 ANOVA Summary Table for the<br>Role-Play Target Scores.....   | 55          |
| 2 ANOVA Summary Table for the Leaderless<br>Group Discussion Target Scores.....   | 57          |
| 3 ANOVA Summary Table for the<br>In-Basket Target Scores.....   | 58          |
| 4 ANOVA Summary Table for the<br>Consensus Target Scores.....   | 60          |
| 5 Description of the Part and Whole<br>Training Strategies for the Role<br>Play and Leaderless Group Discussion.....                | 66          |
| 6 Description of the Part and Whole<br>Training Strategies for the In-Basket.....   | 68          |
| 7 Accuracy Measures and Interpretations.....  | 77          |
| 8 Summary Table for the Error Terms for<br>the Sources of Accuracy.....   | 79          |
| 9 Summary of the Analysis of Variance<br>Results for the Extended Accuracy Design<br>Using Initial Ratings.....                     | 83          |
| 10 T-values for Mean Discrepancies from Zero<br>Between Initial Ratings and Target Scores<br>for Assesseees.....                    | 86          |
| 11 T-values for Mean Discrepancies from Zero<br>Between Initial Ratings and Target Scores<br>for Dimensions by Assesseees.....      | 87          |
| 12 Summary of the Analysis of Variance<br>Results for the Extended Accuracy Design<br>Using Initial Overall Assessment Ratings..... | 89          |
| 13 T-values for Mean Discrepancies from Zero<br>Between Initial Overall Assessment Ratings<br>and Target Scores for Assesseees..... | 92          |

LIST OF TABLES (continued)

| <u>Table</u> | <u>Page</u>   |
|--------------|---|
| 14           | T-values for Mean Discrepancies from Zero Between Initial Overall Assessment Ratings and Target Scores for Assesseees by Part vs. Whole and Team vs. Individual Training.....93 |
| 15           | Summary of the Analysis of Variance Results for the Extended Accuracy Design Using Final Ratings.....94   |
| 16           | T-values for Mean Discrepancies from Zero Between Final Ratings and Target Scores for Assesseees.....97   |
| 17           | T-values for Mean Discrepancies from Zero Between Final Ratings and Target Scores for Dimensions by Assesseees.....99   |
| 18           | Summary of the Analysis of Variance Results for the Extended Accuracy Design Using Final Overall Assessment Ratings.....100   |
| 19           | T-values for Mean Discrepancies from Zero Between Final Ratings and Target Scores for Dimensions by Assesseees by Part vs. Whole Training.....102                               |
| 20           | T-values for Mean Discrepancies from Zero Between Final Ratings and Target Scores for Assesseees by Team vs. Individual Training.....105  |
| 21           | T-values for Mean Discrepancies from Zero Between Final Ratings and Target Scores for Dimensions by Assesseees by Team vs. Individual Training.....106                          |
| 22           | T-values for Mean Discrepancies from Zero Between Final Overall Assessment Ratings and Target Scores for Assesseees by Part vs. Whole and Team vs. Individual Training.....109  |
| 23           | Correlational Accuracy per Dimension for all Assessors.....111  |

LIST OF TABLES (concluded)

| <u>Table</u> |   | <u>Page</u> |
|--------------|---|-------------|
| 24           | Correlational Accuracy per Dimension<br>Between Part vs. Whole and Training<br>Team vs. Individual Training.....                                  | 112         |
| 25           | Results of the Regression of the Target<br>Score OAR onto the Dimension Ratings for<br>all Assessors.....   | 115         |
| 26           | Results of the Regression of the Target<br>Score OAR onto the Dimension Ratings<br>Between Part vs. Whole by Team vs.<br>Individual Training..... | 116         |
| 27           | Summary of the Analysis of Variance Results<br>for the Gathering Behaviors.....   | 119         |
| 28           | Summary of the Analysis of Variance Results<br>for the Communicating Behaviors.....   | 120         |
| 29           | Summary of the Analysis of Variance Results<br>for the Member Dominance Behaviors.....  | 121         |
| 30           | Results of the Regression of the Initial<br>OARs onto the Dimension Ratings for all<br>Assessors.....   | 123         |
| 31           | Results of the Regression of the Initial<br>OARs onto the Dimension Ratings Between<br>Part vs. Whole by Team vs. Individual<br>Training.....     | 124         |

The Effects of Training Strategies on Assessor Behavior  
and the Accuracy of Assessment Center Consensus Ratings

I. INTRODUCTION

Assessment Center Overview

The assessment center method has been recognized as one of the major developments in personnel psychology over the past 25 years (Thornton & Byham, 1982). Numerous studies in applied settings have found positive validities for assessment center ratings with various criteria (e.g., Bray & Campbell, 1968; Bray & Grant, 1966; Bray, Grant & Campbell, 1972; Campbell & Bray, 1967; Cohen, Moses & Byham, 1974; Kraut & Scott, 1972). Furthermore, meta-analytic studies (Gaugler, Rosenthal, Thornton & Bentson, 1987; Schmitt, Gooding, Noe & Kirsch, 1984) have concluded that assessment center ratings are valid predictors. Despite the positive predictive validity of assessment center ratings, there is no conclusive evidence as to why they are effective (Klimoski & Brickner, 1987).

Although our understanding of assessment center ratings may be lacking, this has not diminished its use (Thornton & Byham, 1982). In addition to validity, the indirect benefits associated with the assessment center process may explain its continued use (Finkle, 1976). For example, Finkle noted that the standardization of the assessment center, its job relevancy, and the opportunity to share

behavioral information among assessors, have led to a favorable response to assessment centers by managers.

Another indirect benefit is the use of multiple assessors to evaluate candidate performance. Using multiple assessors provides the opportunity to share behavioral information about a candidate. The consensus meeting is the phase in the assessment center process where information is shared by assessors. The consensus meeting occurs after the candidates have completed the assessment center exercises. In this meeting, information is shared by the assessors, discussed, and used to generate overall dimension performance ratings and an overall assessment rating (OAR). Cohen (1978) and the Task Force on Assessment Center Standards (1977) state that the integration of information to form overall ratings is perhaps the most central aspect of the assessment center. The use of multiple assessors to form ratings has also been recognized as an integral part of the assessment center's "philosophy" (Thornton & Byham, 1982; Zedeck, 1986). Since the consensus meeting produces the ratings used to make administrative decisions and establish validity, the assessors' ability to interpret and integrate information, as well as the structure of the consensus meeting, have a large impact on the effectiveness of the assessment center.

Although standardization within an assessment center



adds to its appeal, variations across assessment centers are common (Finkle, 1976). In particular, consensus meetings may vary by (a) number of assessors in the meeting, (b) role of the chairperson (Klimoski, Friedman & Weldon, 1980), (c) level of consensus (true consensus versus majority rule), (d) order of presentation of exercises and dimensions (Silverman, Dalessio, Woods & Johnson, 1986), (e) and the presentation of information to discuss as narrative reports versus ratings (Smith, 1988). With the possibility of great variation in consensus meetings, the presentation of a "standard" procedure is not possible. However, the procedure for consensus meetings developed by AT&T and used by AT&T and other regulated communications organizations probably typifies that used by most organizations (Thornton & Byham, 1982). The AT&T procedure is described next.

Reading of exercise reports. In this step, each assessor reads aloud a narrative report summarizing the assessor's observations of a candidate in a particular exercise. Each report focuses on the behaviors observed for that exercise and does not contain evaluations or extensive interpretations of behavior. The sequence for reading the reports also follows a prescribed order (e.g., role-play interview is read first; in-basket second; leaderless group discussion third).

Recording of behaviors by assessors. While one assessor reads a report the other assessors record relevant behaviors. After the reading of each report, assessors may ask clarifying questions about the information presented, but they are not allowed to ask evaluative questions or challenge the veracity of another assessor's interpretation of behavior.

Generating initial overall dimension ratings. After all reports are read and clarifying questions answered, initial dimension ratings are independently generated by each assessor. The ratings should integrate all behaviors associated with a particular dimension across all of the exercises that manifested behavior relevant to that dimension.

Posting of initial dimension ratings. Once the initial ratings are completed for a candidate, the ratings of all assessors for a dimension are posted for potential discussion. Once consensus for that dimension is obtained, the ratings for the next dimension are posted.

Discussing the ratings. When a specified level of a priori consensus is not attained for the posted ratings, assessors must discuss ratings until that level is reached. The discussion follows prescribed "ground rules." An assessor with a discrepant rating will first be asked to support that rating. If there are several discrepant

ratings, the assessor with the highest rating will speak first, followed by assessors with the lower ratings. When justifying their ratings, assessors can only provide behavioral evidence and the reasoning used to interpret behavior to support their rating or refute others' ratings. Information that is nonbehavioral or does not pertain to the dimension in question cannot be used as evidence (Finkle & Jones, 1970; Thornton & Byham, 1982). In addition, assessors may question other assessors' ratings, behavioral evidence, and interpretations in this discussion. Revision of ratings should be based on behavioral evidence.

Consensus generally employs a majority rule (Thornton & Byham, 1982). For example, the majority of assessors must agree upon a rating with the remaining assessors in agreement on a rating that is no more than one scale point away from the majority rating. Examples of the majority rule for four assessors who rate three dimensions include: 4, 4, 4, 3; 3, 3, 3, 2; and 1, 2, 2, 2. For combinations of ratings that do not have sufficient agreement (e.g., 3, 3, 4, 2; or 4, 4, 4, 2) discussion continues until the criterion for majority consensus is satisfied. Another kind of consensus is the 100% rule. Here, all assessors must all agree on a single rating.

Once consensus is attained for all dimension ratings,

an OAR is independently generated by each assessor, communicated, and discussed (if necessary) until the prescribed consensus rule is reached. The OAR can either be an overall rating of candidate performance throughout the assessment center or a promotability prediction.

Although considered an integral part of the assessment process, empirical investigation of the consensus meeting has been sparse. Zedeck (1986) stated that the group dynamics in the consensus meeting have been an ignored area of research. Furthermore, Finkle (1976) and Zedeck have found little evidence concerning appropriate meeting size and level of consensus. The use of the consensus meeting appears to be primarily based on appeal and feasibility rather than empirical evidence.

One reason given for using the consensus meeting is that the discussion aspect of the meeting provides new information and clarification that leads to changes in assessor ratings (Zedeck, 1986). This outcome is required in order for the assessors to complete their task. However, the importance and effectiveness of discussion have been questioned. For example, Sackett and Wilson (1982) found that discussion is required only for 22.4% of the ratings. In terms of effectiveness, Zedeck noted that group discussion may strengthen one's initial impressions. If this occurs in consensus meetings, then the discussion

itself may not lead to rating changes. However, changes do occur. The question now is why do assessors change their ratings? A possible answer is that consensus must be reached. Thus, the process and requirements of the meeting, rather than the information exchanged, can lead to changes in the ratings.

Another reason for using the consensus meeting stems from the notion that group output is superior to the sum of individual outputs. Although a great deal of research has compared the performance of groups versus individuals with mixed results (e.g., Bouchard, 1969; Campbell, 1968; Dunnette, 1964; Dunnette, Campbell & Jaastad, 1963; Jenness, 1932; Lorge, Fox, Davitz & Brenner, 1958; Thorndike, 1938), no investigation has directly utilized the consensus meeting context to compare individual and group performance. Although Schmitt (1977) found greater interrater reliability for post-discussion ratings, this finding comes as no surprise. Agreement is required for the meeting to progress, but it is not known whether behavioral information or meeting requirements lead to rating changes. Other indirect evidence comparing individual and group rating quality has suggested that post-discussion ratings may not be superior in quality to ratings generated without group discussion. Wingrove, Jones, and Herriot (1985) found pre- and post-discussion

ratings to have similar validity coefficients. Others (Huck, 1973; Mitchel, 1975; Moses, 1973) found no differences in predictive validity between a mechanical combination of pre-discussion ratings and post-discussion ratings. Tziner and Dolan (1982) and Wollowick and McNamara (1969) found mechanically combined overall ratings to have greater validity than post-discussion ratings. Sackett and Wilson (1982) were able to predict 94.5% of the variance in post-discussion ratings with a mechanical combination of pre-discussion ratings. In addition, they found that for 77.6% of all ratings, interaction was not needed; the pre-discussion ratings had sufficient agreement. Based on this indirect evidence, the importance of the interaction among the assessors for the formation of overall ratings may be overstated.

A third reason for the use of consensus meetings is the system of "checks and balances" that are provided by multiple assessors. With this system, assessors identify and correct other assessors' improper judgments, impressions, and biases. Shack (1983) has questioned the effectiveness of this systems of checks and balances. He suggested that assessors must have the ability to identify impressions and biases of other assessors and the biases that do occur must be random. However, assessor biases might not be identified, because the assessors are usually

from the same hierarchical level in the same organization and are likely to have similar biases. Thus, assessor biases are systematic rather than random, and one assessor's biases probably cannot be identified by other assessors.

Another reason for using the consensus meeting concerns the structure of the assessment center. Assessors rarely have the opportunity to observe a particular candidate in all exercises. Since the assessors do not have complete information for any candidate, they must come together to exchange information. Hoffman (1965) mentioned this need as the reason for the use of groups for problem-solving. This explanation suggests that expediency rather than rating quality is the reason for utilizing consensus meetings. From personal observations of candidate and assessor scheduling, it is more efficient for assessors to observe selected exercises than to observe a candidate in all exercises.

A final reason for using the consensus meeting is that the basic philosophy of the assessment center is the use of multiple assessors to evaluate candidate performance (Thornton & Byham, 1982; Zedeck, 1986). Finkle (1976) noted that the use of a team of assessors for evaluation is universal for assessment centers. Furthermore, Finkle stated that part of the appeal of the assessment center is

the use of multiple assessors who share information. Ratings generated by consensus meetings may also have high acceptability because of the assessment center's appeal. In summary, consensus meetings may be used, despite the promise of mechanical combination, because of appeal and assessment center philosophy.

The preceding discussion of the reasons behind the use of consensus meetings is highly speculative. With the exception of the mechanical combination studies, few studies were uncovered that manipulated aspects of the meeting to assess rating quality. For example, studies have manipulated the role of the chairperson in the meeting (Klimoski et al., 1980), compared the interrater reliability of pre-discussion ratings by using different report formats for the meeting (Smith, 1988), compared the validity of pre- and post-discussion ratings (Wingrove et al., 1985), and compared the ratings of professional and non-professional assessors obtained from the meeting (Greenwood & McNamara, 1969). From the paucity of experimental research, a number of areas in the consensus meeting need investigation. Furthermore, due to the general lack of research, the consensus meeting should not be eliminated from the assessment center, despite the speculation that its hypothesized benefits may not be realized. Two areas that are in need of investigation that



will be addressed here are assessor training and the quality of overall ratings for the consensus meeting. Examining these areas will help to uncover possible methods that can be used to improve rating quality.

#### Consensus Meeting Research Needs

In examining the the quality of overall ratings, a multitude of assessment center validation studies have used the OAR or overall dimension ratings for evidence of validity. Furthermore, other studies have provided information on the psychometric properties of these ratings (e.g., interrater reliability, halo). Only two investigations (Karl & Wexley, 1989; Lorenzo, 1984) have examined the accuracy of these ratings. However, they did not examine the ratings within the team context of the consensus meeting. It has been suggested that for assessing the quality of ratings, accuracy is the most appropriate psychometric measure (Borman, 1977; Cooper, 1981; Dickinson, 1987; Kavanagh, Berman, Hedge & Gould, 1984). In order to get a meaningful indication of the quality of overall ratings, studies examining the accuracy of these ratings must be conducted.

Empirical research examining the training of assessors to function in the consensus meeting is nonexistent. Byham (1977) noted that training focusing on the generation of overall ratings is given the least amount of emphasis in

assessor training. The extent of consensus meeting training is usually one practice session. What exists in the literature are prescriptions of what should be covered in training (Byham, 1977; Byham & Thoresen, 1976; Finkle & Jones, 1970; Thornton & Byham, 1982). Byham and Thoresen concluded that the major skills acquired by assessors involve the observation and recording of behavior, but not skills related to the consensus meeting. Thornton and Byham stated that the "principle task of an assessor is to observe, record, and communicate the behavior of assigned assessees" (p. 235). These prescriptions characterize assessor training. Training focuses primarily on the observation and recording of behavior from exercises rather than on skills relevant to the consensus meeting. Two sources (Finkle & Jones; Thornton & Byham) have provided lists of the tasks to include in assessor training. In both lists the primary focus is on the acquisition of skills relevant to observing exercises. In addition, Finkle and Jones' list states that formal training for the consensus meeting is not done; assessors are just given orientation. Thornton and Byham's list places more emphasis on acquiring consensus meeting skills, but the training needed to acquire these skills is not described.

Although these lists recommend some consensus meeting training empirical research is needed to determine how such

training should be done, what information needs to be presented to the assessors, and how to present the information. Whether such training should be team- or individually-oriented, concentrate on interactive or individual skills, focus on group dynamics or team skills, or be presented in parts or as a whole is unknown. Greater emphasis needs to be placed on consensus meeting training. Wingrove, et al. (1985) stated that "assessors know when to change their ratings, but not how best to do it" (p. 191). Placing greater emphasis on consensus meeting training and investigating the effectiveness of different training methods might help assessors perform more effectively.

#### Can the Consensus Meeting be Considered a Team Task?

An area of research that could provide insight into possible assessor training methods for the consensus meeting is team training. The team training literature has extensively investigated such issues as: whether team or individual training is superior for a team task, the influence of the task itself on training and team performance, and what skills should be emphasized in training. However, before this literature is applied to the consensus meeting process, the consensus meeting task must meet the criteria of a team rather than a group task. Meeting these criteria is important, not only for purposes of generalization, but also so that the research questions

are relevant to the consensus meeting (Klaus & Glaser, 1970). Klaus and Glaser suggested that relevant research for teams involves the manipulation of training variables, while the research for groups concentrates on modifying organizational and structural variables. The general intent of the present research is to examine the effects of various training techniques on the quality of ratings generated through consensus meetings. According to Klaus and Glaser, conceptualizing the consensus meeting as a team function would make the intent of the research more relevant.

The attributes of a team may be ascertained from definitions provided in the literature. These definitions suggest that teams are: two or more individuals (Briggs & Naylor, 1964; Dyer, 1984), in a structured environment (Briggs & Naylor; Glaser, Klaus & Egerman, 1962; Klaus & Glaser, 1970), where the task is well defined (Briggs & Naylor), and effective functioning requires cooperative or coordinated participation of the members (Dyer; Glaser et al.; Klaus & Glaser; Morgan, Glickman, Woodard, Blaiwes & Salas, 1986), in order to achieve a valued objective (Morgan et al.). Further, Klaus and Glaser provided a comparison of teams and groups that help to describe the attributes of a team.

Teams in general:

1. Are rigid in structure, organization and communication networks;
2. Have well-defined positions or assignments, so that the task of each individual can be identified;
3. Depend on cooperative or coordinated participation by members whose activities overlap little and must each be performed at some minimum level of proficiency;
4. Are often involved with equipment or tasks requiring perceptual-motor activities;
5. Can be given specific guidelines on performance based on a task analysis of the team's equipment, mission, or situation.

Groups in general:

1. Have an indefinite, manipulable structure, organization, and communication networks;
2. Have assumed rather than designated positions; each individual's contribution may be highly variable;
3. Depend mainly on individual contributions and may function adequately even when one or several members are not contributing at all;
4. Are often involved with complex decision making activities;
5. Cannot be given much guidance beforehand since the quality and quantity of participation by individual members is not defined (p. 34-35).

The consensus meeting does not clearly fit into the team category. Consensus meetings do not use equipment requiring perceptual-motor activities; activities overlap more than a little; each assessor's contribution may be

variable; and assessors are involved in complex decision making. However, more characteristics of the consensus meeting are congruent with teams than those that are divergent. Namely, the consensus meeting is rigid in structure and communication networks; assessors are given instructions and specific guidance on how to perform based on the team's mission (i.e., assessors are trained to write reports, record behavior, provide behavioral evidence, all of which may lead to improved ratings); the task is mission-oriented; has well-defined positions (i.e., assessors have specific roles as reader, recorder, information provider); and depends upon coordinated participation (i.e., information exchange, providing behavioral evidence). Although the consensus meeting does not have all the attributes of a team, its structure, interdependencies, need for cooperation, and mission-orientation classifies it more as a team than a group. Denson (1981) stated that a distinctive element of teams, versus groups, is the need for interaction among team members. Information exchange is imperative to the success of the consensus meeting. Thus, the consensus meeting is considered a team situation, and the team training literature will be examined for possible answers pertaining to assessor training for the consensus meeting.

### Team Training Background

Numerous researchers have suggested that an effective way to train individuals to perform team tasks is through team training (e.g., Denson, 1981; Meister, 1976; Wagner, Hibbits, Rosenblatt & Schulz, 1977). Team training is defined as any activity experienced by the team members that "results in a change of team function, team organization, or team performance" (Boguslaw & Porter, 1962) (from Denson, 1981, p. 9). Wagner et al. further clarified team training by distinguishing it from multi-individual training. Team training involves the training of individuals on skills and activities needed to improve team member interactions. Denson suggested that team training involves three major skills: coordination, cooperation, and communication. On the other hand, multi-individual training focuses on the acquisition of individual skills and abilities. What distinguishes team from individual training is not the number of individuals at a session, but the content of the training.

The rationale behind team training is the attempt to bring forth the synergistic aspect of team performance relative to the sum of individual contributions. The assumption behind team training is that something is learned (e.g., coordination, cooperation, or communication) that cannot be learned through individual training (Hall &

Rizzo, 1975) that produces an outcome superior to individual training (Collins & Guetzkow, 1964). Furthermore, team training tasks appear to have greater correspondence to transfer tasks that require teamwork than do individual tasks. This greater training task fidelity may lead to greater transfer of training (Goldstein, 1986).

Although team training has a rationale supporting its use, counterhypotheses and disconfirming evidence exist. Johnston (1966) generated four counterhypotheses to the assumption that team training is effective for a team task. First, Johnston suggested that individual skills may be more essential to team performance than team skills. This argument has been supported by those who claimed that individual proficiency is a large contributor to team performance (Meister, 1976; Wiest, Porter & Ghiselli, 1961), as well as by those who claim that individual proficiency is required before team skills may be obtained (Dyer, 1984; Horrocks, Krug & Heermann, 1960; Klaus & Glaser, 1970; Meister; Wagner et al., 1977).

The second counterhypothesis stated that individual skills may be more difficult to learn than team skills. This is associated with the notion that team skills may be known by team members without training. Smode, Hall, and Meyer (1966) argued that individual skills can be acquired in training, but coordination occurs only with high levels



of individual proficiency, not team training. Hall and Rizzo (1975) indirectly supported this argument with their conclusion that greater emphasis should be placed on individual training and developing qualified individuals rather than team training.

The third counterhypothesis stated that team training may not be the only means to acquire team skills; these skills may be more readily acquired through individual training. A number of comparison studies between team and individual training have found individual training to be superior for team tasks. In his review, Meister (1976) concluded that for relatively simple team tasks, individual training was more effective. Johnston (1966) tenuously concluded that coordination skills are better acquired in individual training. In indirect comparisons of team and individual training, Horrocks and his colleagues (Horrocks & Goyer, 1959; Horrocks et al., 1960; Horrocks, Heermann & Krug, 1961) found individual training to lead to more efficient performance on a team decoding task than team training. In a direct comparison where training was an independent measure, Briggs and Naylor (1964) also found individual training to lead to more efficient performance on a task that involved identifying and intercepting aircraft on a radar display. Comparable team performance results have been found between team and individual

training in other research (Briggs & Johnston, 1967; Krumm & Farina, 1962). Furthermore, some investigators (Briggs & Naylor, 1965; Horrocks et al., 1960; Johnston; Kidd, 1961) have suggested that when the task requires low levels of interaction, team training is not efficient. Explanations for these negative findings involved the nature of the team task, and they will be discussed later.

The final counterhypothesis mentioned by Johnston (1966) claimed that team training may generate behaviors that inhibit team performance. Studies that focused on communication have found that communication has positive effects on unstructured tasks and negative effects on structured tasks (Briggs & Naylor, 1965; Johnston; Johnston & Briggs, 1968; Naylor & Briggs, 1965; Nieva, Fleishman & Rieck, 1978; Shiflett, 1972; 1973; Steiner & Dodge, 1956; Thibaut, Strickland, Mundy & Goding, 1960; Williges, Johnston & Briggs, 1966). More specifically, Johnston (1966) and Johnston and Briggs (1968) concluded that team performance is better in tasks that require less verbal communication. Naylor and Briggs suggested that the requirement of communication leads to reduced efficiency because a component (i.e., communication) has been added to a task. Even when efficiency, time, or speed is not important to the successful completion of the task, and communication is required, Johnston and Briggs found

communication to have no effect on team performance. These findings suggest that, depending on the structure of the task, communication may be detrimental to team performance, because of the additional component it adds to a task and its inefficiency as a channel for transmission of information (Briggs & Johnston, 1966).

Although each of Johnston's counterhypotheses has some support, two reasons may explain the mixed results for the effectiveness of team training. First, the method and content of team training may act as moderators to team training results. Second, the team task itself may have a major influence on team performance (Hackman & Morris, 1975). Task components such as task structure, and its attributes (i.e., complexity and organization), work structure, and communication structure may affect team performance (Glaser, Glanzer & Morten, 1955; Naylor & Dickinson, 1969). Depending on the components of the task, team training may be more effective for certain types of tasks.

Focusing on team training methods and the content of training, Freed (1962) and Meister (1976) have argued that most team training methods ignore the acquisition of team skills. Meister mentioned that team training is simply the practice of individual skills in a team context. Freed stated that the assumption that effective teamwork results

from individual proficiency is false. In order for team performance to improve, team skills (e.g., load sharing, coordinating, checking, error detecting, assisting, communicating) pertinent to the task must be emphasized and acquired in training. For example, Parsons (1980) varied the content of team training sessions to determine the type of team training that would lead to superior team performance. The three content areas examined were: Task training (i.e., skills needed to complete the task); Group dynamics (i.e., skills needed to promote interaction and cohesiveness); and Team skills (i.e., skills necessary for the team to function as a team). It was found that the least number of errors were committed by teams who received team skills training.

The recommendations and findings mentioned above suggest that the training program may influence team training effectiveness. If team training consists of practicing individual skills in a team context or focusing on group dynamics or task skills, training may not be effective. Team training should emphasize the acquisition of the team skills needed in order for the team to complete the task successfully.

The second reason for team training's mixed effectiveness concerns the task itself. Researchers (Hackman & Morris, 1975; Morris, 1966; Sorenson, 1971) have

stated that the nature of the task has a major impact on team performance and interaction. The task itself has been found to explain up to 50% of the variation in team performance (Dyer, 1984). Furthermore, attributes of the task such as task structure, task organization, and task complexity (Briggs & Johnston, 1967; Dickinson, 1966; Glaser et al., 1955; Kinkade & Kidd, 1962; Meister, 1976; Naylor & Briggs, 1965; Naylor & Dickinson, 1969) as well as whether the task is emergent or established (Boguslaw & Porter, 1962; McRae, 1966; Wagner et al., 1977) have been found to influence team performance. Before discussing the possible relationships between task attributes and team training, the influence of task attributes on team performance must be examined. Through this examination, the attributes that influence team performance and the behaviors that improve team performance are identified.

Dickinson and Naylor (1966) and Naylor and Dickinson (1969) suggested that team performance is a function of three major characteristics: task structure, work structure, and communication structure. The nature of task structure is described by two attributes of the subtasks that define the team task: complexity and organization. Complexity consists of the demands placed on an individual's information-processing capabilities by each subtask. Organization reflects the interrelationships

between subtasks. Work structure is defined as the sequence in which subtasks must occur and how interactions among team members must occur. Dickinson (1968) indicated that the work structure for a team task is determined, in part, by complexity and organization. The third major component, communication structure, is defined as the communication relationships between team members.

A number of studies have examined the influence of task and work structure on team performance. For example, Dickinson (1966) found that as the team task's organization and complexity decreased, team achievement improved. Dickinson (1968) found that when the work structure was such that the subtasks were distributed among members, interaction among team members improved team performance. Johnston (1966) concluded that individual performance was inversely related to the team skills demanded by the task. In the terminology used by Dickinson, team skills are demanded when the work structure distributes subtasks among team members (i.e., members have less than the total team task). In addition, Naylor and Dickinson (1969) found that decreases in complexity and organization led to greater team achievement. Other studies (Briggs & Naylor, 1965; Johnston & Briggs, 1968) lend further support to the findings mentioned above. These studies concluded that team output increases as organization and complexity

decrease. In a later study, Kabanoff and O'Brien (1979) found superior team performance for a team task that possessed lower subtask organization compared to a team task with higher organization.

Another line of research has suggested that team performance may vary depending on whether the team task is considered emergent or established (Boguslaw & Porter, 1962). Emergent tasks are defined as situations where relevant environmental conditions are not identifiable such that unexpected contingencies and unpredictable outcomes are present. It has been suggested that emergent tasks have high levels of task organization (Meister, 1976). In terms of subtasks, emergent tasks possess high complexity, high organization, and low work structure. On the other hand, established tasks possess low complexity, low organization, and high work structure. Established tasks have identifiable environmental conditions with predictable consequences and outcomes for a range of possible actions. In order for effective team performance to occur in emergent tasks, decision-making, problem-solving, and adaptation skills are required (Wagner et al., 1977). If problem-solving skills are needed, then interaction may also be needed. Shiflett (1972; 1973) found that for problem-solving tasks, team member interactions improved the quality and quantity of solutions generated. Other

investigators (McRae, 1966; Wagner et al.) also recognized the importance of interaction in emergent tasks. They suggested that for tasks with high complexity and organization, interactive skills are critical for successful completion of the team task. This finding is consistent with other findings which stated that the task affects group behavior (Hackman, 1968; Sorenson, 1973). In summary, the research on task structure and emergent vs. established tasks has led to a similar conclusion: Team tasks with high complexity and organization require team member interaction in order for the team to accomplish the task effectively.

A systems perspective helps to explain the importance of the nature of the team task. Namely, a systems perspective suggests that process (i.e., the team task) affects team performance. In order to influence performance, the team task or the inputs (training) can be adjusted. However, for many situations the team task cannot be changed. Thus, the input has to be altered to fit the task to influence performance. With this perspective, it is suggested that different training methods will have varied effectiveness in changing team performance, depending on their suitability for the task. From this reasoning, it is assumed that team and individual training will have varied effects on team performance as a



function of the task.

Research has supported this systems perspective of training, task, and team performance. Hackman and Morris (1975) argued that the task determines the instructions for effective performance. Meister (1976) and Wagner et al. (1977) concluded that the degree of coordination needed to perform the team task influences team training effectiveness. For tasks that require a great deal of coordination, team training is predicted to be more effective than individual training. Other investigators (Egerman, Klaus & Glaser, 1962; Glaser, Klaus & Egerman, 1962) found that for tasks which require large amounts of interaction in order for all members to perform correctly, individual training led to a decrement in team performance. It has also been suggested that as subtask complexity increases, the need for team training increases (Briggs & Johnston, 1967; Meister, 1976). Using an air traffic controller task with high complexity and moderate organization, Kinkade and Kidd (1962) found team training to be superior to individual training. Explaining why complexity affects training success, Briggs and Johnston stated that "one cannot develop a system awareness, an integrated model of the (complex) environment, or exploit fully the self-organizing capability of large teams without team training" (p 25). With high complexity, the demands

on an individual's information-processing capabilities increases the need for interaction. With high organization, information is likely to be distributed among team members and interaction is needed to aggregate and integrate information. With the demand for interaction, the individuals are performing more as a team than as a group. To perform effectively, the team members must be trained on team skills (Freed, 1962; Parsons, 1980).

Within the emergent vs. established task scheme (Boguslaw & Porter, 1962), the variability of team training effectiveness has also been identified. For established tasks, with their low complexity and organization, Wagner et al. (1977) concluded that team training is not as effective as individual training. For emergent tasks, with their greater complexity and organization, team training has been found to be more effective than individual training (Wagner et al.).

In summary, it appears that the team task and its subtasks do influence team performance and the success of team training. Problem-solving tasks require interaction because of their high levels of complexity and organization and low levels of work structure. These team tasks and the need for interaction make team training appropriate. As Dickinson (1968) pointed out, when subtasks are distributed among team members, team performance improves with

increased member interaction. This statement supports the notion that team training will be more effective for tasks with high complexity (i.e., the team task or a large number of subtasks cannot be done by one team member) and high organization (i.e., the high complexity requires a work structure that distributes interrelated subtasks among the team members).

Some of the studies that found team training inferior to individual training may have utilized tasks where interaction was not critical such that each member performed or could perform all subtasks (Briggs & Naylor, 1965; Horrocks et al., 1960; Johnston, 1966; Kidd, 1961). The team tasks employed in these studies are considered contrived tasks, because they can be manipulated to be an individual or a team task. These tasks forced unnecessary interaction and did not possess the necessary composition of subtasks for team training to be successful. In order to investigate teams and team training, "true" team tasks must be utilized (Chidester & Foushee, 1988).

It is suggested here that the consensus meeting employed in the assessment center process may be classified as a "true" team task. The consensus meeting has a mission-orientation, requires team member interaction, and is highly structured. What needs to be examined are the nature of the subtasks in the consensus meeting in order to

determine if it has the characteristics for team training to be effective.

The complexity of the consensus meeting appears to be high. Assessors must determine which behaviors are relevant, categorize them into dimensions, identify relationships between behaviors and between similar dimensions across exercises, formulate overall ratings on the basis of these relationships, and provide behavioral evidence for or against a given rating. Although the assessors' information-processing capabilities are not overextended, there is a great demand placed on their capabilities. The complexity level in consensus meetings appears high enough to be favorable to team training. The level of organization also appears to be high. Assessors must gather information from different assessors, generate and utilize a framework of relationships between similar dimensions across exercises as well as behaviors within and across exercises, and integrate this information into one overall dimension rating or OAR. In order to integrate this information effectively, member interaction is necessary and team training would be favorable for the acquisition of integration skills.

In terms of emergent vs. established tasks, the consensus meeting approaches an emergent task. Although consensus meetings cannot be considered as purely emergent,

Denson (1981) noted that no task is likely to be purely emergent or established. Consensus meetings are considered to have emergent qualities, since problem-solving skills are needed and should be emphasized in training to ensure acceptable results. Furthermore, the consensus meeting may be considered unpredictable in that the assessors cannot be certain that the correct rating was generated. Finally, the consensus meeting requires interaction in order to provide information to support or refute ratings. Classifying consensus meetings as emergent as well as their high levels of complexity and organization make interaction necessary and team training a potential means to improve performance.

#### Part versus Whole Training

In addition to the issue of team vs. individual training, other aspects of training may also improve team performance. Of particular concern here is whether part vs. whole training is given to team members. Although studies and reviews have addressed part vs. whole training (e.g., Adams, 1960; Briggs & Waters, 1958; Hinrichs, 1976; Naylor, 1962; Wightman & Lintern, 1985), no part vs. whole study was found that utilized the assessment center context. Thus, a comparison of these training strategies in an assessment center context appears warranted.

Obviously, there is only one type of whole training,

however, there are a number of partitioning and sequencing techniques to define part training. The emphasis of whole training is on the entire task throughout all phases of training. With this strategy, trainees are presented, practice with, and are given feedback on the entire task.

Part training partitions the task into some systematic sequence of subtasks. The subtasks are usually learned individually and then integrated gradually to form the whole task. Three schemes have been identified that partition the whole task into subtasks (Wightman & Lintern, 1985). Segmentation partitions the task into a temporal or spatial sequence, for the presentation of subtasks. Subtasks may also be presented in order of occurrence or in order of subtask complexity. Another method of segmentation is backward-chaining (Bailey, Hughes & Jones, 1980). Here, the subtask closest to the completion of the whole task is learned first, then prior subtasks are learned in an order opposite to their natural occurrence.

The second scheme for partitioning subtasks is fractionation (Briggs & Waters, 1958). Fractionation method is commonly utilized when multiple subtasks are performed simultaneously (Wightman & Lintern, 1985). Here, one subtask is learned, then another, until all subtasks have been learned. Three methods of fractionation have also been identified (Naylor, 1962). Pure-part consists of

learning each subtask in isolation and then, combining all of the subtasks. Progressive-part involves learning a subtask in isolation, then adding it to other subtasks that were previously learned. Repetitive-part consists of first learning a single subtask, adding a second subtask, learning both subtasks, adding a third subtask, learning all three subtasks, etc.

The third partitioning scheme, simplification (Briggs & Waters, 1958), does not break the task into parts, rather it simplifies the task by adjusting aspects of the task (e.g., easing time constraints, utilizing simpler problems which require less information, or identifying fewer interrelationships).

Rationale and recommendations for both part and whole training strategies have been developed. In their review of part training, Wightman and Lintern (1985) found the common rationale for part training is that through the practice of subtasks, trainee skill on these subtasks improves which, in turn, improves whole task performance. Other investigators (Hall & Rizzo, 1975; Schendel, Shields & Katz, 1978; Wallis, Ewart & Kaufman, 1966) recommended that tasks should be partitioned to insure greater control over the training situation and to improve training effectiveness. Specific to team training, Dyer (1984) suggested that the team task should be sequenced by

complexity or degree of teamwork in order to improve team training. For tasks with many subtasks, Briggs and Waters (1958) argued that it is difficult to acquire the whole task and that the task should be partitioned. Generally, "common sense dictates that a massive body of knowledge should not be taught as a whole" (Adams, 1960).

The rationale behind whole training is based on the premise that an individual cannot identify or understand the interrelationships of the subtasks unless trained on the whole task (Mane, Coles, Karis, Strayer & Donchin, 1984). If a task is partitioned into subtasks, the importance of the interrelationships is not emphasized. Mane et al. recommended that whole training is required when subtasks are interrelated.

General conclusions pertaining to the effectiveness of each strategy have noted that whole training is more effective than part training (Adams, 1960; Wightman & Lintern, 1985). However, such a wide-sweeping conclusion is inappropriate. Similar to the results for team training, comparison studies of part vs. whole training have found that the effectiveness of each strategy varies as a function of the task (Bilodeau, 1957; Briggs & Naylor, 1962; Briggs & Waters, 1958; Naylor, 1962; Naylor & Briggs, 1963; Stammers & Patrick, 1975). More specifically, organization and complexity have been found to moderate



part and whole training effectiveness. For tasks with high levels of organization, whole training is superior and becomes more effective with increases in complexity. On the other hand, for tasks with low organization, part training is superior and its effectiveness increases with increases in complexity. This conclusion has also been extended with the suggestion that for highly organized tasks, whole training is superior regardless of complexity (Briggs & Naylor; Naylor & Briggs). It was also speculated that whole training may be superior for all complex tasks, because increases in complexity may be a result of increases in organization. Other support for whole training was reported by Briggs and Brogden (1954) and Gagne and Foster (1949). In a comparison of practice on the whole task and practice on the subtasks, they found no differences between the practice methods in the performance levels on the whole task.

Wightman and Lintern (1985) found varied effectiveness of the different partitioning schemes for part training. They concluded that segmentation was the most effective strategy, especially the backward-chaining strategy. The superiority is apparently due to the increased opportunity segmentation provides to learn and practice the more complex subtasks. In addition, segmentation was recommended for tasks with variability in subtask

complexity. An explanation for the inferiority of other part strategies may be that subtasks are not as easily learned when the subtasks are distant from the completion of the task (Wightman & Lintern). With backward-chaining the subtasks emphasized are those closest to the completion of the task. In a comparison of fractionation and simplification, Briggs and Waters (1958) found simplification superior because fractionation did not provide practice with the integrated subtasks. More specifically, Briggs and Naylor (1962) found the progressive-part strategy to be superior to pure-part and simplified strategies. However, they also found whole training to be most effective for tasks with high complexity and organization. It appears that if part training is to be used, backward-chaining or another segmentation strategy should be utilized. Two studies (Bailey et al., 1980; Wightman, 1983) found backward-chaining to lead to superior performance on tracking tasks (i.e., simulation of landing a jet on an aircraft carrier deck) than whole training. This partitioning strategy may have been effective, because it emphasized the subtasks near the completion of the whole task and these subtasks were the most complex and organized.

However, there is some question as to the generalizability of part training findings to more

cognitive tasks such as those present in assessment center evaluation. Most of the part vs. whole research has utilized perceptual-motor tasks. Thus, the obvious differences between tasks make generalizations tenuous. Wightman and Lintern (1985) stated that there are no "principles to guide users towards the best procedures or to help maximize the effectiveness of procedures already used" (p 280). However, two aspects of this research (i.e., subtask complexity and organization and subtask sequencing) may be generalizable to the assessment center context. Fairly consistent results have been found for the influence of task organization. On the other hand, task complexity has had a less clear-cut influence. Thus, organization and perhaps complexity will determine whether part vs. whole training would be more effective for training assessors on the observation, recording, and reporting of candidate behavior from a single exercise.

For task sequencing, segmentation appears to be the most effective partitioning strategy. Whether backward-chaining can be utilized and effective for other tasks besides tracking is unknown. However, placing greater emphasis on the more complex subtasks may have promise. Emphasizing the acquisition and practice of complex subtasks may lead to improved performance on the whole task. On the other hand, if the subtasks are highly

organized, no partitioning strategy may be effective because it fails to draw attention to the interrelationships among subtasks.

In the present research, part and whole training strategies will be compared for the observation, recording, and reporting of candidate behavior in a single exercise as the task. In order to generate hypotheses concerning the effectiveness of the two strategies, the complexity and organization for this task must be determined. The complexity of the subtasks appears to be high. A great demand is placed upon assessors' information-processing capabilities. Assessors must observe a dynamic situation (i.e., role-play interview or leaderless group discussion) or read an in-basket, classify the behaviors as relevant or irrelevant, record behaviors, categorize behaviors by dimensions, use their notes and categorizations to integrate the behaviors into a narrative report, and communicate their observations to other assessors. Thus, the task seems to be composed of complex subtasks. Furthermore, the interrelationships among subtasks seems high, because the performance on prior subtasks affects subsequent subtasks. If behaviors are improperly classified or categorized, the accuracy of behavioral integration and the quality of the narrative report suffers. In addition, accurately categorizing behaviors by

dimensions depends on the assessors' knowledge of the dimensions. These interdependencies indicate that subtask organization is high.

With the high levels of organization and complexity for the assessment center exercise rating process, whole training may lead to superior observation, recording, and reporting of behavior than part training. However, the common strategy employed in training assessors is part training. Byham (1977) and Thornton and Byham (1982) listed the subtasks involved in assessor training: Providing a definition of behavior; discriminating between good and poor behavior; understanding the dimensions; observing behaviors; taking notes; categorization of behaviors by dimensions; rating behavior by dimensions; and communicating behavior. The sequencing of these subtasks generally follows a temporal order. For tracking tasks, Wightman and Lintern (1985) suggested that temporal sequencing may not be the most effective strategy. Sequencing the behaviors in terms of complexity may be more appropriate.

In order to sequence the subtasks by complexity, the complexity of the subtasks in the observing, recording, and reporting process must be estimated. The estimation of complexity was based on the perceived information-processing demands that are needed to complete each subtask

(Dickinson & Naylor, 1966; Naylor & Dickinson, 1969) as well as personal observations and experiences by the author. The most complex subtasks appear to be report writing, communicating behavior to assessors, and rating behavior. Less complex subtasks include note taking and the observation of behavior. The least complex subtasks include understanding the dimensions, the categorization of behaviors by dimension, and discriminating between good and poor behaviors. These estimates of subtask complexity were used as a guide for sequencing the subtasks.

Unfortunately, exercise training cannot be completely sequenced by subtask complexity. For example, behaviors cannot be categorized by dimensions until the dimensions are understood. Thus, the sequencing of subtasks must involve a consideration of the need for assessors to have prerequisite information to perform a subtask. Furthermore, the subtasks closest to the completion of exercise assessment (i.e., note taking) may not be the most complex, backward-chaining is not a viable option. With these limitations in mind, a logical sequence for part training is the following: (1) Understanding the dimensions, (2) Categorizing behavior by dimensions, (3) Rating behaviors by dimensions, (4) Observing behavior, (5) Note taking, (6) Writing reports, and (7) Communicating behavior to assessors. Again, this sequence is purely

speculative. By placing greater emphasis on the more complex subtasks early in training, this sequence may lead to superior performance than ordering the subtasks by temporal occurrence.

Although the part vs. whole findings suggest that whole training would be superior to part training for rating an assessment center exercise, differences between the assessors' tasks and the tasks used in previous part vs. whole research make the conclusions less certain. Most part vs. whole training comparisons utilized perceptual-motor tasks, while assessment center exercises involve more cognitive skills. No part vs. whole comparison studies employing a task similar to the one required for an assessor were found. Based on the available part-whole findings, it is predicted that whole training will lead to superior performance in observing, recording, and reporting by assessors than part training. This prediction was made due to the high level of organization and complexity of the assessor's task and the inability to rely entirely on backward-chaining and subtask complexity as the criteria for sequencing subtasks.

#### Present Research Hypotheses

The present research compared the effects of two types of team training, team vs. individual, and two types of individual training, part vs. whole, on the accuracy of

consensus meeting ratings and the behaviors exhibited by team members in the meeting. Part-whole training strategies were utilized in a training session designed to show assessors how to observe, record, and report behaviors exhibited by candidates in an assessment center exercise (i.e., role-play interview, leaderless group discussion, or in-basket).

Based on the part vs. whole research findings and the examination of the subtasks in the exercises, the following hypothesis was generated:

Hypothesis 1: A whole training strategy that emphasizes the interrelationships of subtasks will lead to more accurate ratings than a part training strategy using segmentation to partition the subtasks.

Reasons for greater accuracy with whole training are as follows: (1) A backward-chaining partitioning strategy using complexity as the sole criteria for segmentation could not be used for part training due to high task organization, (2) the final written report will be of higher quality in whole training, (3) those exposed to whole training may be better able to identify the interrelationships among subtasks that exist in the consensus meeting, and (4) by identifying interrelationships, the assessors who were exposed to whole training may perceive interaction among assessors as more



critical to the generation of accurate overall ratings than those exposed to part training.

Team and individual training were utilized during the consensus meeting training session. Team training focused on the acquisition of the team skills (e.g., checking information, filtering information, assisting others, and coordination) needed for the assessors to function effectively as a team as well as the behavioral frameworks needed to integrate information from different sources. Individual training focused on the skills needed to complete the task (e.g., taking notes, generating ratings, and providing behavioral evidence). Due to the high organization and complexity of the consensus meeting and previous team training research findings, the following hypothesis was generated:

Hypothesis 2: Due to the need for interaction among team members on the consensus meeting task, team training will lead to more accurate final ratings than individual training.

A specified order of rating accuracy was also expected to occur for the training strategies. Team and individual training were predicted to have a greater impact on rating quality and assessor behavior in the consensus meeting task than part and whole training. Team and individual training have greater fidelity than part and whole training for the

consensus meeting task. Because team training was predicted to be superior to individual training, team training should produce more accurate ratings and more interactive behaviors than individual training. However, whole training was also predicted to be superior to part training because the skills acquired with whole training may facilitate more effective behaviors in the consensus meeting than part training. With this rationale, the following hypothesis was generated:

Hypothesis 3: The combination of team and whole training will produce the most accurate final ratings followed by team-part, individual-whole, and individual-part.

## II. METHOD

### Participants

Participants were 125 undergraduate students from Old Dominion University and Thomas Nelson Community College. One hundred-eight students (65 females and 43 males) provided complete data and were used in data analyses. The 108 students comprised 36 teams of 3 assessors. Subjects were paid \$50 for approximately 10 hours of participation.

### Design

A 2 x 2 factorial design was used with the two training strategies (Part vs. Whole and Team vs. Individual) serving as the independent variables. The 36 teams were randomly assigned to the four experimental conditions such that nine teams were in each condition.

### Stimulus Exercises

Three assessment center exercises (i.e., in-basket, staffer role-play interview, and assigned-role leaderless group discussion) were utilized to generate the behaviors that would be evaluated at the consensus meeting. These exercises are the three most frequently used in assessment centers (Thornton & Byham, 1982). In a review of 500 assessment centers, Thornton and Byham found in-baskets were used in 95% of the centers surveyed, assigned-role leaderless group discussions in 85%, and role-play interviews in 75%. Furthermore, Byham and Byham (1976)

found a high level of dimension overlap among the dimensions manifested by these exercises. This overlap allowed the behaviors from each exercise to have an impact on the overall dimension ratings.

For the in-basket, assesses assumed the role of a recently hired store manager in a position that had been vacant a short period of time. The assessee had to respond to a number of letters, memoranda, and reports that had accumulated since the position was vacated. All responses to the information had to be written with no telephone contact allowed. A copy of the in-basket, staffer role-play, and assigned-role leaderless group discussion (LGD) are presented in Dickinson and Hedge (1988).

In the staffer role-play interview, assesses assumed the role of a store manager and had to conduct a performance evaluation interview with a department manager. Within the interview, the assessee had to address the performance deficiencies of the department manager (e.g., overordering of merchandise, poor scheduling, inadequate subordinate relations).

For the LGD, each candidate was assigned a supervisory position for a particular department (i.e., Accounting and Finance, Marketing, Data Processing, Public Relations, Human Resources, or Research and Development). The goal of the exercise was for the six supervisors to agree upon a

proposed budget for each department with the total budget held under six million dollars. An assessee's goal was to obtain the needed resources to fund his or her department adequately by persuading the others to accept the assessee's justifications for the budget request.

#### Dimension and Rating Format Development

The three dimensions chosen for evaluation across the exercises were selected based upon the findings of a literature review of assessment centers (Dickinson & Silverhart, 1985). The dimensions were: Problem Solution, Problem Analysis, and Sensitivity. The dimension definitions and corresponding behaviors for each exercise with the exception of Problem Solution for the LGD, were developed in previous studies (Baker, 1986; Campbell, 1986; Fedorko, 1986). For Problem Solution in the LGD, behaviors classified under Initiative were examined and some were used to form a Problem Solution dimension for the LGD. Initiative dealt with proposing methods to organize and run the meeting as well as solutions for dividing up resources. Using behaviors that addressed the proposing of solutions, and their corresponding rankings, a five-point behaviorally anchored rating scale was generated for Problem Solution. Dimension development will be described briefly here; for more detail, refer to the previous research.

The dimensions for each exercise were developed by

conducting eight assessment centers to generate behaviors representative of the dimensions. All assessment centers were videotaped and transcribed to form a list of behaviors. These behaviors were then sorted into dimensions (Smith & Kendall, 1963). Because of low interjudge agreement on the first retranslation, some dimensions were revised and the retranslation process was repeated. For those behaviors with sufficient interjudge agreement, rankings from most effective to least effective for each dimension were completed (Taylor, 1968). Behaviors with ranges under 15.0 were retained. These behaviors were used to form 5-point behaviorally anchored rating scales (BARS) with one anchor behavior per scale point for the role-play and LGD. The behaviors used as anchors on the BARS were five behaviors, one for each quintile, that had mean values that approached an interval scale. Fifteen of these behaviors (i.e., 3 for each of the 5 scale points), were used to create behavioral checklists for each dimension for the role-play and LGD. For the in-basket, all behaviors that survived the retranslation and ranking procedures were used to form dimension-oriented and item-oriented checklists.

For the consensus meeting, dimension definitions and rating scales had to be developed that cut across the three exercises. The dimension definitions were developed by

examining the definitions used for the dimensions of the individual exercises (Baker, 1986; Campbell, 1986; Fedorko, 1986) and definitions developed in later research that utilized the role-play (Johnson, 1987; Silverhart, 1987). From these definitions, a composite definition was formed for each of the three dimensions. Furthermore, the example behaviors provided by Baker and Campbell were aggregated to form overall behavioral examples. Dimension definitions and their corresponding behavioral examples are presented in Appendix A.

The rating scales used for overall dimension evaluations and overall assessment rating were three 5-point BARS and one 5-point graphic rating scale (GRS). The BARS were developed through examination of the ranked behaviors from each dimension for each exercise. For each dimension, all behaviors were first categorized in terms of scale point (1-5). These behaviors were then examined to identify a common "theme" among the behaviors for a particular scale point. Once a theme was identified, those behaviors consistent with the theme were reworded to make them less specific to a single exercise and placed on the appropriate scale point. Due to the large number of dimension-relevant behaviors that could be manifested across the three exercises, multiple anchors were used, when available, for the scale points. The OAR scale

consisted of a 5-point GRS. The GRS was used rather than a behavioral scale in order to be consistent with the way in which OARs are formed in assessment centers. Means for evaluative adjectives provided by Spector (1976), were used to construct a 5-point scale. The three BARS and the GRS that were used for consensus ratings are presented in Appendix B.

#### Consensus Meeting Process Measure

A measure was also constructed to assess the impact of the training methods on the consensus meeting process. This measure was based on previous work on team skills and monitoring team performance (Freed, 1962; Willging, 1985). Freed generated a list of team skills for categorizing interactive behaviors. Freed's list was examined to determine which team skills could be expected to occur in a consensus meeting. For the skills believed to be relevant, consensus meeting behaviors were generated to serve as examples of these skills. Furthermore, Willging identified behaviors that may inhibit group performance (e.g., member dominance, premature consensus). Another behavior, lack of information exchange, was added to Willging's behaviors. Behaviors relevant to these inhibitory actions and with possible occurrence in the consensus meeting were generated to serve as behavioral examples. The team skills, inhibitory actions, and their corresponding examples were



then placed on an observation list similar to that utilized by Willging (1985). This list was used by the experimenters who were present for the consensus meetings. These experimenters were trained on how to use the list and to recognize and record interactive behaviors. This list was pilot-tested to assess its adequacy for observing the consensus meetings.

Furthermore, the list was also reviewed by industrial/organizational psychologists who have served as chairpersons of consensus meetings at two assessment centers. These psychologists were asked if they have observed these behaviors in a consensus meeting and if the definitions were acceptable. Feedback from these individuals was incorporated into the observation list.

When a team skill or inhibitory action was exhibited by a consensus team, the behavior was recorded under the appropriate category. The reliability of the experimenter's observations was assessed through discussion between the experimenter who observed the meeting and the other experimenter. If both experimenters agreed on the rationale used to classify the behavior, the response was retained. If there was disagreement, the experimenters agreed to either delete the response or to reclassify the response. The observation list used to monitor team behavior is presented in Appendix C.

### Target Score Generation

In order to assess the accuracy of each team's ratings, target scores were generated for the three overall dimension ratings and the OAR. Target scores for dimension performance on some of the individual exercises were also established. For the role-plays, target scores had already been developed (Johnson, 1987; Silverhart, 1987), however, for the remaining exercises no target scores were available.

The experts who generated all target scores were five advanced graduate students in industrial/organizational psychology. Each expert was knowledgeable of performance ratings and assessment centers. Three of the experts previously participated in the development of the role-play target scores and had conducted research in the assessment center and rating areas. The remaining two experts were exposed to assessment centers and ratings through upper-level seminars.

Before generating ratings, the experts became familiar with the three exercises and dimensions. The exercises and dimensions to be evaluated were discussed by the experts to ensure a common understanding of the exercises, dimensions, and the behaviors categorized under a particular dimension. Once all experts were comfortable with the dimensions and behaviors, observation and rating began. Target scores

were obtained through majority consensus. The minimum level of agreement required three experts to agree on one rating and the remaining two experts to agree on another rating one scale point from the majority. The majority rating was the target score.

Although the role-play videotapes had target scores, the experts observed these videotapes and recorded behaviors relevant to overall target scores. The target scores and checklists of the behaviors generated by previous experts for the role-plays were referred to after viewing and rating. Any discrepancies between the current and previous target scores were then discussed. In this present research, the experts observed only 5 of the 10 videotapes of role-play performance. Furthermore, the experts were also provided written scripts of the five role-play performances and were allowed to view the videotapes as many times as desired. The target scores for the assessees in the role-plays, LGDs, in-baskets, and overall ratings are presented in Appendix D.

The dimension target scores for the BARS were analyzed using a 5 x 5 x 3 analysis of variance. The independent variables were Raters, Assesseees, and Dimensions. The analysis revealed a significant Assesseees effect ( $p < .01$ ) and a significant Assesseees x Dimension interaction ( $p < .01$ ). A summary of the analysis for the role-play target

scores is presented in Table 1.

The significant Assessee effect indicated that the target scores possessed convergent validity. Convergent validity suggests that the experts agreed on the ordering of the assessee. The significant Assessee x Dimensions interaction indicated discriminant validity. Discriminant validity suggests that the experts were able to differentiate between the assessee on the three dimensions. Convergent and discriminant validities indicate that the target scores are of high quality (Dickinson, 1987; Kavanagh, MacKinney & Wolins, 1971). In addition, a nonsignificant Rater effect ( $p > .05$ ) suggested that the experts were highly reliable.

For the LGD, the experts observed five assessee, were provided with scripts, recorded behaviors, and were allowed to watch the videotapes as many times as needed. For generating these target scores, a consensus meeting process was followed similar to the process that was followed for the experimental consensus meetings. After observing an assessee, the experts independently rated the assessee on the three dimensions using 5-point BARS and behavioral checklists previously generated (Baker, 1986). These ratings were then posted and, if a majority consensus was not obtained, discussion began concerning the rationale behind the ratings. Discussion continued until a majority

Table 1

ANOVA Summary Table for the Role Play Target Scores

| Source         | df | MS     | F-Ratio            | VC    | ICC  |
|----------------|----|--------|--------------------|-------|------|
| Rater (R)      | 4  | .047   | .362               | -.005 | ---- |
| Assessee (A)   | 4  | 15.247 | 117.285*           | 1.008 | .597 |
| Dimensions (D) | 2  | 4.973  | 1.826 <sup>a</sup> | .060  | .036 |
| R x A          | 16 | .130   | -----              | .013  | .008 |
| R x D          | 8  | .057   | .633               | -.011 | ---- |
| A x D          | 8  | 2.757  | 30.630*            | .533  | .316 |
| R x A x D      | 32 | .090   | -----              | .090  | .053 |

Note. Negative variance components were assigned an intraclass correlation of zero. However, negative variance components were included in the denominator (i.e., sum of all variance components) to compute intraclass correlation coefficients for other nonnegative variance components. VC, Variance component. ICC, Intraclass correlation coefficient.

<sup>a</sup>  
Quasi F-ratio.

\*  $p < .01$ .

consensus rating was agreed upon. This agreed upon rating served as the target score.

These dimension target scores for the BARS were also analyzed using a 5 x 5 x 3 analysis of variance. The

analysis revealed a significant Assessee effect ( $p < .01$ ), a significant Assessee x Dimension interaction ( $p < .01$ ), and a nonsignificant Rater effect ( $p > .05$ ). These results suggested that the LGD target scores had convergent and discriminant validities and were of high quality. A summary of the LGD analysis is presented in Table 2.

With the in-basket, experts followed a procedure similar to the other exercises. Experts made ratings using the item-oriented checklist. This checklist was used because of its superior construct validity and greater assessor acceptance (Fedorko, 1986). With the item-oriented checklist, the expert read an item and the assessee response and checked off the corresponding behaviors displayed. Target scores were generated item by item for each dimension using the majority consensus rule.

For these target scores the 5 x 5 x 3 analysis of variance revealed a significant Rates effect ( $p < .01$ ), a significant Assessee x Dimension interaction ( $p < .01$ ), and a nonsignificant Rater effect ( $p > .05$ ). These results suggested that the in-basket target scores had convergent and discriminant validities and were of high quality. A summary of the in-basket analysis is presented in Table 3.

For generating overall dimension and overall rating target scores, the experts used the exercise target scores, checklists, and the behaviors recorded while observing

Table 2

ANOVA Summary Table for the Leaderless Group Discussion  
Target Scores

| Source         | df | MS     | F-Ratio           | VC    | ICC  |
|----------------|----|--------|-------------------|-------|------|
| Rater (R)      | 4  | .100   | .599              | -.004 | .000 |
| Assessee (A)   | 4  | 10.900 | 65.269*           | .716  | .592 |
| Dimensions (D) | 2  | 1.693  | .871 <sup>a</sup> | -.007 | ---- |
| R x A          | 16 | .167   | -----             | .013  | .011 |
| R x D          | 8  | .060   | .472              | -.013 | ---- |
| A x D          | 8  | 2.010  | 15.827*           | .377  | .312 |
| R x A x D      | 32 | .127   | -----             | .127  | .105 |

Note. Negative variance components were assigned an intraclass correlation of zero. However, negative variance components were included in the denominator (i.e., sum of all variance components) to compute intraclass correlation coefficients for other nonnegative variance components. VC, Variance component. ICC, Intraclass correlation coefficient.

<sup>a</sup> Quasi F-ratio.

\*  $p < .01$ .

assessee performance. Since the experts observed all the assessees perform in all exercises they had enhanced opportunities to observe behavior which is a requirement

Table 3

ANOVA Summary Table for the In-Basket Target Scores

| Source         | df | MS     | F-Ratio           | VC    | ICC  |
|----------------|----|--------|-------------------|-------|------|
| Rater (R)      | 4  | .033   | 1.000             | .000  | .000 |
| Assessee (A)   | 4  | 7.402  | 224.303*          | .491  | .154 |
| Dimensions (D) | 2  | 5.578  | .393 <sup>a</sup> | -.016 | ---- |
| R x A          | 16 | .033   | -----             | .004  | .001 |
| R x D          | 8  | .041   | 1.952             | .004  | .001 |
| A x D          | 8  | 14.157 | 674.143*          | 2.827 | .887 |
| R x A x D      | 32 | .021   | -----             | .021  | .007 |

Note. Negative variance components were assigned an intraclass correlation of zero. However, negative variance components were included in the denominator (i.e., sum of all variance components) to compute intraclass correlation coefficients for other nonnegative variance components. VC, Variance component. ICC, Intraclass correlation coefficient.

<sup>a</sup>  
Quasi F-ratio.

\*  $p < .01$ .

for the generation of target scores (Borman, 1977).

The generation of target scores followed a structure similar to that of the experimental consensus meeting. For each assessee, experts communicated their observations to



one another, one exercise at a time. Next, experts independently rated the assessee on the 5-point BARS. Ratings were communicated and, if needed, discussed until a majority consensus was reached. Once consensus for a dimension was obtained, expert rationale for the rating was generated. After all dimension ratings and rationales were obtained, the OAR was completed with the 5-point GRS following the consensus meeting process mentioned above. This procedure was then repeated for the remaining assessees.

For the overall dimension target scores, an Assesseees x Raters x Dimensions analysis of variance was also used. The analysis revealed a significant Assesseees effect ( $p < .01$ ), a significant Assesseees x Dimension interaction ( $p < .01$ ), and a nonsignificant Rater effect ( $p > .05$ ). These result suggested that the overall dimension target scores possessed convergent and discriminant validities and were high quality. A summary of this analysis is presented in Table 4.

After overall ratings for the five assesseees were formed, the experts generated a "behavioral framework" for each dimension and the OAR. This framework consisted of the experts' cognitive strategies they used to integrate behaviors across the exercises to form each dimension rating and the OAR. They included what behaviors were seen

Table 4

ANOVA Summary Table for the Overall Dimension Target Scores

| Source         | df | MS    | F-Ratio            | VC    | ICC  |
|----------------|----|-------|--------------------|-------|------|
| Rater (R)      | 4  | .147  | 2.673              | .006  | .008 |
| Assessee (A)   | 4  | 3.347 | 60.855*            | .219  | .295 |
| Dimensions (D) | 2  | 3.253 | 1.528 <sup>a</sup> | .030  | .040 |
| R x A          | 16 | .055  | -----              | -.013 | ---- |
| R x D          | 8  | .187  | 1.968              | .018  | .024 |
| A x D          | 8  | 2.037 | 21.442*            | .388  | .522 |
| R x A x D      | 32 | .095  | -----              | .095  | .128 |

Note. Negative variance components were assigned an intraclass correlation of zero. However, negative variance components were included in the denominator (i.e., sum of all variance components) to compute intraclass correlation coefficients for other nonnegative variance components. VC, Variance component. ICC, Intraclass correlation coefficient.

<sup>a</sup>  
Quasi F-ratio.

\*  $p < .01$ .

as particularly relevant to a dimension, how salient the behaviors from each exercise were for a given dimension, and what behaviors across exercises were seen as similar. The behavioral frameworks were intended to serve as a

cognitive scheme that could be used by a team to record notes, integrate information, generate ratings, and justify their ratings.

### Part Training

In order to generate a part training program, the observation, recording, and reporting task had to be partitioned into subtasks. A task analysis was used to identify these subtasks, their interrelationships, and their complexity. The target score experts were asked to break down the task into subtasks, identify which subtasks were related, and rank order the subtasks in terms of complexity. The task analysis uncovered eight subtasks. The subtasks identified were: Understanding the exercise, understanding the dimensions, understanding the behaviors that correspond to each dimension, matching behaviors to dimensions, rating behavior by dimension, observing behaviors, taking notes, and writing reports.

For whole and part training programs, the rating behavior by dimension subtask was included despite the fact that it was not required for report writing. Rating was included, because assessors would be required to determine the effectiveness of the behaviors they observed and communicate this to other assessors during the second session. In order to better prepare the assessors for the second session, knowledge of rating behavior by dimensions

needed to be acquired during this training session, although it was not required during report writing.

The next step in developing a part training program was to sequence the subtasks in some systematic order. Following the recommendations of Wightman and Lintern (1985), a segmentation strategy was proposed to sequence the subtasks. However, due to this task's high organization, the sequencing was dictated by two criteria (subtask complexity and the interrelationship of subtasks). These criteria and the experts' input, were used to sequence the subtasks in the following sequence:

1. Understanding the exercise.
2. Understanding the dimensions.
3. Understanding the behaviors that correspond to each dimension.
4. Matching behaviors to dimensions.
5. Rating behaviors by dimensions.
6. Observing behaviors and note taking.
7. Reporting behaviors by means of a narrative report.

For part training, each subtask was presented via videotape to the assessors with definitions and explanations of what the subtask entailed. Questions that the assessors had about the subtask were then answered. Once the assessors understood the subtask, they were allowed a practice trial using the subtask. For the

understanding of dimensions and the behaviors subtasks, practice was provided in a "quiz" format which required matching behaviors to dimensions. Upon completion of practice, feedback was provided by the experimenter on the assessor's performance on a subtask. Any questions from the assessors were then answered.

This process of subtask presentation, practice, feedback, and questions was followed for each subtask. During training on a subtask the focus was on the acquisition of the particular subtask in question. However, due to high organization, previously acquired subtasks needed to be integrated into the presentation, practice, and feedback of some subtasks (e.g., using their observations and notes, assessors matched behaviors to dimensions). The materials used during part training and the part role-play training script are presented in Appendices E and F, respectively.

After feedback was provided and questions answered for the final subtask, a brief summary of the subtasks was presented. Following the summary, the part training session ended.

#### Whole Training

Similar to part training, whole training focused on the acquisition of the seven subtasks. However, the presentation and practice of subtasks varied between the

two training programs.

The process of presentation, practice, feedback, and questions for each subtask was not used in whole training. Whole training presented the whole task to assessors, allowed the assessors practice on the whole task, and provided feedback on the whole process. This was carried out by first presenting via videotape all the subtasks in a temporal order, explaining what each subtask entailed, providing definitions, and pointing out any interrelationships between subtasks. After the presentation of the whole task, assessor questions were answered. Once the assessors had an understanding of the task, the assessors were given one practice trial on the whole task. This involved the assessors observing an assessee's performance for a particular exercise, taking notes, matching behaviors to dimensions, and writing a narrative report. Once practice was completed, feedback was provided on the quality of the reports. In addition, the interrelationships between subtasks were identified and incorporated into feedback to show how earlier subtasks could influence the quality of the reports. The materials used and the whole role-play training script are provided in Appendices G and H. Training materials common to both part and whole training strategies are presented in Appendix I.

After the feedback was provided, questions were answered and a brief summary of the task was communicated to the assessors.

Tables 5 and 6 provide a summary of the components and a comparison of the part and whole training strategies. Table 5 corresponds to the leaderless group discussion and role play, while Table 6 is for the in-basket.

### Individual Training

In the individual training condition, the acquisition of task skills was emphasized. Task skills are those skills needed by the team members in order to perform the task (Parsons, 1980). Since these are essential skills, both individual and team training conditions received training on task skills.

Eight task skills were identified for the consensus meeting. These skills, in temporal order included: Reading reports, taking notes, asking clarifying questions, generating ratings, communicating ratings, reaching consensus, discussing the ratings, and generating OARs.

The training format was primarily lecture with one practice consensus meeting and feedback provided on each skill manifested in the practice meeting. The session began by informing the team of the purpose for consensus meetings. After this introduction, the task skills were introduced in temporal order to the team via videotaped





Table 5 (concluded)

|   |  |
|---|--|
| -----   | Matching Behaviors to Dimensions using the Feedback on Recorded Behaviors <sup>a</sup> |
| -----   | Feedback on Matching Behaviors to Dimensions <sup>a</sup>                              |
| -----   | Evaluations of Behavioral Effectiveness Feedback on Matching <sup>a</sup>              |
| -----   | Feedback on Evaluations <sup>a</sup>   |
| Presentation on Report Writing  | Presentation on Report Writing   |
| Report-Writing Practice using the Feedback on Recorded Behaviors <sup>b</sup> | Report-Writing Practice using the Feedback on Recorded Behaviors <sup>b</sup>          |
| Report-Writing Feedback Specific to Report Writing Instructions               | -----  |
| -----   | Report-Writing Feedback Related to Other Components of the Overall Task                |
| Training Concluded  | Training Concluded   |

<sup>a</sup> These components were not appropriate for and were not included in in-basket training.

<sup>b</sup> For the in-basket exercise, trainees wrote reports using a practice in-basket.

Table 6

Description of the Part and Whole Training Strategies for the In-Basket

| <u>Part</u>   | <u>Whole</u>   |
|---|--|
| Introduction to Training  | Introduction to Training   |
| Presentation of Exercise  | Presentation of Exercise   |
| -----   | Presentation of FOR Behaviors to Expect, and Progression of the Exercise |
| Dimension Definitions   | Dimension Definitions  |
| Presentation on Matching Behaviors to Dimensions                | Presentation on Matching Behaviors to Dimensions                         |
| Presentation of Checklists                                      | Presentation of Checklists   |
| Paper Practice of Matching Behaviors to Dimensions              | -----  |
| Feedback on Matching Behaviors to Dimensions                    | -----  |
| FOR Training for each Dimension                                 | FOR Training for each Dimension  |
| Paper Practice on Evaluating Behavioral Effectiveness           | -----  |
| Feedback on Evaluations   | -----  |
| Presentation on Report Writing                                  | Presentation on Report Writing   |
| Report-Writing Practice using a Practice In-Basket              | Report-Writing Practice using a Practice In-Basket                       |
| Report-Writing Feedback Specific to Report-Writing Instructions | -----  |

Table 6 (concluded)

|                    |  |
|--------------------|--|
| -----              | Report-Writing Feedback<br>Related to Other Components<br>of the Overall Task            |
| -----              | Evaluations of Behavioral<br>Effectiveness using the<br>Feedback from Report-<br>Writing |
| -----              | Feedback on Evaluations  |
| Training Concluded | Training Concluded   |

lecture. For each skill, a description of the skill and explanations of how to carry out the skill were presented. The assessors were allowed to ask questions about any task at the conclusion of its presentation. The training script for individual training is presented in Appendix J.

Upon completion of the task skills presentation, the team was allowed to practice these skills in a consensus meeting for a single assessee. The practice meeting followed the same procedure as the experimental meeting. Feedback was provided by the experimenter at the conclusion of the practice consensus meeting. Feedback was given on either a team or individual level, depending on the task skill in question. Feedback on ratings consisted of target scores and behavioral rationale for each overall rating.

At the conclusion of the practice meeting and feedback, the experimenter answered questions and briefly

reviewed the task skills. The experimental consensus meeting began immediately following the conclusion of training.

### Team Training

Team training also included the acquisition of task skills. The procedure for acquiring and practicing these skills was similar to the procedure used in individual training. Although the two strategies are similar on these aspects, there were two additions to team training which made it distinct from individual training.

The first addition was the presentation of the behavioral frameworks generated by the experts. The frameworks and their relationship to forming overall ratings were presented during the lecture on generating ratings. In addition, when the team received feedback on their ratings they were presented with target scores, behavioral rationale, and explanations of how the behavioral frameworks related to the target scores.

The second distinction involved the presentation, practice, and feedback of team skills. This is consistent with the recommendations of other investigators (Freed, 1962; Morgan, Salas & Glickman, 1987; Parsons, 1980) who stated that the acquisition of team skills should be stressed in team training. The team skills presented in training were those identified by Freed and were expected

to occur in the consensus meeting (checking, communicating, filtering, gathering). In addition, the actions identified by Willging (1985) as inhibitors to team performance (conformity, member dominance) and lack of information exchange were also presented. The inhibitory actions were presented in a rater error training format (e.g., identify them as inhibitors, provide examples, and provide rationale concerning why they are inappropriate). The facilitative skills were presented at the point in the consensus meeting where the skills were expected to occur. At the appropriate point in the meeting, the team skill, how it occurs, and an example of the skill were introduced to the team.

During the practice meeting, the team was given the opportunity to practice and receive feedback on task and team skills. If the team exhibited a team skill, the experimenter provided feedback on the behavior. If an opportunity to exhibit a team skill was overlooked by the team, the experimenter informed the team of the missed opportunity and why it would be desirable to employ a particular team skill at that time. Group discussion concerning the team skills and how they influence the consensus meeting process and ratings was conducted at the conclusion of the practice session and feedback. The materials used, and a summary of team training are provided

in Appendices K and L. Training materials common to both team and individual training strategies are presented in Appendix M.

After the practice meeting and group discussion, assessor questions were addressed and a brief overview of the task skills, team skills, and inhibitory actions was presented. Immediately following this overview, the experimental consensus meeting began.

#### Procedure

This research was conducted in two, 5 hour sessions. For the first session, subjects in group sizes ranging from 1 to 5 were trained to observe, record, and report assessee performance for a single type of exercise. Within a group, assessors were exposed only to one of the three exercises. The session began by informing the assessors of the purpose of the study, the agenda for their participation, and the objective of the first session. Next, assessors read the written descriptions of the exercise they were to observe. In addition, the experimenter further explained the purpose and goals of the exercise.

After the assessors were familiarized with the exercise, they were trained in the part or whole strategy on observing, recording, and reporting behaviors. In addition, the assessors were given one practice session and were provided with target score and behavioral rationale

feedback. Upon completion of the training session, assessors observed four assessees in a single exercise and recorded behaviors.

Once the observation was completed, the assessors wrote narrative reports for each assessor. Consistent with Finkle and Jones' (1970) suggestion, a list of questions that needed to be addressed in the report was given to the assessors and served as guidelines for writing the reports. The list of questions for each exercise is presented in Appendix N.

The completion of the four reports marked the end of the first session. Ratings were not made by the assessors and ratings were not presented in the consensus meeting. The presentation of ratings at the consensus meeting has been found to improve the agreement of pre-discussion ratings (Smith, 1988), and this greater agreement would limit the opportunity for assessor interaction.

The first session varied across groups in two ways. First, part vs. whole training was manipulated in this session; one-half of the subjects received part training and one-half received whole training. Second, the subjects were exposed to different exercises. One-third of the subjects observed and reported behaviors from the in-basket, one-third from the role-play, and one-third from the LGD.

The second session was scheduled within two weeks of the first session with the majority being held within one week of the first session. This session was conducted with a team of three assessors. The team consisted of assessors who each viewed a different exercise and were all exposed to part or whole training.

After the introduction to the consensus meeting and a description of the exercises and dimensions, teams received either team or individual training. After the completion of training, the consensus meeting began.

The consensus meeting followed the procedure outlined in the introduction. Overall ratings were generated following a within-dimension approach (Silverman et al., 1986). The presentation of the narrative reports for the exercises followed a fixed order of least to most complex. The relative complexity of observing each exercise and rating each dimension was determined by the target score experts. After the reports were read and clarifying questions answered, preliminary ratings for the dimensions were independently generated using 5-point BARS. The order in which the dimensions were rated, communicated, and discussed was also fixed across teams. If consensus was not reached for the initial dimension ratings, discussion was carried out until a majority consensus was obtained. Once consensus was reached for the dimension ratings, an



OAR was independently generated using a 5-point GRS, communicated to the team, and if needed, discussion ensued until consensus was obtained. Upon completion of the OAR, the next assessee was evaluated using the same procedure. The consensus meeting was completed when overall ratings had been completed for the four assessees.

The experimenter was present for all consensus meetings. The experimenter's tasks were to ensure that the structure of the consensus meeting was maintained and to record behaviors on the observation list. The experimenter did not participate in decision making and did not provide any information besides that concerning consensus meeting structure.

### Analyses

The accuracy of the ratings was examined through an analysis of variance approach to assess Cronbach's measures of elevation, differential elevation, stereotype, and differential accuracy (Dickinson, 1987). With this strategy, orthonormal contrasts are formed between each team's ratings and the corresponding target scores. These contrasts, referred to as discrepancies, were produced by subtracting an observed rating from its corresponding target score and dividing by the square root of 2.0. Thus, Rating Sources and all sources that interact with Rating Sources reflect some type of accuracy. The sources that

represent the accuracy measures are presented in Table 7. The accuracy sources and their error terms are presented in Table 8.

Elevation accuracy is represented by the Rating Sources effect. A significant effect here is indicative of a deviation between the overall mean target score and the overall mean rating for all teams. Thus, a significant effect suggests a lack of elevation accuracy.

Differential elevation accuracy is represented by the Assesseees x Rating Sources interaction. A significant interaction suggests that the teams were inaccurate in the ordering of assesseees. The Dimensions x Rating Sources interaction reflects stereotype accuracy. Significance suggests that the teams' overall mean dimension ratings are divergent from target score overall dimension ratings. The Dimensions x Assesseees x Rating Sources interaction represents differential accuracy. Differential accuracy examines the ability of the teams to rate the assesseees accurately on each dimension. Again, a significant interaction suggests inaccuracy.

An extension of Dickinson's (1987) basic design allows the comparison of the relative amounts of accuracy for each of the training conditions. For example, the Part vs. Whole x Rating Sources interaction reflects differences in elevation accuracy across part and whole training

Table 7

Accuracy Measures and Interpretations

| Effect                       | Psychometric Interpretation  |
|------------------------------|--|
| Rating Sources (S)           | Elevation Accuracy   |
| Part vs. Whole (PW) x S      | Elevation Accuracy by Part vs. Whole Training                                      |
| Team vs. Individual (TI) x S | Elevation Accuracy by Team vs. Individual Training                                 |
| PW x TI x S                  | Elevation Accuracy by Part vs. Whole and Team vs. Individual Training              |
| Dimension (D) x S            | Stereotype Accuracy  |
| D x TI x S                   | Stereotype Accuracy by Team vs. Individual Training                                |
| D x PW x S                   | Stereotype Accuracy by Part vs. Whole Training                                     |
| D x PW x TI x S              | Stereotype Accuracy by Part vs. Whole and Team vs. Individual Training             |
| Assessees (A) x S            | Differential Elevation Accuracy  |
| A x PW x S                   | Differential Elevation Accuracy by Part vs. Whole Training                         |
| A x TI x S                   | Differential Elevation Accuracy by Team vs. Individual Training                    |
| A x PW x TI x S              | Differential Elevation Accuracy by Part vs. Whole and Team vs. Individual Training |

Table 7 (concluded)

| Effect              | Psychometric Interpretation  |
|---------------------|--|
| D x A x S           | Differential Accuracy  |
| D x A x PW x S      | Differential Accuracy by Part vs. Whole Training                         |
| D x A x TI x S      | Differential Accuracy by Team vs. Individual Training                    |
| D x A x PW x TI x S | Differential Accuracy by Part vs. Whole and Team vs. Individual Training |

strategies. Differences in elevation accuracy across the training strategies can be determined by the significance of this interaction and subsequent post-hoc analyses. Other interactions, presented in Table 7, describe the differences in the four accuracy measures across the training strategies. Significance for any one of these interactions suggests a difference in a given accuracy measure for a training strategy.

Correlations between dimension ratings and OARs with their corresponding target scores were also generated for each part vs. whole by team vs. individual training interaction. Positive correlations reflect accuracy while negative or near-zero correlations suggest inaccuracy.

The trend of correlations across the three sets of

Table 8

Summary Table and Error Terms for the Sources of Accuracy

| Effect                            | Error Term  |
|-----------------------------------|---|
| <u>Between Teams</u>              |   |
| Rating Sources (S)                | R/PT  |
| Part vs. Whole Training (PW)      | $R/PT + A \times PW - A \times R/PT^a$                                      |
| Team vs. Individual Training (TI) | $R/PT + A \times TI - A \times R/PT^a$                                      |
| PW x TI                           | $R/PT + A \times PW \times TI - A \times R/PT^a$                            |
| Raters/PWxTI (R/PT)               | R/PT x A  |
| <u>Within Teams</u>               |   |
| Dimensions (D)                    | $D \times R/PT + D \times A - D \times A \times R/PT^a$                     |
| D x PW                            | $D \times R/PT + D \times A \times PW - D \times A \times R/PT^a$           |
| D x TI                            | $D \times R/PT + D \times A \times TI - D \times A \times R/PT^a$           |
| D x PW x TI                       | $D \times R/PT + D \times A \times PW \times TI - D \times A \times R/PT^a$ |
| D x R/PT                          | D x A x R/PT  |
| Assessees (A)                     | A x R/PT  |
| A x PW                            | A x R/PT  |
| A x TI                            | A x R/PT  |

Table 8 (concluded)

| Effect          | Error Term   |
|-----------------|--------------|
| A x PW x TI     | A x R/PT     |
| A x R/PT        | Error Term   |
| D x A           | D x A x R/PT |
| D x A x PW      | D x A x R/PT |
| D x A x TI      | D x A x R/PT |
| D x A x PW x TI | D x A x R/PT |
| D x A x R/PT    | Error Term   |

<sup>a</sup>  
Quasi F-ratio.

ratings generated during the consensus meeting (initial, revised, final) was also examined. The trend of correlations reflects the effect the consensus meeting and the training conditions had on rating accuracy. If correlations increase from initial to final ratings, the consensus meeting process has a positive effect on rating accuracy.

Regression analyses were also conducted and served as a third measure of rating accuracy. For these analyses, the target score OARs were regressed onto the dimension ratings. Regressions were computed for each training interaction strategy in order for comparisons to be made.

Although these regressions dealt with rating accuracy, they examined a different aspect of accuracy than the analysis of variance and correlations. The regressions determine the amount of variance in the target score OAR that is accounted for by the dimension ratings. If a mechanical combination of the dimension ratings was used to form OARs, the regression results would indicate which training strategy would lead to the most accurate OARs. Greater amounts of variance explained by the dimension ratings would suggest that a more accurate OAR would be generated. The trend in regression results across the three sets of ratings was also examined to assess the effect the consensus meeting and training strategies have on generating accurate OARs.

In addition to the accuracy analyses, the number of interactive and inhibitory behaviors exhibited by team members during the consensus meeting was also examined. Frequency counts for each type of behavior recorded by the experimenter were assessed with multivariate analyses of variance. Separate univariate analyses of variance were then conducted to examine the differences between training strategies for each of the interactive and inhibitory behaviors.

### III. RESULTS

#### Overview

The first section of the results examines two extended design analyses of variance for assessing rating accuracy (Dickinson, 1987). One analysis examines the initial ratings made by the assessors and the second analysis examines the final ratings. The second section examines the correlational accuracy of the ratings and the regression of target score OARs onto the ratings to uncover any differences in assessor judgments across the training strategies. The third section of the results reports the analyses conducted on the team behaviors monitored during the consensus meetings. A final section examines the results of regressions used to determine why assessors made rating changes.

#### Basic Accuracy - Initial Ratings

A summary of the results of the analyses is presented in Table 9 that used orthonormal contrasts (cf. Cesare, 1989) between the initial ratings and corresponding target scores as the dependent measure. The initial ratings were those made independently by the assessors immediately after the three exercise reports were read. Variance components (Vaughan & Corballis, 1969) and intraclass correlation coefficients were computed to compare the amounts of rating variance accounted for by the sources of variation.



Table 9

Summary of the Analysis of Variance Results for the  
Extended Accuracy Design Using Initial Ratings.

| Source                          | df  | MS    | F-Ratio           | VC     | ICC   |
|---------------------------------|-----|-------|-------------------|--------|-------|
| <u>Between Teams</u>            |     |       |                   |        |       |
| Rating Sources (S) <sup>a</sup> | 1   | 90.75 | 106.76**          | .0694  | .0824 |
| Part/Whole Training (PW)        | 1   | 0.20  | 0.29 <sup>b</sup> | -.0006 | ----- |
| Team/Individual Training (TI)   | 1   | 1.94  | 2.34 <sup>b</sup> | .0013  | .0015 |
| PW x TI                         | 1   | 3.78  | 3.82 <sup>b</sup> | .0075  | .0089 |
| Raters/PW x TI (R/PWxTI)        | 104 | 0.85  | 1.16 <sup>b</sup> | .0100  | .0119 |
| <u>Within Teams</u>             |     |       |                   |        |       |
| Dimensions (D)                  | 2   | 37.12 | 1.96 <sup>b</sup> | .0351  | .0417 |
| D x PW                          | 2   | 0.49  | 1.36 <sup>b</sup> | .0006  | .0007 |
| D x TI                          | 2   | 0.40  | 1.33 <sup>b</sup> | .0004  | .0005 |
| D x PW x TI                     | 2   | 0.01  | 0.06 <sup>b</sup> | -.0013 | ----- |
| D x R/PWxTI                     | 208 | 0.25  | 1.25 <sup>b</sup> | .0125  | .0148 |
| Assessees (A)                   | 3   | 51.81 | 70.97**           | .1577  | .1872 |
| A x PW                          | 3   | 0.56  | 0.77              | -.0010 | ----- |
| A x TI                          | 3   | 0.71  | 0.97              | -.0001 | ----- |
| A x PW x TI                     | 3   | 0.87  | 1.19              | .0017  | .0020 |
| A x R/PWxTI                     | 312 | 0.73  | -----             | .1767  | .2097 |
| D x A                           | 6   | 18.90 | 94.50**           | .1731  | .2054 |

Table 9 (concluded)

| Source          | df  | MS   | F-Ratio | VC     | ICC   |
|-----------------|-----|------|---------|--------|-------|
| D x A x PW      | 6   | 0.31 | 1.55    | .0020  | .0024 |
| D x A x TI      | 6   | 0.25 | 1.25    | .0009  | .0011 |
| D x A x PW x TI | 6   | 0.11 | 0.55    | -.0033 | ----- |
| D x A x R/PWxTI | 624 | 0.20 | -----   | .2000  | .2374 |

Note. Negative variance components were assigned an intraclass correlation of zero. However, negative variance components were included in the denominator (i.e., sum of all variance components) to compute intraclass correlation coefficients for the nonnegative variance components. VC, Variance component; ICC, Intraclass correlation coefficient.

<sup>a</sup>

Each of the remaining effects represents an interaction with Rating Sources.

<sup>b</sup>

Quasi F-ratio.

\*  $p < .05$ . \*\*  $p < .01$ .

The results indicate inaccuracies in the ratings for the basic accuracy design. The significant Rating Sources effect showed that assessors were more lenient ( $\bar{M} = 2.79$ ) than the target scores ( $\bar{M} = 2.47$ ). Furthermore, inaccuracy was also present for the Assessee's effect and the

#### Dimensions x Assessee interaction.

The Assessee effect was significant and accounted for 19% of the rating variance. Tukey's honestly significant difference (HSD) procedure showed that the four mean discrepancies were significantly different from one another. As shown in Table 10, Assessee 3 had the greatest discrepancy followed by Assessee 1, Assessee 2, and Assessee 4.

T-tests were also conducted on the mean discrepancies for each of the assesseees in order to detect significant differences from zero. For these tests, significance indicates that the ratings were inaccurate. Each discrepancy was evaluated against a p-value less than .0125. This conservative p-value maintained a family error rate of  $p < .05$  for this set of t-tests. The mean discrepancies for Assesseees 1, 2, and 3 were significantly different from zero while the discrepancy for Assessee 4 was not.

The significant Dimensions x Assesseees interaction accounted for 21% of the rating variance. Tukey's HSD procedure showed 15 significant differences, out of a possible 18, between the same dimension discrepancies across the four assesseees. For problem analysis there were five significant differences. These mean discrepancies are shown in Table 11. The discrepancy for Assessee 1 was

Table 10

T-values for Mean Discrepancies from Zero Between Initial Ratings and Target Scores for Assesseees.

| Assessee 1       | Assessee 2        | Assessee 3        | Assessee 4      |
|------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-----------------|
| 8.14*<br>(0.321) | 2.77*<br>(-0.131) | 14.28*<br>(0.796) | 1.43<br>(0.072) |

Note. Mean discrepancies are in parentheses; those nearer to zero reflect greater accuracy. T-tests were based on 107 degrees of freedom.

\* denotes a significant t-value with  $p < .0125$ .

significantly greater than the remaining three assessee discrepancies. Further, the discrepancy for Assessee 3 was significantly greater than the remaining two assessee discrepancies.

For the four problem solution discrepancies, there were three significant differences. The mean discrepancy for Assessee 3 was significantly greater than the remaining assessee discrepancies.

Sensitivity also had five significant differences. The discrepancy for Assessee 3 was greater than the remaining three assessee discrepancies. The discrepancy for Assessee 4 was greater than the remaining two discrepancies.

Table 11

T-values for Mean Discrepancies from Zero Between Initial Ratings and Target Scores for Dimensions by Assesseees.

|            | PA                | PS                | SE                | OAR               |
|------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| Assessee 1 | 18.48*<br>(0.982) | 4.69*<br>(0.268)  | 5.31*<br>(-0.288) | 8.46*<br>(0.373)  |
| Assessee 2 | 5.53*<br>(-0.327) | 4.46*<br>(0.268)  | 5.57*<br>(-0.334) | 8.62*<br>(-0.517) |
| Assessee 3 | 11.74*<br>(0.681) | 18.86*<br>(1.296) | 10.39*<br>(0.413) | 21.69*<br>(1.290) |
| Assessee 4 | 5.50*<br>(-0.321) | 6.87*<br>(0.419)  | 1.82<br>(0.118)   | 3.95*<br>(0.229)  |

Note. Mean discrepancies are in parentheses; those nearer to zero reflect greater accuracy. T-tests were based on 107 degrees of freedom. PA, Problem analysis; PS, Problem solution; SE, Sensitivity.

\* denotes a significant t-value with  $p < .0031$ .

In sum, the problem solution and sensitivity mean discrepancies for Assessee 3 were significantly greater than the remaining three assessee discrepancies. For problem analysis, the greatest discrepancy was for Assessee 1.

The results of the t-tests conducted on the mean discrepancies of the four assesseees for each of the three dimensions are presented in Table 11. The t-tests for this

interaction used a p-value less than .0031 to insure a family error rate of  $p < .05$ . For this interaction, all discrepancies were shown to be significantly different from zero, with the exception of the sensitivity discrepancy for Assessee 4.

#### Basic Accuracy - Initial Overall Assessment Ratings

A separate analysis of variance that used orthonormal contrasts was conducted for the OARs. A summary of the results is presented in Table 12. The results indicate inaccuracies in the ratings for the basic accuracy design. The significant Rating Sources effect showed that assessors were more lenient ( $M = 2.74$ ) than the target scores ( $M = 2.60$ ). Furthermore, inaccuracy was also present for the Assessee effect.

The Assessee effect was significant and accounted for 55% of the rating variance. Tukey's HSD procedure showed that all assessee mean discrepancies were significantly different with the exception of the comparison between Assessee 1 and Assessee 4. As shown in Table 11, Assessee 3 had the greatest discrepancy followed by Assessee 2, Assessee 1, and Assessee 4.

T-tests were also conducted on the mean discrepancies for each of the assesseees to detect significant differences from zero. Each discrepancy was evaluated against a p-value less than .0125. All mean discrepancies were

Table 12

Summary of the Analysis of Variance Results for the  
Extended Accuracy Design Using Initial Overall Assessment  
Ratings.

| Source                          | df  | MS    | F-Ratio  | VC     | ICC   |
|---------------------------------|-----|-------|----------|--------|-------|
| <u>Between Teams</u>            |     |       |          |        |       |
| Rating Sources (S) <sup>a</sup> | 1   | 51.04 | 127.60** | .1172  | .1200 |
| Part/Whole Training (PW)        | 1   | 0.00  | 0.00     | -.0005 | ----- |
| Team/Individual Training (TI)   | 1   | 2.89  | 2.54     | .0041  | .0042 |
| PW x TI                         | 1   | 0.37  | 0.27     | -.0070 | ----- |
| Raters/PW x TI (R/PWxTI)        | 104 | 0.40  | 1.54**   | .0088  | .0090 |
| <u>Within Teams</u>             |     |       |          |        |       |
| Assesseees (A)                  | 3   | 59.41 | 228.50** | .5477  | .5606 |
| A x PW                          | 3   | 0.08  | 0.31     | -.0033 | ----- |
| A x TI                          | 3   | 1.00  | 3.85**   | .0137  | .0140 |
| A x PW x TI                     | 3   | 1.24  | 4.77**   | .0363  | .0372 |
| A x R/PWxTI                     | 312 | 0.26  | -----    | .2600  | .2661 |

Note. Negative variance components were assigned an intraclass correlation of zero. However, negative variance components were included in the denominator (i.e., sum of all variance components) to compute intraclass correlation coefficients for the nonnegative variance components.

Table 12 (concluded)

VC, Variance component; ICC, Intraclass correlation coefficient.

<sup>a</sup>

Each of the remaining effects represents an interaction with Rating Sources.

<sup>b</sup>

Quasi F-ratio.

\*  $p < .05$ . \*\*  $p < .01$ .

significantly different from zero reflecting inaccuracy.

#### Training Conditions - Initial Ratings

The interactions of the basic accuracy effects for the initial ratings with the training conditions describe how the conditions influenced rating accuracy. As shown in Table 9, none of the interactions were significant. Part vs. whole training, team vs. individual training, and their interaction did not affect rating accuracy for the initial ratings. The sum of the intraclass correlation coefficients for all of the interactions accounted approximately for 1% of the rating variance.

#### Training Conditions - Initial Overall Assessment Ratings

Although no differences between training conditions was shown for the dimension ratings, training did influence the OARs. As shown in Table 12, two interactions of the basic accuracy effects with training conditions were significant. The significant Assesseees x Team vs. Individual training interaction accounted for 1% of the



rating variance. Discrepancies were compared between team and individual training for the same assessee (e.g., team training for Assessee 1 vs. individual training for Assessee 1). Tukey's HSD uncovered two differences. As shown in Table 13, mean discrepancies for Assessee 3 and 4 in the individual training condition were significantly greater than those for Assessee 3 and 4 in the team training condition.

The results of the t-tests for each of the assessees in the team and individual training conditions are presented in Table 13. These tests used a p-value less than .0063. All mean discrepancies, with the exception of Assessee 4 in the team condition, were significant from zero.

For the analysis of OARs, the Assessee x Part vs. Whole training x Team vs. Individual training interaction was significant. This interaction accounted for 4% of the rating variance. Discrepancies were compared between the four training conditions for the same assessee (e.g., Part-Team training for Assessee 1 vs. Whole-Individual training for Assessee 1). From these comparisons, one difference between discrepancies was significant. As shown in Table 14, the discrepancy for Assessee 4 in the Part-Individual condition was significantly greater than that for Assessee 4 in the Part-Team condition.

Table 13

T-values for Mean Discrepancies from Zero Between Initial Overall Assessment Ratings and Target Scores for Assesseees.

|      | Assessee 1       | Assessee 2        | Assessee 3        | Assessee 4       |
|------|------------------|-------------------|-------------------|------------------|
| Ind  | 6.06*<br>(0.354) | 6.97*<br>(-0.498) | 17.23*<br>(1.440) | 5.04*<br>(0.406) |
| Team | 5.91*<br>(0.393) | 6.98*<br>(-0.537) | 14.49*<br>(1.139) | 0.68<br>(0.052)  |

Note. Mean discrepancies are in parentheses; those nearer to zero reflect greater accuracy. T-tests were based on 53 degrees of freedom. Ind, Individual.

\* denotes a significant t-value with  $p < .0063$ .

The t-tests, using a p-value less than .0031, are shown in Table 14. Four of the 14 discrepancies did not differ significantly from zero and reflect accuracy. Of the four training conditions, the Whole-Team condition had two discrepancies that did not differ from zero. These were for Assessee 1 and 4. The Part-Team and Part-Individual conditions had nonsignificant mean discrepancies for Assessee 4 and Assessee 1, respectively. All discrepancies for the Whole-Individual condition were significantly different from zero.

Basic Accuracy - Final Ratings

A summary of the analysis of variance for the final

Table 14

T-values for Mean Discrepancies from Zero Between Initial Overall Assessment Ratings and Target Scores for Assesseees by Part vs. Whole and Team vs. Individual Training.

|            | Assessee 1       | Assessee 2        | Assessee 3        | Assessee 4       |
|------------|------------------|-------------------|-------------------|------------------|
| Part-Ind   | 2.05<br>(0.183)  | 5.04*<br>(-0.524) | 13.71*<br>(1.493) | 3.70*<br>(0.445) |
| Whole-Ind  | 8.62*<br>(0.524) | 4.72*<br>(-0.471) | 10.85*<br>(1.388) | 3.36*<br>(0.367) |
| Part-Team  | 8.75*<br>(0.576) | 4.21*<br>(-0.498) | 7.85*<br>(1.152)  | 0.46<br>(-0.052) |
| Whole-Team | 1.99<br>(0.210)  | 5.76*<br>(-0.576) | 16.53*<br>(1.126) | 1.54<br>(0.157)  |

Note. Mean discrepancies are in parentheses; those nearer to zero reflect greater accuracy. T-tests were based on 53 degrees of freedom. Ind, Individual.

\* denotes a significant t-value with  $p < .0031$ .

dimension ratings is presented in Table 15. Final ratings were produced by discussion and revision of initial ratings. Thus, final ratings take into account more of the interactive components within the consensus meeting. Differences across the training strategies, especially team vs. individual training, were expected to be more prevalent for the final ratings.

The significant Rating Sources effect for the mean

Table 15

Summary of the Analysis of Variance Results for the  
Extended Accuracy Design Using Final Ratings.

| Source                          | df  | MS    | F-Ratio           | VC     | ICC   |
|---------------------------------|-----|-------|-------------------|--------|-------|
| <u>Between Teams</u>            |     |       |                   |        |       |
| Rating Sources (S) <sup>a</sup> | 1   | 86.68 | 117.14**          | .0663  | .0857 |
| Part/Whole Training (PW)        | 1   | 0.12  | 0.08 <sup>b</sup> | -.0010 | ----- |
| Team/Individual Training (TI)   | 1   | 4.01  | 1.71 <sup>b</sup> | .0013  | .0017 |
| PW x TI                         | 1   | 3.12  | 3.32 <sup>b</sup> | .0050  | .0065 |
| Raters/PW x TI (R/PWxTI)        | 104 | 0.74  | 1.68              | .0250  | .0323 |
| <u>Within Teams</u>             |     |       |                   |        |       |
| Dimensions (D)                  | 2   | 38.15 | 1.81 <sup>b</sup> | .0263  | .0340 |
| D x PW                          | 2   | 0.84  | 1.31 <sup>b</sup> | .0008  | .0010 |
| D x TI                          | 2   | 0.36  | 0.72 <sup>b</sup> | -.0005 | ----- |
| D x PW x TI                     | 2   | 0.22  | 0.76 <sup>b</sup> | -.0006 | ----- |
| D x R/PWxTI                     | 208 | 0.19  | 1.36**            | .0125  | .0161 |
| Assesseees (A)                  | 3   | 55.79 | 126.80**          | .1708  | .2207 |
| A x PW                          | 3   | 1.12  | 2.55              | .0042  | .0054 |
| A x TI                          | 3   | 2.05  | 4.66**            | .0099  | .0128 |
| A x PW x TI                     | 3   | 0.64  | 1.45              | .0025  | .0032 |
| A x R/PWxTI                     | 312 | 0.44  | -----             | .1000  | .1292 |
| D x A                           | 6   | 21.07 | 150.50**          | .1938  | .2504 |

Table 15 (concluded)

| Source          | df  | MS   | F-Ratio | VC    | ICC   |
|-----------------|-----|------|---------|-------|-------|
| D x A x PW      | 6   | 0.59 | 4.21**  | .0083 | .0107 |
| D x A x TI      | 6   | 0.45 | 3.21**  | .0057 | .0074 |
| D x A x PW x TI | 6   | 0.24 | 1.71    | .0037 | .0049 |
| D x A x R/PWxTI | 624 | 0.14 | -----   | .1400 | .1809 |

Note. Negative variance components were assigned an intraclass correlation of zero. However, negative variance components were included in the denominator (i.e., sum of all variance components) to compute intraclass correlation coefficients for the nonnegative variance components. VC, Variance component; ICC, Intraclass correlation coefficient.

a

Each of the remaining effects represents an interaction with Rating Sources.

b

Quasi F-ratio.

\*  $p < .05$ . \*\*  $p < .01$ .

discrepancies indicated that the assessors still generated more lenient ratings ( $\bar{M} = 2.78$ ) than the target scores ( $\bar{M} = 2.47$ ). Inaccuracy was also present for the Assessee and Dimensions x Assessee interaction effects as was observed for the initial ratings.

The significant Assessee effect accounted for 22% of the rating variance. The Tukey HSD procedure showed that the four mean discrepancies were significantly different from one another. As shown in Table 16, Assessee 3 had the greatest discrepancy followed by Assessee 1, Assessee 2, and Assessee 4.

The results of the t-tests for each of the assesseees for the final ratings are also presented in Table 16. The t-tests used a p-value less than .0125 to determine which discrepancies were significantly different from zero. The discrepancies for Assesseees 1, 2, and 3 were different from zero, while the discrepancy for Assessee 4 was not. The same pattern of results was also detected for the initial ratings. The consensus meeting process did not improve accuracy, overall, in rating the assesseees.

The Dimensions x Assesseees interaction accounted for 25% of the rating variance. The Tukey HSD procedure showed 14 significant differences between the same dimension discrepancies across the four assesseees. Mean discrepancies are shown in Table 17. For problem analysis and sensitivity there were five significant differences. For problem analysis, the mean discrepancies for Assessee 1 and Assessee 3 were significantly different from the remaining two assessee discrepancies. For sensitivity, discrepancies for Assessee 3 and Assessee 4 were different

Table 16

T-values for Mean Discrepancies from Zero Between Final Ratings and Target Scores for Assesseees.

| Assessee 1        | Assessee 2        | Assessee 3        | Assessee 4      |
|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-----------------|
| 12.68*<br>(0.386) | 4.05*<br>(-0.164) | 15.66*<br>(0.779) | 0.79<br>(0.032) |

Note. Mean discrepancies are in parentheses; those nearer to zero reflect greater accuracy. T-tests were based on 107 degrees of freedom.

\* denotes a significant t-value with  $p < .0125$ .

from the remaining two discrepancies.

For problem solution, there were four significant differences. The discrepancy for Assessee 3 was significantly greater than the remaining three assessee discrepancies. Further, the discrepancy for Assessee 4 was significantly greater than the discrepancy for Assessee 2.

In sum, the problem solution and sensitivity mean discrepancies for Assessee 3 were significantly greater than the remaining three assessee discrepancies. For problem analysis, the greatest discrepancy was for Assessee 1. This discrepancy was significantly greater than the remaining assessee discrepancies.

The t-tests for the Dimensions x Assesseees mean

discrepancies used a p-value less than .0031. As shown in Table 17, these tests indicated that all discrepancies, with the exception of sensitivity for Assessee 4, were significantly different from zero. A comparison of the mean discrepancies and t-tests for initial and final ratings indicates that the consensus process did not improve the overall accuracy of the assessors in ordering assessees by dimensions.

#### Basic Accuracy - Final Overall Assessment Ratings

A summary of the results for the final OARs analysis of variance is presented in Table 18. The results indicate inaccuracies in the ratings for the basic accuracy design. Similar to the initial ratings, the significant Rating Sources effect showed that assessors were more lenient ( $\bar{M} = 2.70$ ) than the target scores ( $\bar{M} = 2.60$ ). Furthermore, inaccuracy was also present for the Assessee effect.

The Assessee effect was significant and accounted for 56% of the rating variance. Tukey's HSD procedure showed that all assessee mean discrepancies were significantly different with the exception of the comparison between Assessee 1 and Assessee 4. As shown in Table 17, Assessee 3 had the greatest discrepancy followed by Assessee 2, Assessee 1, and Assessee 4.

T-tests were also conducted on the mean discrepancies for each of the assesseees in order to detect significant



Table 17

T-values for Mean Discrepancies from Zero Between Final Ratings and Target Scores for Dimensions by Assesseees.

|            | PA                | PS                | SE                | OAR                |
|------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|--------------------|
| Assessee 1 | 23.49*<br>(1.100) | 6.04*<br>(0.314)  | 5.92*<br>(-0.255) | 9.10*<br>(0.373)   |
| Assessee 2 | 7.93*<br>(-0.393) | 4.88*<br>(0.236)  | 6.40*<br>(-0.334) | 11.90*<br>(-0.570) |
| Assessee 3 | 12.59*<br>(0.687) | 21.83*<br>(1.237) | 6.53*<br>(0.412)  | 22.42*<br>(1.257)  |
| Assessee 4 | 8.94*<br>(-0.393) | 8.40*<br>(0.452)  | 0.74<br>(0.039)   | 3.75*<br>(0.216)   |

Note. Mean discrepancies are in parentheses; those nearer to zero reflect greater accuracy. T-tests were based on 107 degrees of freedom. PA, Problem analysis; PS, Problem solution; SE, Sensitivity.

\* denotes a significant t-value with  $p < .0031$ .

differences from zero. Each discrepancy was evaluated against a p-value less than .0125. All mean discrepancies were significantly different from zero reflecting inaccuracy.

Training Conditions - Final Ratings

Three interactions with the training strategies were significant. As shown in Table 15, significance for the Dimensions x Assesseees x Part vs. Whole training

Table 18

Summary of the Analysis of Variance Results for the  
Extended Accuracy Design Using Final Overall Assessment  
Ratings.

| Source                          | df  | MS    | F-Ratio           | VC     | ICC   |
|---------------------------------|-----|-------|-------------------|--------|-------|
| <u>Between Teams</u>            |     |       |                   |        |       |
| Rating Sources (S) <sup>a</sup> | 1   | 44.01 | 129.44**          | .1494  | .1486 |
| Part/Whole Training (PW)        | 1   | 0.01  | 0.07 <sup>b</sup> | -.0003 | ----- |
| Team/Individual Training (TI)   | 1   | 3.76  | 1.83 <sup>b</sup> | .0039  | .0039 |
| PW x TI                         | 1   | 0.51  | 0.44 <sup>b</sup> | -.0044 | ----- |
| Raters/PW x TI (R/PWxTI)        | 104 | 0.34  | 1.48**            | .0069  | .0069 |
| <u>Within Teams</u>             |     |       |                   |        |       |
| Assessees (A)                   | 3   | 60.59 | 263.43**          | .5589  | .5560 |
| A x PW                          | 3   | 0.04  | 0.17              | -.0011 | ----- |
| A x TI                          | 3   | 1.95  | 8.48**            | .0319  | .0317 |
| A x PW x TI                     | 3   | 1.04  | 4.52**            | .0300  | .0298 |
| A x R/PWxTI                     | 312 | 0.23  | -----             | .2300  | .2288 |

Note. Negative variance components were assigned an intraclass correlation of zero. However, negative variance components were included in the denominator (i.e., sum of all variance components) to compute intraclass correlation coefficients for the nonnegative variance components.

Table 18 (concluded)

VC, Variance component; ICC, Intraclass correlation coefficient.

<sup>a</sup>

Each of the remaining effects represents an interaction with Rating Sources.

<sup>b</sup>

Quasi F-ratio.

\*  $p < .05$ . \*\*  $p < .01$ .

interaction suggested that this training strategy affected differential accuracy. Although significant, this interaction only accounted for 1% of the rating variance. The Tukey HSD procedure was conducted in the examination of all mean discrepancies. The discrepancies shown in Table 19 were compared between part and whole training for the same assessee and dimension (e.g., part training for Assessee 1 and problem analysis vs. whole training for Assessee 1 and problem analysis). These comparisons uncovered two significant differences. The discrepancy for Assessee 3 for problem analysis was significantly greater in the part condition than in the whole condition. Conversely, the discrepancy for Assessee 4 for problem solution was greater in the whole condition than in the part condition.

The t-tests, using a p-value less than .0016, are shown in Table 19. For the part condition the discrepancies for Assessee 3 and 4 on sensitivity were

Table 19

T-values for Mean Discrepancies from Zero Between Final Ratings and Target Scores for Dimensions by Assesseees by Part vs. Whole Training.

|            | Part              |                   |                   |                   |
|------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
|            | PA                | PS                | SE                | OAR               |
| Assessee 1 | 17.30*<br>(1.139) | 7.53*<br>(0.432)  | 3.75*<br>(-0.275) | 6.06*<br>(0.354)  |
| Assessee 2 | 5.30*<br>(-0.354) | 4.25*<br>(0.314)  | 3.43*<br>(-0.275) | 8.83*<br>(-0.589) |
| Assessee 3 | 9.46*<br>(0.825)  | 13.46*<br>(1.218) | 3.20<br>(0.314)   | 14.13*<br>(1.257) |
| Assessee 4 | 6.76*<br>(-0.393) | 3.89*<br>(0.314)  | 0.52<br>(-0.039)  | 2.57<br>(0.236)   |
|            | Whole             |                   |                   |                   |
|            | PA                | PS                | SE                | OAR               |
| Assessee 1 | 15.89*<br>(1.061) | 2.33<br>(0.196)   | 5.15*<br>(-0.236) | 6.76*<br>(0.393)  |
| Assessee 2 | 5.89*<br>(-0.432) | 2.57<br>(0.157)   | 5.91*<br>(-0.393) | 7.96*<br>(-0.550) |
| Assessee 3 | 9.01*<br>(0.550)  | 18.19*<br>(1.257) | 6.55*<br>(0.511)  | 18.19*<br>(1.257) |
| Assessee 4 | 5.90*<br>(-0.393) | 8.83*<br>(0.589)  | 1.59<br>(0.118)   | 2.77<br>(0.196)   |

## Table 19 (concluded)

Note. Mean discrepancies are in parentheses; those nearer to zero reflect greater accuracy. T-tests were based on 53 degrees of freedom. PA, Problem analysis; PS, Problem solution; SE, Sensitivity.

\* denotes a significant t-value with  $p < .0016$ .

nonsignificant. In the whole condition, the discrepancies for Assesseees 1 and 2 for problem solution and Assessee 4 for sensitivity were not significantly different from zero. The remaining discrepancies were significantly different from zero. From the results of these t-tests, no conclusions can be made as to which training strategy is superior. The effects of part and whole training on rating accuracy varied across dimensions and assesseees.

For team vs. individual training, significant interactions were present for differential elevation (i.e., Assesseees x Team vs. Individual Training) and differential accuracy (i.e., Dimensions x Assesseees x Team vs. Individual Training).

The Assesseees x Team vs. Individual Training interaction accounted for 1% of the rating variance. Tukey's HSD test uncovered no differences in mean discrepancies for the same assessee between team and individual training. A comparison of mean discrepancies for Assesseees 2 and 3 between team and individual training

was conducted by means of the Scheffe post-hoc method (Hays, 1981). As shown in Table 20, these assessees were chosen for comparison because their mean discrepancies displayed a disordinal interaction (Marascuilo & Levin, 1983). Results of the Scheffe post-hoc indicated a significant disordinal interaction ( $p < .05$ ).

The results of the t-tests for each of the assessees in the team and individual training conditions are presented in Table 20. These tests used a p-value less than .0063. All mean discrepancies, with the exception of Assessee 2 in the team condition, were significant from zero.

The Dimensions x Assesseees x Team vs. Individual Training interaction also accounted for 1% of the rating variance. The Tukey HSD test uncovered two significant differences between team and individual training for the same assessee-dimension pairings. The mean discrepancies are shown in Table 21. The mean discrepancy for Assessee 3 for problem solution was greater in the individual training condition than in the team training condition. Further, the discrepancy for Assessee 4 for sensitivity was greater for individual training condition than for team training condition. The remaining pairings of mean discrepancies did not differ significantly.

The results of the t-tests on the final ratings for

Table 20

T-values for Mean Discrepancies from Zero Between Final Ratings and Target Scores for Assesseees by Team vs. Individual Training.

|      | Assessee 1       | Assessee 2        | Assessee 3        | Assessee 4       |
|------|------------------|-------------------|-------------------|------------------|
| Ind  | 9.46*<br>(0.406) | 3.85*<br>(-0.196) | 13.73*<br>(0.864) | 3.58*<br>(0.183) |
| Team | 8.43*<br>(0.367) | 2.07<br>(-0.131)  | 9.14*<br>(0.694)  | 2.09<br>(-0.118) |

Note. Mean discrepancies are in parentheses; those nearer to zero reflect greater accuracy. T-tests were based on 53 degrees of freedom. Ind, Individual.

\* denotes a significant t-value with  $p < .0063$ .

the four assesseees on the three dimensions for team and individual training for the final ratings are presented in Table 21. These t-tests were conducted with a p-value less than .0016. All the mean discrepancies for the individual condition were significantly different from zero. For the team strategy, 4 of the 12 discrepancies were nonsignificant. The nonsignificant discrepancies were: Assessee 1 for problem solution, Assessee 2 for problem solution and sensitivity, and Assessee 4 for sensitivity. These results indicate that assessors exposed to team training, with its emphasis on interactive behaviors,

Table 21

T-values for Mean Discrepancies from Zero Between Final Ratings and Target Scores for Dimensions by Assessee by Team vs. Individual Training.

|            | Individual        |                   |                   |                   |
|------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
|            | PA                | PS                | SE                | OAR               |
| Assessee 1 | 16.53*<br>(1.100) | 5.31*<br>(0.393)  | 4.79*<br>(-0.275) | 5.41*<br>(0.314)  |
| Assessee 2 | 7.28*<br>(-0.471) | 3.75*<br>(0.275)  | 6.75*<br>(-0.392) | 7.96*<br>(-0.550) |
| Assessee 3 | 12.31*<br>(0.786) | 18.15*<br>(1.375) | 4.99*<br>(0.432)  | 19.19*<br>(1.454) |
| Assessee 4 | 4.79*<br>(-0.275) | 7.96*<br>(0.550)  | 3.75*<br>(0.275)  | 5.89*<br>(0.432)  |
|            | Team              |                   |                   |                   |
|            | PA                | PS                | SE                | OAR               |
| Assessee 1 | 16.53*<br>(1.100) | 3.26<br>(0.236)   | 3.64*<br>(-0.236) | 7.53*<br>(0.432)  |
| Assessee 2 | 4.25*<br>(-0.314) | 3.11<br>(0.196)   | 3.18<br>(-0.275)  | 8.83*<br>(-0.589) |
| Assessee 3 | 6.76*<br>(0.589)  | 13.62*<br>(1.100) | 4.23*<br>(0.393)  | 14.30*<br>(1.061) |
| Assessee 4 | 8.09*<br>(-0.511) | 4.37*<br>(0.354)  | 3.11<br>(-0.196)  | 0.01<br>(0.001)   |



Table 21 (concluded)

Note. Mean discrepancies are in parentheses; those nearer to zero reflect greater accuracy. T-tests were based on 53 degrees of freedom. PA, Problem analysis; PS, Problem solution; SE, Sensitivity.

\* denotes a significant t-value with  $p < .0016$ .

generated more accurate dimension ratings for specific assessees than those exposed to individual training.

Training Conditions - Final Overall Assessment Ratings

As shown in Table 18, two interactions of the basic accuracy effects with training conditions were significant for the final OARs. The significant Assesseees x Team vs. Individual training interaction accounted for 3% of the rating variance. Discrepancies were compared between team and individual training for the same assessee. Tukey's HSD uncovered two differences. These discrepancies are presented in Table 21. The mean discrepancies for Assessee 3 and 4 in the individual training condition were significantly greater than those for Assessee 3 and 4 in the team training condition. These are the same differences that were shown for the initial OARs.

The results of the t-tests for each of the assesseees in the team and individual training conditions are presented in Table 21. These tests used a p-value less than .0063. All mean discrepancies, with the exception of

Assessee 4 in the team condition, were significantly different from zero.

For the analysis of OARs, the Assesseees x Part vs. Whole training x Team vs. Individual training interaction was significant. This interaction accounted for 3% of the rating variance. The discrepancies shown in Table 22 were compared between the four training conditions for the same assessee. For these comparisons, Tukey's HSD revealed, three significant differences. The discrepancy for Assessee 4 in the Part-Individual condition was significantly greater than the discrepancies for Assessee 4 in the Part-Team and Whole-Team conditions. Further, the mean discrepancy for Assessee 3 in the Whole-Individual condition was significantly greater than that for the Whole-Team condition.

The t-tests, with a p-value less than .0031, are shown in Table 22. Four of the 14 discrepancies did not differ significantly from zero and reflect accuracy. Of the four training conditions, the Whole-Team condition had two discrepancies that did not differ from zero. These were for Assessee 1 and 4. The Part-Team and Part-Individual conditions had nonsignificant mean discrepancies for Assessee 4 and Assessee 1, respectively. All discrepancies for the Whole-Individual condition were significantly different from zero. These results were identical to those

Table 22

T-values for Mean Discrepancies from Zero Between Final Overall Assessment Ratings and Target Scores for Assesseees by Part vs. Whole and Team vs. Individual Training.

|            | Assessee 1       | Assessee 2        | Assessee 3        | Assessee 4       |
|------------|------------------|-------------------|-------------------|------------------|
| Part-Ind   | 1.80<br>(0.157)  | 8.01*<br>(-0.629) | 12.50*<br>(1.414) | 5.05*<br>(0.550) |
| Whole-Ind  | 7.20*<br>(0.471) | 4.16*<br>(-0.471) | 14.61*<br>(1.493) | 3.30*<br>(0.314) |
| Part-Team  | 9.53*<br>(0.550) | 5.05*<br>(-0.550) | 8.30*<br>(1.100)  | 0.65<br>(-0.079) |
| Whole-Team | 2.62<br>(0.314)  | 8.01*<br>(-0.629) | 14.82*<br>(1.021) | 0.77<br>(0.079)  |

Note. Mean discrepancies are in parentheses; those nearer to zero reflect greater accuracy. T-tests were based on 53 degrees of freedom. Ind, Individual.

\* denotes a significant t-value with  $p < .0031$ .

obtained for the initial OARs.

#### Correlational Analyses

Further analyses were conducted to examine the correlational accuracy of the ratings. Specifically, correlational accuracy per dimension (Pulakos, 1984) was examined. This measure represents the relationships between the ratings for a dimension across the four assesseees with their corresponding target scores. Positive

correlations suggest accuracy and negative or near-zero correlations reflect inaccuracy. Another facet of the correlations is their trend from initial to final ratings. The trend of the correlations were examined to evaluate the effect of the consensus meeting process on the formation of ratings. If the correlations increase positively from initial to final ratings, the consensus meeting process would have a positive effect on rating accuracy.

The correlations for each dimension with their corresponding target scores for the initial, revised, and final ratings across all assessors are presented in Table 23. Except for the OARs, all correlations were significant from zero. However, the problem analysis ratings were negative and reflect inaccuracy. Furthermore, the trend of correlations from initial to final ratings for problem analysis suggested that the ratings became more inaccurate. These findings reflected the inaccuracy associated with generating problem analysis ratings and the inability of the consensus meeting process to correct that inaccuracy. The correlations for problem solution and sensitivity showed a positive trend. No obvious trend was observed for the OARs.

The correlations for each dimension associated with four training conditions are presented in Table 24. From these results it appears that assessors exposed to Part-

Table 23

Correlational Accuracy per Dimension for all Assessors.

|         | PA      | PS     | SE     | OAR  |
|---------|---------|--------|--------|------|
| Initial | -.349** | .197** | .444** | .076 |
| Revised | -.400** | .242** | .522** | .062 |
| Final   | -.484** | .281** | .529** | .080 |

Note. The correlations are based on a sample size of 432. PA, Problem analysis; PS, Problem solution; SE, Sensitivity.

\*  $p < .05$ . \*\*  $p < .01$ .

Team training generated the most accurate ratings. This was the only strategy that had all its correlations significantly different from zero. In addition, Fisher's z-test for correlations from two independent samples indicated that OARs generated in the Part-Team condition were significantly more accurate than those produced in the Part-Individual condition ( $p < .05$ ). Other significant differences between correlations included a) the final Whole-Team OARs were more accurate than the final Part-Individual OARs, b) the initial Part-Team problem solution ratings were more accurate than those for Part-Individual, and c) the final Part-Team problem solution ratings were more accurate than those for Whole-Team.

Table 24

Correlational Accuracy per Dimension Between Part vs. Whole and Team vs. Individual Training.

| Part-Individual  |         |        |        |        |
|------------------|---------|--------|--------|--------|
|                  | PA      | PS     | SE     | OAR    |
| Initial          | -.391** | .043   | .391** | -.143  |
| Revised          | -.477** | .121** | .449** | -.146  |
| Final            | -.524** | .227** | .482** | -.163* |
| Part-Team        |         |        |        |        |
|                  | PA      | PS     | SE     | OAR    |
| Initial          | -.400** | .327** | .507** | .226** |
| Revised          | -.454** | .380** | .614** | .210*  |
| Final            | -.534** | .443** | .597** | .237** |
| Whole-Individual |         |        |        |        |
|                  | PA      | PS     | SE     | OAR    |
| Initial          | -.356** | .218*  | .415** | .073   |
| Revised          | -.430** | .240** | .463** | .040   |
| Final            | -.555** | .277** | .483** | .000   |

Table 24 (concluded)

| Whole-Team |         |       |        |       |
|------------|---------|-------|--------|-------|
|            | PA      | PS    | SE     | OAR   |
| Initial    | -.254** | .181* | .465** | .116  |
| Revised    | -.244** | .211* | .565** | .107  |
| Final      | -.349** | .163* | .564** | .211* |

Note. The correlations are based on a sample size of 108. PA, Problem analysis; PS, Problem solution; SE, Sensitivity.

\*  $p < .05$ . \*\*  $p < .01$ .

In summary, the combination of training strategies that presents the components of report writing in parts as well as emphasizes the importance of interactive behaviors in the consensus meeting leads to greater correlational accuracy than other combinations of training strategies.

#### Regression Analyses

The target score OARs were regressed onto the initial, revised, and final dimension ratings across all assessors and assessees to assess the amount of variance in the target score OARs accounted for by the dimension ratings. These analyses determined the accuracy of the ratings in predicting assessment center outcomes. The regressions

produced R-statistics (i.e., multiple correlation coefficients) and F-ratios. The F-ratios were converted to standard normal scores (i.e., z-scores) and these scores were examined and compared across training strategies.

The R-statistics, F-ratios, and z-scores across all training conditions are presented in Table 25. The R-statistics for the three sets of ratings were significantly different from zero. Sensitivity contributed the most variance followed by problem analysis and problem solution. Sensitivity also entered first into all the regressions.

The results of the regressions for each training condition are presented in Table 26. The R-statistics that were not significantly different from zero included the initial ratings for the Whole-Individual condition and the initial and revised ratings for the Whole-Team condition. Other R-statistics differed significantly from zero. Although there were no significant differences between any of the R-statistics for corresponding training conditions, the Part-Team condition appeared to have the greatest R-statistics. Further, the Part-Team and Whole-Team conditions showed consistent, positive trend from initial to final ratings.

Based on the regression results, it appears that the Part-Team training strategy led to the most accurate OARs. This condition had the highest R-statistics and positive



Table 25

Results of the Regression of the Target Score OAR onto the Dimension Ratings for all Assessors.

|         | R    | F-ratio | Z-score |
|---------|------|---------|---------|
| Initial | .259 | 10.26** | 3.81    |
| Revised | .305 | 14.68** | 4.61    |
| Final   | .297 | 13.77** | 4.46    |

Note. The F-ratios for the regressions had 2 degrees of freedom in the numerator and 428 degrees of freedom in the denominator.

\*  $p < .05$     \*\*  $p < .01$ .

increments from initial to final ratings. Apparently, presenting the information relevant to report writing in parts and emphasizing the interactive skills needed in the consensus meeting leads to more accurate OARs.

Process Analysis

Additional measures collected in this research were frequency counts of the interactive and inhibitory behaviors displayed during the consensus meetings. Examination of the frequencies of these behaviors should help explain why there were differences in rating accuracy across training strategies.

Originally, four interactive and three inhibitory

Table 26

Results of the Regression of the Target Score OAR onto the Dimension Ratings Between Part vs. Whole by Team vs. Individual Training.

| Part-Individual  |      |         |         |
|------------------|------|---------|---------|
|                  | R    | F-ratio | Z-score |
| Initial          | .327 | 4.14*   | 2.09    |
| Revised          | .338 | 4.44*   | 2.20    |
| Final            | .335 | 4.38*   | 2.18    |
| Part-Team        |      |         |         |
|                  | R    | F-ratio | Z-score |
| Initial          | .352 | 4.89**  | 2.35    |
| Revised          | .440 | 8.35**  | 3.28    |
| Final            | .481 | 10.39** | 3.70    |
| Whole-Individual |      |         |         |
|                  | R    | F-ratio | Z-score |
| Initial          | .251 | 2.31    | 1.28    |
| Revised          | .293 | 3.26*   | 1.74    |
| Final            | .295 | 3.32*   | 1.76    |

Table 26 (concluded)

| Whole-Team |      |         |         |
|------------|------|---------|---------|
|            | R    | F-ratio | Z-score |
| Initial    | .184 | 1.21    | 0.52    |
| Revised    | .283 | 3.01    | 1.62    |
| Final      | .329 | 4.22*   | 2.11    |

Note. The F-ratios for the regressions had 2 degrees of freedom in the numerator and 104 degrees of freedom in the denominator.

\*  $p < .05$ . \*\*  $p < .01$ .

behaviors composed the behavioral observation list. However, lack of information exchange was dropped from analysis, because it was observed only in 1 of the 36 teams. Furthermore, checking and filtering were also eliminated from analysis, since these behaviors were not observed for the nine teams in one of the training interactions. Separate multivariate analyses of variance were done using the remaining interactive (i.e., communicating and gathering) and inhibitory (i.e., member dominance and conformity) behaviors. Univariate analyses of variance were then conducted to further examine the differences between training conditions.

The results of the multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) showed no differences between part and whole training for interactive (Wilks lambda(2,31) = .867,  $p > .05$ ) or inhibitory behaviors (Wilks lambda(2,31) = .930,  $p > .05$ ). Further, there were no significant differences for the interaction of training conditions for interactive (Wilks lambda(2,31) = .919,  $p > .05$ ) or inhibitory behaviors (Wilks lambda(2,31) = .983,  $p > .05$ ). These results were not surprising, since the manipulation concerning interactive behaviors occurred in the team and individual training strategies.

For the interactive behaviors, the MANOVA for team vs. individual training was nonsignificant (Wilks lambda(2,31) = .864,  $p > .05$ ). However, exploratory univariate analyses of variance showed significant differences for gathering ( $p < .05$ ) and communicating ( $p < .05$ ) between team and individual training. A nonsignificant multivariate result and significant univariate results can occur, since there is no necessary relationship between the two outcomes of analyses (Finn & Mattsson, 1978). The analysis of variance summaries for gathering and communicating are presented in Tables 27 and 28, respectively. For team vs. individual training, gathering accounted for approximately 3% of the variance in behaviors and 2% for communicating. Assessors exposed to team training displayed significantly more

Table 27

Summary of the Analysis of Variance Results for the Gathering Behaviors.

| Source                        | df | MS    | F-Ratio | VC      | ICC   |
|-------------------------------|----|-------|---------|---------|-------|
| Part/Whole Training (PW)      | 1  | 20.25 | 1.82    | .0634   | .0056 |
| Team/Individual Training (TI) | 1  | 56.25 | 5.06*   | .3134   | .0275 |
| PW x TI                       | 1  | 6.25  | 0.56    | -.1016  | ----- |
| Error                         | 32 | 11.13 | ----    | 11.1250 | .9759 |

Note. VC, Variance component; ICC, Intraclass correlation coefficient.

\*  $p < .05$ .

gathering behaviors per meeting ( $\bar{M} = 3.83$ ) than assessors exposed to individual training ( $\bar{M} = 1.83$ ). The number of communicating behaviors displayed per meeting was also greater for the assessors exposed to team training ( $\bar{M} = 3.22$ ) than individual training ( $\bar{M} = 1.22$ ).

The MANOVA for the inhibitory behaviors was significant (Wilks lambda(2,31) = .784,  $p < .05$ ). Examination of the inhibitory behaviors showed that the number of member dominance behaviors displayed was significantly different between team and individual training ( $p < .01$ ). The summary of the univariate analysis

Table 28

Summary of the Analysis of Variance Results for the Communicating Behaviors.

| Source                        | df | MS    | F-Ratio | VC     | ICC    |
|-------------------------------|----|-------|---------|--------|--------|
| Part/Whole Training (PW)      | 1  | 2.78  | 0.33    | -.0392 | -----  |
| Team/Individual Training (TI) | 1  | 36.00 | 4.28*   | .1916  | .0228  |
| PW x TI                       | 1  | 0.11  | 0.01    | -.1730 | -----  |
| Error                         | 32 | 8.42  | ----    | 8.417  | 1.0025 |

Note. VC, Variance component; ICC, Intraclass correlation coefficient.

\*  $p < .05$ .

is presented in Table 29. This effect accounted for approximately 5% of the behavior variance. Member dominance occurred with less frequency in the team training condition ( $M = .06$ ) than in the individual training condition ( $M = .50$ ). The number of times conformity was displayed did not vary between team and individual training ( $p > .05$ ).

In summary, three of the six behaviors displayed differences in the hypothesized direction. The presence of behaviors associated with obtaining information (i.e., gathering), dispensing relevant information (i.e.,

Table 29

Summary of the Analysis of Variance Results for the  
Member Dominance Behaviors.

| Source                        | df | MS   | F-Ratio | VC     | ICC   |
|-------------------------------|----|------|---------|--------|-------|
| Part/Whole Training (PW)      | 1  | 0.44 | 2.07    | .0016  | .0071 |
| Team/Individual Training (TI) | 1  | 1.78 | 8.26**  | .0109  | .0484 |
| PW x TI                       | 1  | 0.11 | 0.52    | -.0022 | ----- |
| Error                         | 32 | 0.22 | ----    | .2150  | .9543 |

Note. VC, Variance component; ICC, Intraclass correlation coefficient.

\*  $p < .05$ .

communicating), and the lack of dominating behaviors (i.e., member dominance) contributed to the more accurate ratings for the team training strategy. The absence of significance for checking, filtering, and conformity probably limited the magnitude of the differences in rating accuracy between team and individual training.

Secondary Process Measures

The initial OARs were also regressed onto the initial, revised, and final dimension ratings. Since the initial OARs were made independently by each assessor immediately following dimension ratings, these regressions reflect the

effects of team member interaction. If the proportion of variance accounted for increased from initial to revised and final ratings, it suggests that the additional information provided when discussing ratings or the demands of the task (i.e., consensus must be reached in order to continue) led to changes by the assessors in their ratings.

The regression results across all training conditions are presented in Table 30. All R-statistics were significantly different from zero. There was an increase in the R-statistics from initial to revised ratings, but a decrease in R-statistics from revised to final ratings. Thus, the revised ratings appeared to be somewhat better predictors of OARs than the initial and final ratings.

The results of the regressions for the four training conditions are shown in Table 31. All R-statistics were significantly different from zero. All R-statistics increased from initial to revised ratings and decreased from revised to final ratings. Further, no significant differences in R-statistics were detected between the training conditions. These results suggest that the behavioral interaction associated with revising and finalizing dimension ratings had a minimal impact on how assessors make OAR and dimension rating changes.



Table 30

Results of the Regression of the Initial OARs onto the  
Dimension Ratings for all Assessors.

|         | R    | F-ratio  | Z-score |
|---------|------|----------|---------|
| Initial | .799 | 252.30** | 14.95   |
| Revised | .861 | 411.30** | 17.51   |
| Final   | .819 | 291.40** | 15.68   |

Note. The F-ratios for the regressions had 2 degrees of freedom in the numerator and 428 degrees of freedom in the denominator.

\*  $p < .05$     \*\*  $p < .01$ .

Table 31

Results of the Regression of the Initial OARs onto the Dimension Ratings Between Part vs. Whole by Team vs. Individual Training.

| Part-Individual  |      |          |         |
|------------------|------|----------|---------|
|                  | R    | F-ratio  | Z-score |
| Initial          | .751 | 44.90**  | 7.16    |
| Revised          | .822 | 72.03**  | 8.49    |
| Final            | .559 | 44.00**  | 7.10    |
| Part-Team        |      |          |         |
|                  | R    | F-ratio  | Z-score |
| Initial          | .847 | 88.11**  | 7.08    |
| Revised          | .902 | 150.69** | 10.69   |
| Final            | .858 | 97.06**  | 9.37    |
| Whole-Individual |      |          |         |
|                  | R    | F-ratio  | Z-score |
| Initial          | .807 | 64.69**  | 8.18    |
| Revised          | .867 | 104.73** | 9.59    |
| Final            | .843 | 85.32**  | 8.98    |

Table 31 (concluded)

| Whole-Team |      |         |         |
|------------|------|---------|---------|
|            | R    | F-ratio | Z-score |
| Initial    | .773 | 51.29** | 7.52    |
| Revised    | .854 | 93.06** | 9.24    |
| Final      | .826 | 74.58** | 8.59    |

Note. The F-ratios for the regressions had 2 degrees of freedom in the numerator and 104 degrees of freedom in the denominator.

\*  $p < .05$ . \*\*  $p < .01$ .

#### IV. DISCUSSION

##### Overview

The purpose of this research was to examine the effects of Part vs. Whole and Team vs. Individual training on rating accuracy and the manifestation of interactive behaviors in an assessment center consensus meeting. It was hypothesized that whole training would generate greater rating accuracy than part training. Team training was hypothesized to lead to more accurate ratings than individual training. It was also hypothesized that assessors exposed to Whole-Team training would produce the most accurate ratings followed by Part-Team, Whole-Individual, and Part-Individual training.

##### Basic Accuracy

Across the training conditions, the majority of ratings were inaccurate. Inaccuracy occurred for three of Cronbach's four accuracy measures. The Rating Sources effect or Elevation Accuracy showed overall inaccuracy across dimensions and assessees. Assessors tended to make initial and final dimension ratings and OARs that were greater than the target scores. Differential Elevation Accuracy and Differential Accuracy showed that the assessors were inaccurate in their ordering of assessees and in their differential ordering of assessees by dimensions, respectively. For Differential Elevation

Accuracy, only the mean discrepancies for the initial and final dimension ratings for Assessee 4 were accurate, while no assessee OAR discrepancies were accurate. For Differential Accuracy, only the sensitivity discrepancy for Assessee 4 for initial and final dimension ratings was accurate. Furthermore, Differential Elevation Accuracy and Differential Accuracy did not change from initial to final ratings, suggesting that the consensus meeting itself did not improve rating accuracy. The Dimensions source effect or Stereotype Accuracy was nonsignificant, indicating that across exercises and assessees that assessors were accurate in making dimension ratings.

There are several explanations for the rating inaccuracy. First, making ratings in the consensus meeting was a cognitively complex and organized task that required relating many subtask components. Writing accurate narrative reports and generating accurate ratings required the ability to complete previous subtasks. For example, assessors had to know their exercise, the dimensions, how to match behaviors to dimensions, evaluate behavioral effectiveness, observe behavior, take notes, and write reports. For the assessors who observed the role-play or leaderless group discussion, these skills needed to be utilized while observing a dynamic situation where behaviors were displayed at a rapid pace. In the consensus

meeting, the assessors had to retain their knowledge from the previous session and acquire knowledge about making ratings, question information presented, filter information to determine its importance, check information for its appropriateness, integrate information across different exercises to form dimension ratings, and provide rationales for their ratings. Further, for two of the three exercises the assessors had to integrate information into their ratings from situations they did not observe. The requirements of the consensus meeting make it a highly complex and organized task. The difficulty of being an assessor has been supported in earlier assessment center research (Sackett & Dreher, 1982; 1984).

Second, the extensive information provided in the training sessions could have resulted in information overload. If information overload did occur, assessors probably employed "cognitive simplification techniques." It is common for individuals to employ schemas to categorize and simplify information (Cantor & Mischel, 1977; Payne, 1976). Since the assessors were basically naive to the situation, the schemas and categorizations inevitably led to the improper acquisition of a subtask and inaccurate ratings (Nathan & Alexander, 1985).

Finally, using student assessors rather than managers might have contributed to rating inaccuracy. It has been

noted in the performance appraisal research that managers with greater experience with performance appraisals can make more accurate ratings than inexperienced students (Cardy, Bernardin, Abbott, Senderak, & Taylor, 1987). Greater experience leading to greater rating accuracy is also supported by Lorenzo (1984), who suggested that substantial rating accuracy in an assessment center context can be obtained only after several months of constant exposure to being an assessor. This amount of exposure may be required in order to obtain accurate ratings in the assessment center context.

Other results in need of explanation are the correlations of the assessor problem analysis ratings with their corresponding target scores. All of these correlations were negative and the trend from initial to final ratings was negative. The negative trend suggests the inability of the consensus meeting to improve accuracy. Further, all of the problem analysis discrepancies were significantly different from zero. In contrast, the remaining two dimensions had mean discrepancies that did not differ significantly from zero.

An explanation for the inaccurate ratings for problem analysis concerns the correlations between the target scores. The correlations of problem analysis target scores with problem solution, sensitivity, OAR target scores were

negative. These negative correlations occurred as a result of utilizing only four assessees and would probably change with a larger sample of assessees and behaviors. It has been noted in the multiple cue probability learning research that individuals have difficulty dealing with negative relationships between information sources (Lindell & Stewart, 1974; Naylor & Clark, 1968). Assessors may have had difficulty in rating problem analysis accurately, because of its negative relationships with the other dimensions and the OAR.

#### Part vs. Whole Training

Comparisons between part and whole training conditions revealed no clear differences in any of the analyses. The hypothesis predicting superiority in rating accuracy for whole training was not supported. This was somewhat surprising, since the complex task of writing narrative reports was believed to be highly organized, and it has been shown that whole training has superior results for tasks with high organization and complexity (Briggs & Naylor, 1962; Naylor & Briggs, 1963).

One reason for the lack of superiority of whole training was subtask interrelationships were obvious to the assessors in part training. Whole training varied from part training in the presentation of subtasks and identification of their interrelationships. The



identification of the interrelationships was to provide those exposed to whole training with greater insight into the task. This exposure should have simplified the task for those in whole training. However, the interrelationships might have been readily detectable by assessors in the part training condition. If this was the case, then the added information provided to those in whole training would not have provided the hypothesized advantage.

In part training training, subtask interrelationships were emphasized by the temporal sequencing of subtasks. Due to the high level of task organization, the subtasks could not be viewed as independent entities and a pure-part sequencing strategy was not employed. Rather, a temporal sequencing strategy was employed. This strategy has shown more favorable results than pure-part partitioning strategies (Wightman & Lintern, 1985). Using the temporal sequencing strategy resulted in linking subtasks acquired previously to subtasks being learned. This linking could have made those assessors exposed to part training aware of the interrelationships of subtasks, eliminating the advantages of presenting the interrelationships in whole training.

A second reason for the lack of superiority of whole training was the administration of practice and feedback.

In the whole condition, assessors were presented information on the exercise, dimensions, matching behaviors to dimensions, evaluating behavioral effectiveness, observation, and note taking before being allowed to practice and receive feedback. In part-training practice and feedback were provided after the presentation of each of these subtasks. Thus, assessors exposed to part training were able to utilize and digest the information presented via practice and feedback following its presentation. This practice and feedback for shorter episodes of information presentation required shorter attention spans and could have led to greater acquisition of subtasks. Requiring shorter attention spans could have also led to greater motivation in part training. In sum, the greater learning and motivation in part training may have countered the greater insight into subtask interrelationships associated with whole training and led to no differences between the strategies.

The three way interaction of part vs. whole training with dimensions and assessees was significant for the final ratings. However, post-hoc analyses showed that the effects of part and whole training varied with dimensions and assessees. Part training was more effective for the sensitivity ratings, while whole training led to greater accuracy for the problem solution ratings. An explanation

for these results is that complete task information (i.e., whole training) is needed to better understand more complex dimensions. Problem solution was believed to be more complex than sensitivity (cf. Johnson, 1987; Silverhart, 1987). Due to its greater complexity, the interrelationships of problem solution subtasks may have been less clear than for sensitivity. Thus, whole training was more beneficial for problem solution ratings.

#### Team vs. Individual Training

Although no differences were detected between part and whole training, there were differences in rating accuracy between team and individual training. Assessors exposed to team training were more accurate in generating final ratings for problem solution and sensitivity. The superiority for team training was also shown for initial and final OARs. These differences support the hypothesis that assessors exposed to team training make more accurate final ratings than those exposed to individual training. In addition, the positive trend in accuracy from initial to final ratings showed that an emphasis in team training on the interactive behaviors associated with the consensus meeting process does help to generate more accurate ratings. When the acquisition of team skills is stressed in training, team training can be effective, supporting the suggestions of Freed (1980) and Meister (1976).

There are two occasions in the consensus meeting where interaction is present. The first is when narrative reports are read and questions are asked to check, filter, and gather information. This occurs before ratings are made. The second occasion is when an adequate level of agreement is not attained and the ratings need to be revised before final ratings can be formed. Since differences between team and individual training did not occur for the initial ratings, the information presented in team training concerning asking questions about reports and checking information from exercise reports did not have an impact on rating accuracy. However, the instructions on how to interact in order to revise divergent ratings did influence rating accuracy. This is evident from the differences in accuracy results for the initial and final ratings and the positive trends in accuracy from initial to final ratings.

An obvious explanation for the superiority of team training is that the consensus meeting process has appropriate levels of subtask complexity and organization to make team training a viable means to improve task outcomes (McRae, 1966; Wagner et al, 1977). These results support earlier research that emergent team tasks (Boguslaw & Porter, 1962) with high levels of task complexity and organization can benefit from team training (Briggs &

Johnston, 1967; Kinkade & Kidd, 1962; Meister, 1976; Wagner, et al, 1977). Further, the superiority of team training also showed that although individual skills are critical for the successful completion of the task (Johnston, 1966), team skills do have a significant impact on team performance.

The superiority of team training over individual training might be due to the greater number of gathering and communicating behaviors displayed by assessors exposed to team training. Further, the inhibitory behavior of member dominance was displayed more often in the individual training conditions than in the team training conditions. Thus, the interactive behaviors used and inhibitory behaviors avoided by teams when ratings were being discussed and revised led to the generation of more accurate final ratings.

The combination of superior rating accuracy and greater frequency of communicating behaviors exhibited in the team training condition does not support previous research. For example, Johnston (1966) noted that an increase in communication has detrimental effects on team performance. Further, Briggs and his colleagues (e.g., Briggs & Naylor, 1965; Johnston & Briggs, 1968) have suggested that the influence of communication on training effectiveness varies as a function of task structure. They

noted that communication has positive effects for unstructured tasks and negative effects for structured tasks. This suggests the unlikely conclusion that the consensus meeting task is an unstructured task. Briggs and others also suggested that communication can have detrimental effects on tasks that have time demands. The tasks employed in previous research (e.g., radar control operators) appear to have time demands (e.g., Briggs & Naylor, 1965; Johnston & Briggs, 1968; Kidd, 1961). In contrast, the consensus meeting does not have an obvious time demand; within reason, assessors can take as long as they want to respond. A delayed response is not seen as poor performance.

Although the hypothesis for team training was supported, the magnitude of the effect was small. Reasons for this include: the amount of total training, the lack of other interactive behaviors being displayed, the percentage of initial ratings needing revision, and the lack of knowledge by assessors of other exercises prior to the consensus meeting.

Although assessors exposed to individual training did not receive training on team skills, they were provided with more extensive training than is commonly given in assessment centers (Finkle & Jones, 1970; Thornton & Byham, 1982). Consensus meeting training is typically little more

than one practice session (Byham, 1977). In addition to a practice session, individual training also included information on the process of the meeting, how to use the rating scales, how to reach consensus, and a frame-of-reference for each dimension. Thus, comparisons between team and individual training should not be considered a simple treatment vs. control comparison; both training conditions received additional training directly related to the purpose of the meeting. If a true control group had been utilized, the advantages of team training might have been greater.

The number of checking, filtering, and conformity behaviors displayed during the consensus meetings did not vary between training conditions. Reasons for the nonsignificant results for checking and filtering behaviors will be addressed later. Conformity did not vary, since all assessors were instructed not to revise ratings until the rationale of each team member was heard, although this was covered more thoroughly with team training. In addition, the opportunity to display conformity was dictated by the number of times the specified level of consensus was not obtained. Overall, 22.2% of the ratings needed to be revised and provided an opportunity for the teams to display conformity. This percentage is similar to that found by Sackett and Wilson (1982), who reported that

22.4% of their ratings needed revision. Thus, the opportunity to display conformity was somewhat limited.

Finally, assessors possessed knowledge of the exercise they observed, but they knew little about the other two exercises. The assessors were given only limited information about the structure of the other exercises (i.e., meeting with other managers to solve problems, meeting with a subordinate to solve problems, handling written memos and paperwork). This was purposely done to promote interaction in the meeting, increase team member interdependence, and team training effectiveness. It was believed that in this situation the assessors would ask the team member who observed the exercise for information concerning the exercise.

Although the unfamiliarity of other exercises did promote the occurrence of gathering and communicating behaviors, it could have been done at the expense of checking and filtering behaviors. Gathering information from and communicating with the assessor who was the exercise expert needed to occur to better understand the remaining exercises. However, a limited knowledge of the exercise may have restricted the assessor's ability to check behaviors within an exercise and filter the information to determine its importance. The assessors may not have had the knowledge to determine if the exercise was



being interpreted properly by the expert assessor or know the important behaviors associated with an exercise. With greater knowledge of all three of the exercises, the assessors may have been able to display more checking and filtering behaviors.

This research showed that the presence of gathering and communicating behaviors did lead to more accurate ratings. Whether the presence of checking and filtering behaviors would have led to even greater accuracy is not known. Future research should determine if providing the assessors with information about all three of the exercises would lead to more checking and filtering behaviors and greater accuracy. Such research would help determine which behaviors during the meeting are most important. If the increased occurrence of all of the behaviors does lead to greater accuracy, then the lack of exercise knowledge does limit the effectiveness of team training.

#### Part vs. Whole by Team vs. Individual Effects

No significant effect was shown for the interaction of part vs. whole and team vs. individual training with analyses of variance for the dimension ratings. However, significant effects for the interaction were uncovered with analyses of variance for the initial and final OARs. For these latter analyses, the Whole-Team training condition generated accurate OAR mean discrepancies for two

assessees, the Part-Team and Part-Individual training conditions each had one nonsignificant OAR discrepancy, and all OAR discrepancies for Whole-Individual training were significantly different from zero. For the correlational and regression analyses, however, the Part-Team training provided the most accurate ratings and led to the most accurate OAR predictions. In sum, the hypothesis that Whole-Team training would be most accurate was partially supported by the analyses of the OARs, while the correlational and regression analyses did not support this prediction.

The interaction results indicated that the training strategies have greater effects on OARs than on dimension ratings. This may have been due to Whole-Team training having greater fidelity with the task of generating OARs. Generating OARs requires greater integration of information than does generating dimension ratings. For OARs, assessors need to integrate information across three dimensions and three exercises. Whole-Team training was most effective, because whole training emphasizes the interrelationships of subtasks and their integration and team training emphasizes proper team member interaction during the consensus meeting. Proper member interaction not only helped assessors generate more accurate OARs, but also more accurate dimension ratings. These dimension

ratings were then taken into account to form OARs. Due to more accurate dimension ratings and greater knowledge of integration, the Whole-Team condition generated the most accurate OARs.

Although the Whole-Team condition was superior in the OAR analyses, Part-Team appeared to be most effective in the correlational analyses. Since both of the analyses assessed rating accuracy, these findings are contradictory. As noted by Sulsky and Balzer (1988), however, the relationships among different accuracy measures tend to be low. Thus, the two analyses may have examined different aspects of accuracy.

The regression analyses indicated that Part-Team training would lead to the most accurate predictors, if a mechanical combination of the dimension ratings was used to predict target score OARs. These results have practical importance. Previous research has supported the use of mechanical combination to form OARs (Karl & Wexley, 1989; Sackett & Wilson, 1982). If the mechanical combination of dimension ratings is employed as a means to form OARs, then the present research suggests that Part-Team training should be used to attain more accurate overall ratings.

#### Limitations

While conducting this research, some limitations were realized. As mentioned earlier, the order of presentation

of the components during part and whole training could have limited differences between the conditions. One alternative to enhance differences would be to begin whole training with a videotaped presentation of a consensus meeting. Assessors were told at the outset that the narrative reports would be used to make dimension ratings across exercises, however, some assessors did not have a clear picture of the relationship between the reports and their use in the consensus meeting. The viewing of a videotape of the consensus meeting at the beginning of training would demonstrate to assessors how the reports were related to the consensus meeting. Further, the videotapes would show explicitly the interrelationship between the subtasks to be acquired and the use of the narrative report. Thus, a videotape of the consensus meeting shown to the assessors at the beginning of whole training might improve their understanding of the task and lead to improved rating accuracy.

Another limitation specific to part and whole training was the use of ratings to assess training effectiveness. The purpose of part and whole training was to acquire the skills needed to generate accurate narrative reports. Although the ratings were generated on the basis of narrative report information, ratings were an indirect measure of part and whole training effectiveness. The

ratings were also influenced by exposure to team and individual training and the proficiency of other team members.

An alternative to the ratings would be to employ a more structured narrative report that could be used as a direct measure of part and whole training effectiveness. This type of report would have assessors answer specific questions by filling in blanks or completing sentence stems. This structured report would also be presented at the consensus meetings.

On the other hand, a structured report might limit interaction in the consensus meeting. With less information in terms of amount and detail, there would be less information to question and clarify. However, the assessor's responsibility to check information would be easier to carry out and checking behaviors might be displayed more frequently. The reports that were employed in this research (e.g., open-ended questions, requiring more lengthy responses) are the type that are more commonly employed in assessment centers (Finkle & Jones, 1970; Personal Observation, 1987). Using a more structured report may be a better measure of part and whole training effectiveness, but such a report would likely decrease the accuracy of the ratings, limit interaction, and reduce the generalizability of the results.

Another option would be to use a structured report as a measure of part and whole training effectiveness and also use open-ended reports in the consensus meeting. This would provide a more appropriate measure of part and whole training effectiveness. However, the use of the structured report could still have an indirect effect on the narrative reports and rating accuracy. Part and whole training with report writing required approximately five to six hours. Extending the training by another hour or so in order to complete structured reports could have had an effect on trainee motivation.

Finally, the opportunity to practice the consensus meeting probably resulted in fewer interactive behaviors being displayed in the experimental consensus meetings. Obviously, the practice session was an important component of team and individual training and should not be eliminated. However, interactive behaviors were not recorded during the practice session. In the practice session, the experimenters observed that the assessors in the team training condition displayed many gathering and communicating behaviors. Unfortunately, the interactions during the practice session were not recorded.

#### Future Research

In addition to the areas of future research mentioned earlier (i.e., determining the interactive behaviors with

the greatest influence on ratings, providing more information about the other exercises, using a structured narrative report), there are other research needs.

First and foremost, a more comprehensive taxonomy needs to be developed to assess subtasks in terms of complexity and organization. Identifying the subtasks is commonly done through a task analysis (Dieterly, 1988). Previous research has recommended how task analysis can be better suited to team tasks through the use of an interaction ratio (Dieterly) or revision of the CODAP job analysis procedure (Christal, 1974) to determine the amount of team-member interaction occurring during the task. Furthermore, taxonomies that classify the activities of teams are also available (Freed, 1962; Shifflett, Eisner, Price & Schemmer, 1982). However, the problem lies in determining the levels of subtask complexity and organization.

The levels of complexity and organization (e.g., high, moderate, low) are usually determined through an examination of the subtasks and educated guessing. If the subtasks and their components place great demands on individuals' information processing capabilities, the subtask is considered complex; if the completion of a subtask depends upon other subtasks, it is considered organized. However, there are no guidelines for what is

considered high, moderate, or low complexity and organization.

These decisions are not minor ones in the area of training research. The levels of complexity and organization that a subtask possesses have been identified as moderators to the effectiveness of team and individual (e.g., Briggs & Johnston, 1967; Dickinson, 1966) as well as part and whole training (e.g., Briggs & Naylor, 1962; Naylor & Briggs, 1963). In order to improve the likelihood of utilizing the appropriate training strategy, a taxonomy for determining the level of complexity and organization must be developed. Research needs to be conducted that can help identify differences in complexity and organization across various tasks.

Replication of the present research should also be conducted. Specifically, the effects of team training on other cognitive team tasks should be examined, since no other research investigation was found that examined team training for cognitive tasks. Much of the previous research examined team training on psychomotor tasks (e.g., Kinkade & Kidd, 1962; Naylor & Briggs, 1965).

Finally, it has been suggested that the purpose for training (e.g., feedback and development, promotion) may influence the type of training and training strategies to utilize (Dickinson & Baker, 1989). In the present



research, Whole-Team training was effective for generating OARs (i.e., commonly used for promotion) but not for dimension ratings (i.e., commonly used for feedback and development). Past research has investigated the tasks most amenable to team, individual, part, and whole training. Future research should investigate if training purpose could be a moderator of training effectiveness. Determining what purposes are most amenable, along with a more descriptive taxonomy, would make decisions to employ team training more likely to improve effectiveness.

#### Implications

Since this was the only research investigation that examined training to improve assessor rating accuracy in consensus meetings, the results have obvious implications for assessment centers. It has been shown here that incorporating team training into consensus meeting training results in more accurate ratings than exposure to the consensus meeting alone. Exposing assessors to the interactive behaviors to employ and avoid, and providing practice with these behaviors should be incorporated into assessment center training. Furthermore, it was shown that more extensive training should be given concerning consensus meeting participation. The present research suggested that it cannot be assumed that assessors will know what behaviors should and should not be displayed in

the consensus meeting; they must be trained.

### Conclusions

Three hypotheses were proposed and investigated in the present research on the assessment center process. The hypothesis of greater rating accuracy for whole training was not supported. No differences in rating accuracy were present between part and whole training. As hypothesized, team training led to greater rating accuracy than individual training. This result occurred due to the use of interactive behaviors leading to an improvement in accuracy from initial to final ratings. The hypothesis of differences between the four training strategies was partially supported. Whole-Team training was superior to the remaining training strategies for the OAR analyses. However, Part-Team training appeared to be most effective for the correlational and regression analyses. In the regression analyses, Part-Team training was found to lead to the most accurate predictions of target score OARs. In summary, this research demonstrated that assessor training can lead to improved outcomes for the assessment center process.

## V. REFERENCES

- Adams, J. A. (1960). Part trainers. In G. Finch (Ed.), Educational and training media: A symposium. Washington, DC: National Academy of Science, National Research Council.
- Bailey, J. S., Hughes, R. G., & Jones, W. E. (1980). Application of backward-chaining to air-to-surface weapons delivery training (AFHRL-TR-79-63). Williams AFB, AZ: Operations Training Division, Human Resources Laboratory.
- Baker, T. A. (1986). Multitrait-multimethod analysis of performance ratings using behaviorally anchored and behavioral checklist formats. Unpublished master's thesis, Old Dominion University, Norfolk, VA.
- Berstein, V., Hakel, M. D., & Harlan, A. (1975). The college student as interviewer: A threat to generalizability. Journal of Applied Psychology, 60, 266-268.
- Bilodeau, E. A. (1957). Patterns of internal consistency in multipart skilled performances. American Journal of Psychology, 70, 550-551.
- Boguslaw, R., & Porter, E. H. (1962). Team functions and training. In R. M. Gagne (Ed.), Psychological principles in system development. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

- Borman, W. C. (1977). Consistency of rating accuracy and rating errors in the judgment of human performance. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 20, 233-252.
- Bouchard, T. J., Jr. (1969). Personality, problem-solving procedure, and performance in small groups. Journal of Applied Psychology, 53, 1-29.
- Bray, D. W., & Campbell, R. J. (1968). Selection of salesmen by means of an assessment center. Journal of Applied Psychology, 52, 36-41.
- Bray, D. W., & Grant, D. L. (1966). The assessment center in the measurement of potential for business management. Psychological Monographs, 80, 1-27.
- Bray, D. W., Grant, D. L., & Campbell, R. J. (1972). The study of management careers and the assessment of management ability. In A. J. Morrow (Ed.), The failure of success. New York: AMACOM.
- Briggs, G. E., & Brogden, W. J. (1954). The effect of component practice on performance of a lever-positioning skill. Journal of Experimental Psychology, 48, 375-380.
- Briggs, G. E., & Johnston, W. A. (1966). Stimulus and response fidelity in team training. Journal of Applied Psychology, 50, 114-117.

- Briggs, G. E., & Johnston, W. A. (1967). Team training (NAVTRADEVCCEN 1327-4, AD-660 019). Orlando FL: Naval Device Training Center.
- Briggs, G. E., & Naylor, J. C. (1962). The relative efficiency of several training methods as a function of transfer task complexity. Journal of Experimental Psychology, 64, 505-512.
- Briggs, G. E., & Naylor, J. C. (1964). Experiments on team training in a CIC-Type task environment (NAVTRADEVCCEN 1327-1, AD-608 309). Port Washington, NY: Naval Training Device Center.
- Briggs, G. E., & Naylor, J. C. (1965). Team versus individual training, training task fidelity, and task organization effects on transfer performance by 3-man teams. Journal of Applied Psychology, 49, 387-392.
- Briggs, G. E., Waters, L. K. (1958). Training and transfer as a function of component interaction. Journal of Experimental Psychology, 56, 492-500.
- Byham, R. N., & Byham, W. C. (1976). Effectiveness of assessment center exercises in producing behavior. Assessment & Development, 3, 9-10.
- Byham, W. C. (1977). Assessor selection and training. In J. L. Moses & W. C. Byham (Eds.), Applying the assessment center method. New York: Pergamon Press.

- Byham, W. C., & Thoresen, J. (1976). Effectiveness of assessor training techniques. Pittsburgh, PA: Development Dimensions International.
- Campbell, J. (1968). Individual versus group problem solving in an industrial sample. Journal of Applied Psychology, 52, 205-210.
- Campbell, R. J., & Bray, D. W. (1967). Assessment centers: An aid in management selection. Personnel Administration, 30, 6-13.
- Campbell, W. J. (1986). Construct validation of role playing exercises in an assessment center using BARS and behavioral checklist formats. Unpublished master's thesis, Old Dominion University, Norfolk, VA.
- Cantor, N., & Mischel, W. (1977). Traits as prototypes: Effects on recognition memory. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 35, 38-48.
- Cardy, R. L., Bernardin, H. J., Abbott, J. G., Senderak, M. P., & Taylor, K. (1987). The effects of individual performance schemata and dimension familiarization on rating accuracy. Journal of Occupational Psychology, 60, 197-205.
- Cesare, S. J. (1989). Accuracy of performance measurement: An investigation of training method and amount of practice. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Old Dominion University, Norfolk, VA.

- Chidester, T. R., & Foushee, H. C. (1988, August). Flight crew research at NASA-Ames. Paper presented at the annual Meeting of the American Psychological Association, Atlanta, GA.
- Christal, R. E. (1974). The United States Air Force occupational research project (AFHRL-TR-73-75). Brooks AFB, TX: Air Force Human Resource laboratory.
- Cohen, B. M., Moses, J. L., & Byham, W. C. (1974). The validity of assessment centers: A literature review. Monograph II. Pittsburgh, PA: Development Dimensions Press.
- Cohen, S. L. (1978). Standardization of assessment center technology: Some critical concerns. Journal of Assessment Center Technology, 1, 1-10.
- Collins, B. E., & Guetzkow, H. A. (1964). A social psychology of group processes for decision making. New York: John Wiley.
- Cooper, W. H. (1981). Ubiquitous halo. Psychological Bulletin, 90, 218-244.
- Cronbach, L. J. (1955). Processes affecting scores on understanding of others and assuming "similarity." Psychological Bulletin, 52, 177-193.

- Denson, R. W. (1981). Team training: Literature review and annotated bibliography (AFHRL-TR-80-40, AD-A099 994). Wright-Patterson AFB, OH: Logistics and Technical Training Division, Air Force Human Resource Laboratory.
- Dickinson, T. L. (1987). Designs for evaluating the validity and accuracy of performance ratings. Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 40, 1-21.
- Dickinson, T. L. (1968). The effects of work interaction and its interplay with task organization on team and member performance. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The Ohio State University, Columbus, OH.
- Dickinson, T. L. (1966). The effects of task variables and work structure on the performance of teams. Unpublished master's thesis, The Ohio State University, Columbus, OH.
- Dickinson, T. L., & Baker, T. A. (1989). Training to improve rating accuracy: A meta-analysis. Paper presented at the annual Meeting of the American Psychological Association, New Orleans, LA.
- Dickinson, T. L., & Hedge J. W. (1988). Work performance ratings: Measurement test bed for validity and accuracy research (AFHRL-TP-88-36, AD-A205 166). Brooks Air Force Base, TX: Training Systems Division.



- Dickinson, T. L., & Naylor, J. C. (1966). Effects of task complexity and organization on team behavior using the multiple regression model. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Midwestern Psychological Association.
- Dickinson, T. L., & Silverhart, T. A. (1985). Performance measure test bed: A review of the assessment center literature. Unpublished manuscript, Old Dominion University, Norfolk, VA.
- Dieterly, D. L. (1988). Team performance requirements. In S. Gael (Ed.), The job analysis handbook for business, industry, and government. (Volume 1). New York: John Wiley.
- Dunnette, M. D. (1964). Are meetings any good for solving problems? Personnel Administration, March-April, 12-29.
- Dunnette, M. D., Campbell, J., & Jaastad, K. (1963). The effect of group participation on brainstorming effectiveness for two industrial samples. Journal of Applied Psychology, 47, 30-37.
- Dyer, J. L. (1984). Team research and team training: A state-of-the-art review. In F. A. Muckler (Ed.), Human Factors Review. Santa Monica, CA: Human Factors Society, Inc.

- Egerman, K., Klaus, D. J., & Glaser, R. (1962). Increasing team proficiency through training. Decremental effects of reinforcement in teams with redundant members (AIR-B64-6/62-TR). Pittsburgh, PA: American Institute for Research.
- Fedorko, M. G. (1986). A multitrait-multimethod investigation of two checklist formats for rating the in-basket. Unpublished master's thesis, Old Dominion University, Norfolk, VA.
- Finkle, R. B. (1976). Managerial assessment centers. In M. D. Dunnette (Ed.), Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Finkle, R. B., & Jones, W. S. (1970). Assessing corporate talent: A key to manpower planning. New York: John Wiley.
- Finn, J. D., & Mattsson, I. (1978). Multivariate analysis in educational research. Chicago: National Educational Resources.
- Freed, A. (1962). Human interactions in man-machine systems. Human Factors, 4, 389-396.
- Gagne, R. M., & Foster, H. (1949). Transfer of training from practice on components on a motor skill. Journal of Experimental Psychology, 39, 47-68.

- Gaugler, B. B., Rosenthal, D. B., Thornton, G. C., III, & Bentson, C. (1987). Meta-analysis of assessment center validity. Journal of Applied Psychology, 72, 493-511.
- Glaser, R., Glanzer, M., & Morten, A. W. (1955). A study of some dimensions of team performance. Pittsburgh, PA: American Institute for Research.
- Glaser, R., Klaus, D. J., & Egerman, K. (1962). Increasing team proficiency through training. 2. The acquisition and extinction of a team response (AIR-B64-5/62-TR, AD-276 429). Pittsburgh, PA: American Institute for Research.
- Greenwood, J. M., & McNamara, W. J. (1969). Leadership styles of structure and consideration and managerial effectiveness. Personnel Psychology, 22, 141-152.
- Hackman, J. R., & Morris, C. G. (1975). Group tasks, group interaction processes, and group performance effectiveness: A review and proposed integration. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), Advances in experimental social psychology. (Volume 9). New York: Academic Press.
- Hall, E. R., & Rizzo, W. A. (1975). An assessment of the United States Navy tactical team training (TAEG Report No. 18, AD-A011 452). Orlando, FL: Training Analysis and Evaluation Group.
- Hays, W. L. (1981). Statistics (3rd ed.). New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

- Hinrichs, J. R. (1976). Personnel training. In M. D. Dunnette (Ed.), Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Hoffman, L. R. (1965). Group problem solving. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), Advances in experimental social psychology. (Volume 2). New York: Academic Press.
- Horrocks, J. E., & Goyer, R. (1959). Human factors analysis of team training (NAVTRADEVCEEN 198-1). Port Washington, NY: Naval Training Device Center.
- Horrocks, J. E., Heermann, E., & Krug, R. E. (1960). Team training III: An approach to optimum methods and procedures (NAVTRADEVCEEN 198-5, AD-267 666). Columbus, OH: The Ohio State University.
- Horrocks, J. E., Krug, R. E., & Heermann, E. (1961). Team training II: Individual learning and team performance (NAVTRADEVCEEN 198-2, AD-247 147). Columbus, OH: The Ohio State University Research Foundation.
- Huck, J. R. (1973). Assessment centers: A review of external and internal validities. Personnel Psychology, 26, 191-212.
- Jenness, A. (1932). The role of discussion in changing opinion regarding a matter of fact. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 27, 279-296.

- Johnson, R. L. (1987). The influence of direct versus indirect observation, candidate report format, and assessor training on the accuracy of assessor ratings. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Old Dominion University, Norfolk, VA.
- Johnston, W. A. (1966). Transfer of team skills as a function of type of training. Journal of Applied Psychology, 50, 102-108.
- Johnston, W. A., & Briggs, G. E. (1968). Team performance as a function of team arrangement and workload. Journal of Applied Psychology, 52, 89-94.
- Kabanoff, B., & O'Brien, G. E. (1979). The effects of task type and cooperation upon group products and performance. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 23, 163-181.
- Karl, K. A., & Wexley, K. N. (1989). Patterns of performance and rating frequency: Influence on the assessment of performance. Journal of Management, 15, 5-20.
- Kavanagh, M. J., Borman, W. C., Hedge, J. W., & Gould, R. B. (1984). A model for performance measurement quality for validation research in the military. AFHRL Technical Paper, Brooks AFB, TX: Manpower and Personnel Division, Air Force Human Resources Laboratory.

- Kavanagh, M. J., MacKinney, A. C., & Wolins, L. (1971).  
Issues in managerial performance: Multitrait-  
multimethod analyses of ratings. Psychological  
Bulletin, 75, 34-49.
- Kidd, J. S. (1961). A comparison of one-, two-, and three-  
man work units under various conditions of work load.  
Journal of Applied Psychology, 45, 195-200.
- Kinkade, R. G., & Kidd, J. S. (1962). The use of an  
operational game as a method of task familiarization.  
Journal of Applied Psychology, 46, 1-5.
- Klaus, D. J., & Glaser, R. (1970). Reinforcement  
determinants of team proficiency. Organizational  
Behavior and Human Performance, 5, 33-67.
- Klimoski, R. J., & Brickner, M. (1987). Why do assessment  
centers work? The puzzle of assessment center validity.  
Personnel Psychology, 40, 243-260.
- Klimoski, R. J., Friedman, B. A., & Weldon, E. (1980).  
Leader influence in the assessment of performance.  
Personnel Psychology, 33, 389-401.
- Kraut, A. I., & Scott, G. J. (1972). Validity of an  
operational management assessment program. Journal of  
Applied Psychology, 56, 124-129.

- Krumm, R. L., & Farina, A. J., Jr. (1962). Effectiveness of integrated flight simulator training in promoting B-52 crew coordination (AMRL-TDR-62-1). Pittsburgh, PA: American Institute for Research.
- Lindell, M. K., & Stewart, T. R. (1974). The effects of redundancy in multiple cue probability learning. American Journal of Psychology, 87, 393-398.
- Lorenzo, R. V. (1984). Effects of assessorship on managers' practicing in acquiring, evaluating, and communicating information about people. Personnel Psychology, 37, 617-634.
- Lorge, I., Fox, D., Davitz, J., & Brenner, M. (1958). A survey of studies contrasting the quality of group performance and individual performance, 1920-1957. Psychological Bulletin, 55, 337-372.
- Mane, A. M. (1984). Acquisition of perceptual-motor skill: Adaptive and part-whole training. In Proceedings of the Human Factors Society 28th Annual Meeting. Santa Monica, CA: Human Factors Society.
- Mane, A. M., Coles, M. G., Karis, D., Strayer, D., & Donchin, E. D. (1984). The design and use of subtasks in part training and their relationship to the whole task. In Proceedings of the 20th Annual Convention on Manual Control. Moffett Field, CA: Ames Research Center.

- Marascuilo, L. A., & Levin, J. R. (1983). Multivariate statistics in the social sciences: A researcher's guide. Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole.
- McRae, A. V. (1966). Interaction content and team effectiveness (HumRRO-TR-66-10, AD-637 311). Fort Benning, GA: George Washington University, Human Resources Research Office.
- Meister, D. (1976). Team functions. In D. Meister (Ed.), Behavioral foundations of system development. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Mitchel, J. O. (1975). Assessment center validity: A longitudinal study. Journal of Applied Psychology, 60, 573-579.
- Morgan, B. B., Jr., Glickman, A. S., Woodard, E. A., Blaiwes, A. S., & Salas, E. (1986). Measurement of team behavior in a Navy environment (TR-86-014). Orlando, FL: Naval Training Systems Center.
- Morgan, B. B., Jr., Salas, E., & Glickman, A. S. (1987). Teamwork from team training: An assessment of instructional processes in Navy team training systems. Interscience/Industry Training Systems Conference.
- Morris, C. G. (1966). Task effects on group interaction. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 5, 545-554.



- Moses, J. L. (1973). The development of an assessment center for the early identification of supervisory potential. Personnel Psychology, 26, 569-580.
- Nathan, B. R., & Alexander, R. A. (1985). The role of inferential accuracy in performance rating. Academy of Management Review, 10, 109-115.
- Naylor, J. C. (1962). Parameters affecting the relative efficiency of part and whole training methods: A review of the literature (NAVTRADEVCEEN 950-1). Columbus, OH: The Ohio State University Research Foundation, Laboratory of Aviation Psychology.
- Naylor, J. C., & Briggs, G. E. (1965). Team training effectiveness under various conditions. Journal of Applied Psychology, 49, 223-229.
- Naylor, J. C., & Briggs, G. E. (1963). Effects of task complexity and task organization of the relative efficiency of part and whole training methods. Journal of Experimental Psychology, 65, 217-224.
- Naylor, J. C., & Clark, R. D. (1968). Intuitive inference strategies in interval learning tasks as a function of validity magnitude and sign. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 3, 378-399.
- Naylor, J. C., & Dickinson, T. L. (1969). Task structure, work structure, and team performance. Journal of Applied Psychology, 53, 167-177.

- Nieva, V. F., Fleishman, E. A., & Rieck, A. (1978). Team dimensions: Their identity, their measurement, and their relationship. Washington, DC: Advanced Research Resources Organization.
- Parsons, K. L. (1980). The effects of load sharing system training upon team performance. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI.
- Payne, J. W. (1976). Task complexity and contingent processing in decision making: An information search and protocol analysis. Organizational Behavior and Human Processes, 16, 366-387.
- Pulakos, E. D. (1984). A comparison of rater training programs: Error training and accuracy training. Journal of Applied Psychology, 69, 581-588.
- Rotter, G. S., & Portugal, S. M. (1969). Group and individual effects in problem solving. Journal of Applied Psychology, 53, 338-341.
- Sackett, P. R., & Dreher, G. F. (1984). Situational specificity of behavior and assessment center validation strategies: A rejoinder to Neidig and Neidig. Journal of Applied Psychology, 69, 187-190.
- Sackett, P. R., & Dreher, G. F. (1982). Constructs and assessment center dimensions: Some troubling empirical findings. Journal of Applied Psychology, 67, 401-410.

- Sackett, P. R., & Wilson, M. A. (1982). Factors affecting the consensus judgment process in managerial assessment centers. Journal of Applied Psychology, 67, 10-17.
- Schendel, J. D., Sheilds, J. L., & Katz, M. S. (1978). Retention of motor skills: A review (TP-313). Alexandria, VA: U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences.
- Schmitt, N. (1977). Interrater agreement in dimensionality and combination of assessment center judgments. Journal of Applied Psychology, 62, 171-176.
- Schmitt, N., Gooding, R. Z., Noe, R. A., & Kirsch, M. (1984). Meta-analysis of validity studies published between 1964 and 1982 and the investigation of study characteristics. Personnel Psychology, 37, 407-422.
- Shack, M. A. (1983). The implications of cognitive and interpersonal processes for assessment centers. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Bowling Green State University, Bowling Green, OH.
- Shiflett, S. C. (1972). Group performance as a function of task difficulty and organizational interdependence. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 7, 442-456.
- Shiflett, S. C. (1973). Performance effectiveness and efficiency under different dyadic work strategies. Journal of Applied Psychology, 57, 257-263.

- Shifflett, S. C., Eisner, E. J., Price, S. J., & Schemmer, F. M. (1982). The definition and measurement of team functions. Final Report. Bethesda, MD: ARRO.
- Silverhart, T. A. (1987). Factors affecting the efficacy of rater training: Information type and mode of presentation. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Old Dominion University, Norfolk, VA.
- Silverman, W. H., Dalessio, A., Woods, S. B., & Johnson, R. J. (1986). Influences of assessment center methods on assessor ratings. Personnel Psychology, *39*, 565-578.
- Smith, A. B. (1988). A comparison of psychometric properties for assessment center dimension ratings dervied by two different integration methods. Unpublished manuscript, Colorado State University, Fort Collins, CO.
- Smith, P. C., & Kendall, L. M. (1963). Retranslation of expectations: An approach to the construction of unambiguous anchors for rating scales. Journal of Applied Psychology, *47*, 149-155.
- Smode, A. F., Hall, E. R., & Meyer, D. (1966). An assessment of research relevant to pilot training (AMRL-TR-66-196). Wright-Patterson AFB, OH: Aerospace Medical Research Laboratories.
- Sorenson, J. R. (1971). Task demands, group interaction, and group performance. Sociometry, *34*, 483-495.

- Spector, P. E. (1976). Choosing response categories for summated rating scales. Journal of Applied Psychology, 61, 374-375.
- Stammers, R., & Patrick, J. (1975). The psychology of training. London: Methuen.
- Steiner, I. D., & Dodge, J. S. (1956). Interpersonal perception and role structure as determinants of group and individual efficiency. Human Relations, 9, 467-480.
- Sulsky, L. M., & Balzer, W. K. (1988). Meaning and measurement of performance rating accuracy: Some methodological and theoretical concerns. Journal of Applied Psychology, 73, 497-506.
- Task Force on the Development of Assessment Center Standards (1977). Standards for ethical considerations for assessment center operations. In J. L. Moses & W. C. Byham (Eds.), Applying the assessment center method. New York: Pergamon Press.
- Taylor, J. B. (1968). Rating scales as measures of clinical judgment: A method for increasing scale reliability and sensitivity. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 28, 747-766.
- Thibaut, J., Strickland, L. H., Mundy, D., & Goding, E. F. (1960). Communication, group demands, and group effectiveness. Journal of Personality, 28, 156-166.

- Thorndike, R. L. (1938). The effect of discussion upon the correctness of group decisions, when the factor of majority influence is allowed for. Journal of Social Psychology, 9, 334-362.
- Thornton, G. C., III, & Byham, W. C. (1982). Assessment centers and managerial performance. Orlando, FL: Academic Press.
- Tziner, A. & Dolan, S. (1982). Validity of an assessment center for identifying future female officers in the military. Journal of Applied Psychology, 67, 728-736.
- Vaughan, G. M., & Corballis, M. C. (1969). Beyond tests of significance: Estimating strength of effects in selective ANOVA designs. Psychological Bulletin, 72, 204-213.
- Vidulich, M., Yeh, Y., & Schneider, W. (1983). Time-compressed components for air-intercept control skills. In Proceedings of the Human Factors Society 27th Annual Meeting. Santa Monica, CA: Human Factors Society.
- Wagner, H., Hibbits, N., Rosenblatt, R. D., & Schulz, R. (1977). Team training and evaluation strategies: State-of-the-art (HumRRO-TR-77-1, AD-A039-505). Alexandria, VA: HumRRO.
- Wallis, K. B., Ewart, W. L., & Kaufman, R. A. (1966). Instructional system approach to flight crew training. Human Factors, 8, 173-178.

- Wiest, W. M., Porter, L. W., & Ghiselli, E. E. (1961). Relationships between individual proficiency and team performance and efficiency. Journal of Applied Psychology, 45, 435-440.
- Wightman, D. C. (1983). Part-task training strategies in simulated carrier landing final approach training (NAVRAEQUIPCEN IH-347). Orlando, FL: Naval Training Equipment Center.
- Wightman, D. C., & Lintern, G. (1985). Part-task training for tracking and manual control. Human Factors, 27, 267-283.
- Willging, W. C. (1985). Effects of discussion and task decomposition on accuracy and member acceptance of small group decisions. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Colorado State University, Fort Collins, CO.
- Williges, R. C., Johnston, W. A., & Briggs, G. E. (1966). Role of verbal communication in teamwork. Journal of Applied Psychology, 50, 473-478.
- Wingrove, J., Jones, A., & Herriot, P. (1985). The predictive validity of pre- and post-discussion assessment centre ratings. Journal of Occupational Psychology, 58, 189-192.
- Wollowick, H. B., & McNamara, W. J. (1969). Relationship of the components of an assessment center to management success. Journal of Applied Psychology, 53, 348-352.

Zedeck, S. (1986). A process analysis of the assessment center method. In B. M. Staw & L. L. Cummings (Eds.), Research in organizational behavior. (Volume 8). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.



**Appendix A**  
**Dimension Definitions and Example Behaviors**

## Dimension Definitions and Example Behaviors

### Problem Solution

**Definition.** The assessee suggests, recommends, or outlines actions, methods, or strategies that help in the resolution of problems.

**Behaviors.** An individual suggests one or more specific ways to resolve problems or organize discussion. The individual may recommend or decide on a course of action that remedies several problems or issues.

### Problem Analysis

**Definition.** Breaking up a problem into parts such that the parts can be examined for their importance, interrelationships, or need for additional information.

**Behaviors.** An individual identifies, integrates, or inquires about components of the problem with the intent of determining the nature of the problem. For example, the individual may identify a piece of information, integrate pieces of information, define the problem, or question others for information.

### Sensitivity

**Definition.** Showing concern for the feelings, needs, and points of view of others. Letting people know you are aware of their individual situations.

**Behaviors.** An individual acknowledges others' concerns, problems, opinions, and requests and supports them. For example, the individual may attempt to ease others' concerns, support or respect others' concerns and viewpoints.

Appendix B  
The Dimension Rating Scales and the Overall  
Assessment Rating Scale

## Overall Problem Analysis Rating Scale

Definition. Breaking up a problem into parts such that the parts can be examined for their importance, interrelationships, or need for additional information.

Behaviors. An individual identifies, integrates, or inquires about components of the problem with the intent of determining the nature of the problem. For example, the individual may identify a piece of information, integrate pieces of information, define the problem, or question others for information.

- 5 - Recognizes relationships between separate pieces of information, separate requests, or separate problems.
- 4 - Probes for information by asking specific questions about specific problems or requests.  
- Identifies the impact of a decision on other issues.  
- Takes different pieces of information, requests, or problems into account to analyze a problem.
- 3 - Asks for others' opinions concerning an issue.  
- Asks for general input concerning an issue.  
- Identifies the pros and cons of an action or request.
- 2 - Identifies information that has been provided.  
- Asks others for suggestions about a problem.  
- Asks for clarification about some information.  
- Asks general questions (e.g., Are you having any problems) that cut across problems.
- 1 - Does not identify some problems, items, or requests that are provided on the information sheets.  
- Inquires about provided information.  
- Forms inaccurate relationships.  
- Doesn't relate past problems to present problems or requests.

## Overall Problem Solution Rating Scale

Definition. The assessee suggests, recommends, or outlines actions, methods, or strategies that help in the resolution of problems.

Behaviors. An individual suggests one or more specific ways to resolve problems or organize discussion. The individual may recommend or decide on a course of action that remedies several problems or issues.

- 5
  - Provides a number of specific actions that can be used to solve a particular problem.
  - Provides a detailed way to organize the meeting.
  - Outlines a specific plan of action.
  
- 4
  - Makes decisions after checking the needed information.
  - Proposes one specific alternative solution.
  - Provides a specific solution to a problem.
  
- 3
  - Provides a universal method to form all departmental budgets.
  - Forms a general solution without providing a specific method for carrying out the solution.
  - Provides general actions that need to be carried out.
  
- 2
  - Establishes a single goal without specifying how to achieve it.
  - Forms an obvious solution (e.g., the budgets need to be lowered).
  
- 1
  - Forms solutions, makes decisions without checking the needed information.
  - Delegates a task, but does not provide instructions.
  - States that a problem can be solved, but doesn't say how.
  - Makes rash, inaccurate decisions.

## Overall Sensitivity Rating Scale

**Definition.** Responding to and/or showing concern for the feelings, needs, and points of view of others. Letting people know you are aware of their individual situations.

**Behaviors.** An individual acknowledges others' concerns, problems, opinions, and requests and supports them. For example, the individual may attempt to ease others' concerns, support or respect others' concerns and viewpoints.

- 5
  - Shows support for the individual(s) who the assessee is addressing.
  - Acknowledges the importance and needs of others who the assessee is meeting with.
  
- 4
  - Respects opposing viewpoints; acknowledges others' views.
  - Acknowledges the problems someone may be having.
  - Compliments others for their past efforts and input.
  
- 3
  - Thanks others for providing needed information; reinforces others for providing suggestions.
  - Puts others at ease.
  - Supports one department, or others the assessee is not meeting with.
  
- 2
  - Does not support one's suggestion, but has justification.
  - Does not acknowledge criticisms directed at the assessee or his/her department.
  
- 1
  - Downplays the opinions of others without justification.
  - Assessee states that his/her stance won't change, but others will have to change their positions.
  - Shows no concern for others' feelings and/or problems.

### Overall Assessment Rating Scale

Taking into account the assessee's behavior across all exercises and dimensions, the managerial performance of this assessee is considered:

5 - Excellent

4 - Good

3 - Fair

2 - Passable

1 - Poor

Appendix C  
Target Score Means, Standard Deviations, and  
Rationales for the Role-play, Leaderless  
Group Discussion, In-basket, and Dimension Ratings



Target Score Means and Standard Deviations for the Role Plays.

|                   | Dimension      |                |                |
|-------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
|                   | PA             | PS             | SE             |
| Practice Assessee | 2.80<br>(.447) | 3.60<br>(.548) | 4.00<br>(.000) |
| Assessee 1        | 2.00<br>(.000) | 1.00<br>(.000) | 3.60<br>(.548) |
| Assessee 2        | 4.00<br>(.000) | 3.60<br>(.548) | 3.80<br>(.447) |
| Assessee 3        | 4.00<br>(.000) | 2.40<br>(.548) | 3.00<br>(.000) |
| Assessee 4        | 2.00<br>(.000) | 1.00<br>(.000) | 1.00<br>(.000) |

Note. Standard Deviations are in parentheses.

Target Score Means and Standard Deviations for the  
Leaderless Group Discussions.

|                      | Dimension      |                |                |
|----------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
|                      | PA             | PS             | SE             |
| Practice<br>Assessee | 2.00<br>(.000) | 2.20<br>(.447) | 3.00<br>(.000) |
| Assessee 1           | 3.60<br>(.548) | 3.60<br>(.548) | 3.80<br>(.447) |
| Assessee 2           | 1.00<br>(.000) | 1.00<br>(.000) | 2.80<br>(.447) |
| Assessee 3           | 2.60<br>(.548) | 2.20<br>(.447) | 2.00<br>(.000) |
| Assessee 4           | 4.20<br>(.447) | 3.00<br>(.000) | 3.00<br>(.000) |

Note. Standard Deviations are in parentheses.

Target Score Means and Standard Deviations for the In-  
Baskets

|                   | Dimension      |                |                |
|-------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
|                   | PA             | PS             | SE             |
| Practice Assessee | 2.78<br>(.204) | 5.00<br>(.000) | 3.05<br>(.231) |
| Assessee 1        | 3.20<br>(.000) | 2.77<br>(.275) | 3.00<br>(.000) |
| Assessee 2        | 2.63<br>(.165) | 0.00<br>(.000) | 5.00<br>(.000) |
| Assessee 3        | 3.98<br>(.172) | 1.50<br>(.000) | 0.00<br>(.000) |
| Assessee 4        | 4.25<br>(.000) | 2.90<br>(.183) | 2.87<br>(.268) |

Note. Standard Deviations are in parentheses.

Target Score Means and Standard Deviations for the Overall Dimension Ratings and OAR

|                   | Dimension      |                |                |                |
|-------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
|                   | PA             | PS             | SE             | OAR            |
| Practice Assessee | 2.60<br>(.548) | 2.80<br>(.447) | 3.80<br>(.447) | 3.00<br>(.000) |
| Assessee 1        | 2.00<br>(.000) | 3.00<br>(.000) | 4.00<br>(.000) | 3.00<br>(.000) |
| Assessee 2        | 2.80<br>(.447) | 2.00<br>(.000) | 3.00<br>(.000) | 2.60<br>(.548) |
| Assessee 3        | 2.40<br>(.548) | 1.40<br>(.548) | 2.00<br>(.000) | 1.00<br>(.000) |
| Assessee 4        | 3.00<br>(.000) | 2.00<br>(.000) | 2.00<br>(.000) | 1.80<br>(.447) |

Note. Standard Deviations are in parentheses.

## Behavioral Rationales for the Experts' Overall Ratings

## Ratee #1

Problem Analysis - Assessee did recognize relationships in his department and with his departmental requests and other departments in the LGD. But, the majority of Problem Analysis behaviors were general, not probing, questions. He did not systematically uncover information. Mostly used clarifying, general questions.

Problem Solution - Provided a number of specific solutions in the LGD (provided some in the IB). Used the needed information to make decisions for two IB memos. RP lowered the rating. In the RP rash, inaccurate decisions were made without using complete information. Brought up scheduling, but didn't get to it.

Sensitivity - Shows support for others during the LGD and RP. Acknowledges past performance in LGD and RP and 1 incident in the IB (employees are good). Shows awareness of concerns. Didn't show willingness to work with others and 3 major insensitive behaviors (Customer complaint, theft, sexual harassment) in the IB.

Overall Rating - PA knocked him down.

## Ratee #2

**Problem Analysis** - Demonstrated the ability to identify relationships and ask specific questions in RP. Identified the need to gather additional information (in general and for some specific memos) in the IB. Identified relationships in the RP and IB. RP questions were probing and tied to solutions. However, the LGD Problem Analysis was poor; only one specific question, did not identify problems, requests or relationships in her department.

**Problem Solution** - In the RP the assessee showed some specific solutions to specific problems. However, there were some general solutions in the RP. In the IB and LGD, rash decisions were made and some IB decisions did not directly address the problem at hand. Ib had a few specific solutions, but no effective solutions were made in the LGD.

**Sensitivity** - In the RP the assessee did show sensitive behavior and acknowledged the employee's situation on some occasions. However, in the other 2 exercises the assessee showed a lack of sensitivity. IB showed one sensitive behavior (apologize to customer). However, beyond that, no sensitive or insensitive behaviors were displayed.

## Ratee #3

**Problem Analysis** - Identified 1 relationship in each of the three exercises. Had a sequence of specific questions in the RP. However, restated information that was already presented in the LGD. Didn't look to gather additional information for many memos in the IB. Didn't identify problems for some memos. Most questions in the LGD were for clarification. Sought opinions of employee in the RP.

**Problem Solution** - General solutions in the RP. Poor solutions (no solution) made for important memos in the IB (sexual harassment, Val-U-Trac lights). Made decisions in the LGD without the needed information (the departmental representatives' input). Made rash decisions in the LGD (formed budgets without needed information, used money as the only information). Solutions in the IB were basically general without action plans for carrying them out.

**Sensitivity** - In IB showed no concern for the sexual harassment victim. Didn't apologize to customer in IB. Was insensitive in the LGD: inflexible, downplayed others' criticisms, did not acknowledge others' information. In RP the assessee did show concern for staffers and acknowledged the work of the employee.

## Ratee #4

Problem Analysis - Recognized some relationships in the IB. However, missed Lori's performance rating and her possible promotion. Identified a number of relationships across departments in the LGD. Asked some specific questions. Majority of questions in the LGD were the clarifying type. RP questions were not probing, the information from the questions was not used.

Problem Solution - Had some poor solutions in all 3 exercises (IB- ignoring the theft memo, LGD- forming other departments' budgets and firing people, RP- making decisions without the needed information). There were some specific solutions in the IB (time-off, sexual harassment, customer complaint) and LGD (suggested a few integrations of requests to help lower the budgets).

Sensitivity - Showed effective sensitivity in the IB with the sexual harassment and customer complaint memos. Showed general courtesy in the other memos. Was supportive of others' requests and departments in the LGD. However, she showed insensitive behaviors in the LGD and throughout the RP. In the RP she attacked the employee without justification.



Appendix D

Interactive and Inhibitory Behavior Observation List

## Behavioral Observation List

Interactive Behaviors

- 
- Checking - Recognizing errors in another assessor's report or behavioral rationale.  
Recognizing the use of impressions and/or improper behavioral interpretations.
- 
- Filtering - As a team, determining what information is relevant or irrelevant for consideration for a rating during discussion or narrative report clarification.
- 
- Communicating - Providing the needed information to others when questioned about a narrative report.  
Giving clear and complete justification for a rating.

---

Gathering - Asking other assessors for more information to clarify the information provided.  
Asking for specifics about an assessor's behavioral rationale and details concerning the narrative report.

Inhibitory Behaviors

---

Member Dominance - One or two members dominate the discussion at a point when all the members' inputs are needed. There is not equal participation among the three assessors during the discussion of ratings.

---

Conformity - Ratings are changed without hearing the rationale behind the ratings. An assessor(s) changes his/her rating before the behavioral rationales have been communicated to the team. Assessor(s) attempts to convince an assessor with a discrepant rating to change it without the use of rationale.

---

Lack of Information - Information is introduced into the Exchange discussion that was not mentioned in any narrative report and used as behavioral rationale. This excludes exercise-specific information.

Appendix E  
Training Materials Used During Part Training

•

## Checklist for the In-Basket

## Problem Analysis

- \_\_\_ 1. Recognizes the need to investigate whether other complaints of harassment have been made against Bill.
- \_\_\_ 2. Recognizes the need to question Bill about the harassment complaint.
- \_\_\_ 3. Has Frank (assistant) investigate the possibility of employee theft.
- \_\_\_ 4. Recognizes the relationship between Brenda Miller's (customer) complaint and the manager's suggestion that she be promoted to fill the opening for a Buyer.
- \_\_\_ 5. Will question Lori or has Frank (assistant) question Lori about the customer complaint.
- \_\_\_ 6. Has someone check to insure the Summer Sale ad is correct.
- \_\_\_ 7. Recognizes the relationship between the unavailable Val-U-Trac lights and their inclusion in the Summer Sale bulletin.
- \_\_\_ 8. Asks staff for suggestions on how to improve the department in response to the manager's request for this information.
- \_\_\_ 9. Recognizes the need to investigate the problem of the dress-code violations further.
- \_\_\_ 10. Recognizes the conflict between Phyllis's time-off request and the Summer Sale dates.
- \_\_\_ 11. Checks Chandler's performance rating in response to his complaint and request for transfer.
- \_\_\_ 12. Asks Frank (assistant) for input on the Chandler performance appraisal/transfer problem.
- \_\_\_ 13. Recognizes the need to investigate the possibility of other performance appraisal problems.

- \_\_\_ 14. Recognizes the relationship between the Training Workshop memo and the customer complaint against Lori.
- \_\_\_ 15. Recognizes the relationship between Pat (store manager) asking about the possible promotion of Lori and the customer complaint.

#### Problem Solution

- \_\_\_ 1. Warns, will warn, or has Frank (assistant) warn Bill regarding the sexual harassment complaint.
- \_\_\_ 2. Makes arrangements to get lights to replace the Val-U- Trac lights.
- \_\_\_ 3. Schedules a weekly cleaning inspection in response to the manager's complaint about the dirty condition of the department.
- \_\_\_ 4. Arranges to have security or Frank (assistant) watch Mike in response to Lori's report that he is stealing.
- \_\_\_ 5. Has security strengthened in response to Lori's report that Mike has been stealing.
- \_\_\_ 6. Suggests offering Brenda Miller (customer) additional merchandise or a discount in response to her complaint about the delayed delivery of her sofa and rude treatment by Lori.
- \_\_\_ 7. Has the Val-U-Trac lights removed from the sales bulletin.
- \_\_\_ 8. Makes sure or has Frank (assistant) make sure adequate staff is scheduled for the Summer Sale.
- \_\_\_ 9. Delegates the entire Summer Sale matter to Frank (assistant) without specific suggestions.
- \_\_\_ 10. Delegates the entire matter of the dress-code violations to Frank (assistant) without specific suggestions.
- \_\_\_ 11. Ok's the time off request without assuring Phyllis can be spared for the day.

- \_\_\_ 12. Recommends Phyllis arrange to trade time off with another employee in response to her request for a day off to attend the wedding of a friend.
- \_\_\_ 13. Grants Glen Chandler's request.
- \_\_\_ 14. Suggests training program for Lori in response to Brenda Miller's (customer) complaint about the delayed delivery of her sofa and rude treatment by Lori.
- \_\_\_ 15. Protests Pat's (store manager) suggestion of promoting Lori.

#### Sensitivity

- \_\_\_ 1. Acknowledges the sexual harassment problem for Cindy.
- \_\_\_ 2. Apologizes to Cindy for the sexual harassment problem.
- \_\_\_ 3. Thanks Lori for the information regarding the employee theft problem.
- \_\_\_ 4. Apologizes to Brenda Miller (customer) for the delayed delivery of her sofa or her rude treatment by Lori.
- \_\_\_ 5. Has Frank (assistant) apologize to Brenda Miller (customer) for the delayed delivery of her sofa or her rude treatment by Lori.



## Checklist for the Role-Play

## Problem Analysis

- \_\_\_ 1. Assessee inquires whether the employee has had any problems adjusting to the store.
- \_\_\_ 2. Assessee asks the employee whether there is anything that he would like to bring up.
- \_\_\_ 3. Assessee inquires whether the employee checked last year's inventory before ordering the picnic tables.
- \_\_\_ 4. Assessee inquires whether the employee had ever received any complaints from his subordinates.
- \_\_\_ 5. Assessee inquires whether the employee consulted his subordinates regarding their scheduling preferences.
- \_\_\_ 6. Assessee inquires whether there is a reason why the employee always schedules the full-time employees for weekend nights.
- \_\_\_ 7. Assessee inquires about what the employee believes is the reason that his subordinates are not doing their work.
- \_\_\_ 8. Assessee inquires whether the employee's subordinates needed more training.
- \_\_\_ 9. Assessee inquires what the employee has to say about a complaint.
- \_\_\_ 10. Assessee relates the employee's adjustment to the new store to the problems that he is experiencing.
- \_\_\_ 11. Assessee inquires as to the reason the employee works so many hours.
- \_\_\_ 12. Assessee relates the employee's lack of patience in his dealings with his subordinates to his long hours.
- \_\_\_ 13. Assessee asks the employee what he thinks could be done to improve his relations with his subordinates.

- \_\_\_ 14. Assessee investigates how the employee took care of the problem when his subordinates didn't do the work or didn't do it well.
- \_\_\_ 15. Assessee inquires whether the employee has any questions about his responsibilities.

#### Problem Solution

- \_\_\_ 1. Assessee suggests that the employee talk with his subordinates and find out how they feel about working nights and weekends.
- \_\_\_ 2. Assessee suggests that if the staffers did not want to work nights and weekends that he should rotate them.
- \_\_\_ 3. Assessee suggests that the employee explain to the staffers how the inventory system works.
- \_\_\_ 4. Assessee recommends that the employee exert more authority and let the staffers know who is boss.
- \_\_\_ 5. Assessee suggests that the employee sit down with his subordinates and attempt to develop a better working relationship.
- \_\_\_ 6. Assessee suggests that the employee might want to share his knowledge so that his subordinates would have a better understanding of how the company works.
- \_\_\_ 7. Assessee outlines what the employee should have done when describing errors.
- \_\_\_ 8. Assessee recommends that the employee try delegating more responsibility to his subordinates.
- \_\_\_ 9. Assessee suggests to the employee that he could threaten to reduce the hours of the staffers if they did not do their jobs.
- \_\_\_ 10. Assessee suggests that the employee show his subordinates what he wants them to do rather than doing it himself.

- \_\_\_ 11. Assessee suggests that a goal could be obtained without specifying the manner in which it could be accomplished.
- \_\_\_ 12. Assessee suggests that the employee is going to have to develop better communications with his subordinates.
- \_\_\_ 13. Assessee suggests that the employee hand out notecards with responsibilities listed on them to his subordinates as a solution to the delegation problem.
- \_\_\_ 14. Assessee suggests that the employee needs to take time to do a better job on his scheduling and ordering.
- \_\_\_ 15. Assessee outlines action plans for employee development.

#### Sensitivity

- \_\_\_ 1. Assessee puts the employee at ease by asking him how he likes being at the new store.
- \_\_\_ 2. Assessee acknowledges that a lot of employees are apprehensive about the appraisal process.
- \_\_\_ 3. Assessee puts the employee at ease by acknowledging that his past performance appraisals were good.
- \_\_\_ 4. Assessee acknowledges the difficulty of adjusting to a new store.
- \_\_\_ 5. Assessee states that he/she has confidence in the employee.
- \_\_\_ 6. Assessee indicates that he/she is impressed by all of the hours the employee has been working.
- \_\_\_ 7. Assessee compliments the employee on the responsibility he feels for his position.
- \_\_\_ 8. Assessee supports the employee by wanting to see how they can make his performance even better.
- \_\_\_ 9. Assessee expresses the desire to work with the employee to remedy the problems.

- \_\_\_ 10. Assessee conveys the impression that the employee is guilty until proven innocent.
- \_\_\_ 11. Assessee listens intently to what the employee has to say.
- \_\_\_ 12. Assessee asks the employee about his feelings of the issues that had been discussed.
- \_\_\_ 13. Assessee tells the employee that he is ultimately responsible for insuring that all of the work is done properly.
- \_\_\_ 14. Assessee acknowledges that it is difficult to turn over responsibility.
- \_\_\_ 15. Assessee doesn't thank the employee for his time at the conclusion of the interview.

## Checklist for the Leaderless Group Discussion

## Problem Analysis

- \_\_\_ 1. Identifies the percentage increase of the budget over last year's departmental budget.
- \_\_\_ 2. Identifies that some departments were underbudget in the past.
- \_\_\_ 3. Inquires about information that is on the summary sheet.
- \_\_\_ 4. Identifies the priorities of the department's requests.
- \_\_\_ 5. Relates the increased departmental budget and organizational growth.
- \_\_\_ 6. Defines the relationship between the requested marketing strategy to the past (unsuccessful) marketing strategy.
- \_\_\_ 7. Does not relate past departmental problems with present requests.
- \_\_\_ 8. Identifies the primary markets of the organization (government, wholesalers, not individual consumers).
- \_\_\_ 9. Relates Data Processing's request for increased computer capacity and their request for additional personnel.
- \_\_\_ 10. Relates the computing needs of Accounting and Data Processing.
- \_\_\_ 11. Identifies problems that affect the entire organization.
- \_\_\_ 12. Relates the requests of different departments that are stated on the summary sheets.
- \_\_\_ 13. Inquires about other members' views to obtain more information.
- \_\_\_ 14. Identifies the justifications for and against the budgeting of a program or need.
- \_\_\_ 15. Forms inaccurate relationships.

## Problem Solution

- \_\_\_ 1. Proposes various methods to organize the meeting.
- \_\_\_ 2. Proposes that each department first mention their departmental budget totals, then explain the needs for the money, then make compromises on their budgets.
- \_\_\_ 3. Proposes that they decide on departmental budgets by examining the requests of the department, its past performance, and its future needs.
- \_\_\_ 4. Proposes that each department get a 40% increase over last year's budgets.
- \_\_\_ 5. Proposes to allow each member a certain length of time for everyone to speak for their departments.
- \_\_\_ 6. Proposes issues that have already been discussed.
- \_\_\_ 7. Proposes a solution that is inefficient or inappropriate.
- \_\_\_ 8. Proposes to the group that the departments prioritize their budgets.
- \_\_\_ 9. Proposes that the members do not allocate all the available funds, suggests placing some funds in a "kitty" or "pot".
- \_\_\_ 10. Proposes that money should go to requested programs and needs that are most important to the entire organization.
- \_\_\_ 11. Proposes budgets for other departments that are far below the requests from the departmental representatives.
- \_\_\_ 12. Proposes to eliminate some of the department's requests before hearing the opinions of other members.
- \_\_\_ 13. Proposes that another department, besides his/hers, should make cuts in their budget.
- \_\_\_ 14. Proposes an alternative method to satisfy a request of another department in order to reduce that department's budget.

- \_\_\_ 15. Proposes to the other members a method to lower the budget of the assessee's department.

#### Sensitivity

- \_\_\_ 1. Acknowledges that one must work with other members.
- \_\_\_ 2. Acknowledges the contributions the other departments made to the organization.
- \_\_\_ 3. Acknowledges the importance of other departments' needs and requested programs.
- \_\_\_ 4. Downplays the past work of another department.
- \_\_\_ 5. Supports the increased budget of another department.
- \_\_\_ 6. Supports the departmental representatives (they know more about their departments than do the other members).
- \_\_\_ 7. Does not support some of the requests from other departments since these departments have had failures in the past.
- \_\_\_ 8. Supports the need for more R & D researchers.
- \_\_\_ 9. Acknowledges that compromises will have to be made by all departments.
- \_\_\_ 10. States that the assessee's department is not going to make any cuts.
- \_\_\_ 11. Acknowledges the importance of other departments to the organization.
- \_\_\_ 12. Acknowledges the views and opinions of the other members.
- \_\_\_ 13. Downplays the validity of another member's criticisms.
- \_\_\_ 14. Does not acknowledge the mentioned justifications of another member against the department's budget.

### In-Basket Questionnaire

We have just discussed the dimensions that you will be using to rate the performance of the assessees in the In-Basket. The purpose of this questionnaire is to determine your understanding of the behaviors that are associated with each of the three dimensions.

For the present task, you will read each behavioral item and indicate what dimension it best represents. Please write the letter that corresponds to the appropriate dimension in the space preceding the behavior.

A. PROBLEM ANALYSIS      B. PROBLEM SOLUTION      C. SENSITIVITY

- \_\_\_ 1. Recognizes the need to question Cindy about the sexual harassment complaint.
- \_\_\_ 2. Recognizes the need to investigate the customer complaint further.
- \_\_\_ 3. Recommends that the staff clean or replace items in response to the complaint about the dirty condition of the department.
- \_\_\_ 4. Investigates whether or not Phyllis can be spared for the day.
- \_\_\_ 5. Thanks Sue Baker for the information about Glen Chandler's performance appraisal/transfer problem.
- \_\_\_ 6. Recognizes the relationship between Pat (store manager) asking about the possible promotion of Lori and the customer complaint.
- \_\_\_ 7. Acknowledges the problems and treatment experienced by Brenda Miller (customer).
- \_\_\_ 8. Recommends changing Mike's hours so he is not working at closing time in response to Lori's report that he is stealing.
- \_\_\_ 9. Thanks Pat (store manager) for asking for input on Lori's promotion decision.
- \_\_\_ 10. Recognizes the need to discuss the performance appraisal/transfer problem with Glen Chandler.
- \_\_\_ 11. Has Frank (assistant) make sure adequate stock is ordered for the Summer Sale.



## A. PROBLEM ANALYSIS      B. PROBLEM SOLUTION      C. SENSITIVITY

- \_\_\_ 12. Recommends immediate action against Lori in response to Brenda Miller's (customer) complaint about the delayed delivery of her sofa and rude treatment by Lori.
- \_\_\_ 13. Schedules a weekly cleaning inspection in response to the complaint about the dirty condition of the department.
- \_\_\_ 14. Has Frank (assistant) enforce the dresscode.
- \_\_\_ 15. Suggests other employee(s) for possible promotion in response to Lori's recommendation for the Buyer's job.
- \_\_\_ 16. Recognizes the relationship between Valley Furniture's request to increase the cabinet order and the upcoming Manager's Meeting.
- \_\_\_ 17. Thanks Frank (assistant) for taking care of a specific matter.
- \_\_\_ 18. Supports Cindy in her sexual harassment situation.
- \_\_\_ 19. Has Frank (assistant) discuss Pat's (store manager) suggestion of promoting Lori with her.
- \_\_\_ 20. Refuses Phyllis' request for a day off to attend the wedding of a friend.
- \_\_\_ 21. Recommends immediate action against the employees accused of dresscode violations.
- \_\_\_ 22. Thanks John (assistant store manager) for his information about dresscode violations.
- \_\_\_ 23. Suggests employees for the training in response to the Training Workshop memo.
- \_\_\_ 24. Investigates whether some of the faulty Val-U-Trac lights have been already sold.
- \_\_\_ 25. Has Frank (assistant) remove the Val-U-Trac lights from the store shelves.

### Role-Play Questionnaire

We have just discussed the dimensions that you will be using to rate the performance of the assesseees in the Role-Play. The purpose of this questionnaire is to determine your understanding of the behaviors that are associated with each of the three dimensions.

For the present task, you will read each behavioral item and indicate what dimension it best represents. Please write the letter that corresponds to the appropriate dimension in the space preceding the behavior.

A. PROBLEM ANALYSIS      B. PROBLEM SOLUTION      C. SENSITIVITY

- \_\_\_ 1. Assessee inquires whether the employee has any questions about his responsibilities.
- \_\_\_ 2. Assessee states that the employee is ultimately responsible for insuring that all of the work is done properly.
- \_\_\_ 3. Assessee relates the employee's lack of patience in his dealings with his subordinates to his long hours.
- \_\_\_ 4. Assessee listens intently to what the employee has to say.
- \_\_\_ 5. Assessee suggests that if the staffers did not want to work nights and weekends that he should rotate them.
- \_\_\_ 6. Assessee suggests that the employee talk with his subordinates and find out how they feel about working nights and weekends.
- \_\_\_ 7. Assessee acknowledges the difficulty of adjusting to a larger store.
- \_\_\_ 8. Assessee suggests that the employee hand out note cards with responsibilities listed on them to his subordinates as a solution to the delegation problem.
- \_\_\_ 9. Assessee acknowledges that a lot of employees are apprehensive about the appraisal process.

## A. PROBLEM ANALYSIS    B. PROBLEM SOLUTION    C. SENSITIVITY

- \_\_\_ 10. Assessee inquires whether there is a reason why the employee always schedules the full-time staffers for weekend nights.
- \_\_\_ 11. Assessee inquires whether the employee had ever received any complaints from his subordinates.
- \_\_\_ 12. Assessee investigates how the employee took care of the problem when his subordinates didn't do the work or didn't do it well.
- \_\_\_ 13. Assessee supports the employee by wanting to see how they can make his performance even better.
- \_\_\_ 14. Assessee recommends that the employee try delegating more responsibility to his subordinates.
- \_\_\_ 15. Assessee suggests that the employee might want to share his knowledge so that his subordinates would have a better understanding of how the company works.
- \_\_\_ 16. Assessee expresses the desire to work with the employee to remedy the problems.
- \_\_\_ 17. Assessee doesn't thank the employee for his time at the conclusion of the interview.
- \_\_\_ 18. Assessee inquires as to the reason the employee works so many hours.
- \_\_\_ 19. Assessee inquires whether the employee has had any problems adjusting to the store.
- \_\_\_ 20. Assessee suggests that the employee could threaten to reduce the hours of the staffers if they did not do their jobs.
- \_\_\_ 21. Assessee relates the employee's adjustment to the new store to the problems that he is experiencing.
- \_\_\_ 22. Assessee inquires whether the employee checked last year's inventory before ordering the picnic tables.
- \_\_\_ 23. Assessee suggests that the employee explain to the staffers how the inventory system works.

## A. PROBLEM ANALYSIS    B. PROBLEM SOLUTION    C. SENSITIVITY

- \_\_\_ 24. Identifies that at the old store where the employee worked was smaller and he didn't have to delegate as much.
- \_\_\_ 25. Asks the employee for input about an issue that was brought up.
- \_\_\_ 26. Acknowledges that it is tough to have patience.
- \_\_\_ 27. Inquires whether some staffers don't belong.
- \_\_\_ 28. Suggests that the employee groom his staffers, then the employee can move up in the company and have someone to take his place.
- \_\_\_ 29. Suggests that the employee needs more patience in dealing with his staffers.
- \_\_\_ 30. Identifies that the employee has done a good job in the past.
- \_\_\_ 31. Agrees with the employee that the staffers should come to him with their complaints.
- \_\_\_ 32. Believes that the employee will do well in the future.
- \_\_\_ 33. States that the employee can come to him or her if the employee needs any help or advice.
- \_\_\_ 34. Proposes that the employee show his staffers how to do a task and be with them until they've done it a few times and are comfortable with it.
- \_\_\_ 35. Suggests that the employee needs to teach the staffers how to do the job.

### Leaderless Group Discussion Questionnaire

We have just discussed the dimensions that you will be using to rate the performance of the assessees in the Leaderless Group Discussion. The purpose of this questionnaire is to determine your understanding of the behaviors that are associated with each of the three dimensions.

For the present task, you will read each behavioral item and indicate what dimension it best represents. Please write the letter that corresponds to the appropriate dimension in the space preceding the behavior.

#### A. PROBLEM ANALYSIS      B. PROBLEM SOLUTION      C. SENSITIVITY

- \_\_\_ 1. Compliments other members for bringing up good points.
- \_\_\_ 2. Acknowledges that the current Accounting personnel are good workers, but they have been overworked.
- \_\_\_ 3. Identifies possible future problems if R & D's requests are not met.
- \_\_\_ 4. Wants everyone to support the final budgets.
- \_\_\_ 5. Proposes budgets for other departments.
- \_\_\_ 6. Downplays another member's suggested budget for the department.
- \_\_\_ 7. Suggests to another member what requests should be cut from the department's budget.
- \_\_\_ 8. Relates R & D's and Marketing's office space needs.
- \_\_\_ 9. Proposes that each department give their requested budget, calculate an overall total, and then make budget cuts.
- \_\_\_ 10. Kept the department's requested budget reasonable to let other departments satisfy their needs.
- \_\_\_ 11. Inquires about the need to remodel R & D.
- \_\_\_ 12. Takes the importance of the departments to the organization into account when proposing budgets.

## A. PROBLEM ANALYSIS      B. PROBLEM SOLUTION      C. SENSITIVITY

- \_\_\_ 13. Compares the requests of the department to the requests of other departments.
- \_\_\_ 14. Does not recognize some of the problems/requests in the department.
- \_\_\_ 15. Inquires about the contributions another department makes to the organization.
- \_\_\_ 16. Shows concern towards other departments' well-being.
- \_\_\_ 17. Suggests that the R & D and Marketing requests for office space are the same and proposes that it is a single request.
- \_\_\_ 18. Proposes that the personnel problems of other departments be handled by the Human Resources department.
- \_\_\_ 19. Interrupts other members while they are talking.
- \_\_\_ 20. Identifies the personnel requests of other departments as a responsibility of the Human Resources department.
- \_\_\_ 21. Identifies the need to take into account the future goals of the organization when allocating funds.
- \_\_\_ 22. Proposes that the extra money from the underbudget departments be placed into the present budgets.
- \_\_\_ 23. Identifies the past problems of the department, but does not relate them to present requests.
- \_\_\_ 24. Recognizes and accounts for being 5% overbudget by adding it into the present budget to form a revised base budget.
- \_\_\_ 25. Asks if everyone is agreeable to a proposal.
- \_\_\_ 26. Identifies the need that R & D has for computers and Data Processing.
- \_\_\_ 27. Proposes that each department receive an additional \$300,000 as a compromise if the group cannot agree on a budget.

## A. PROBLEM ANALYSIS      B. PROBLEM SOLUTION      C. SENSITIVITY

- \_\_\_ 28. Recognizes the dollar increase from last year's budget to this year's budget (\$1.8 million).
- \_\_\_ 29. Identifies information that has already been brought up.
- \_\_\_ 30. Acknowledges that the assessee has to work with the other group members.
- \_\_\_ 31. Eliminates a request from the department's budget without hearing the opinions of the other members.

## Summary Frame-of-References

Problem Analysis

|                       |   |  |
|-----------------------|---|--|
| Most Effective (ME)   | - | Relationships of information.<br>Integration of separate pieces of information.  |
| Effective (E)         | - | Specific questions about specific issues.<br>Taking the needed information into account.   |
| Average (A)           | - | General questions about specific issues.<br>Identifying some piece of information about an issue.                                    |
| Ineffective (I)       | - | General questions that cut across different issues.<br>Identifying information that has been provided.                               |
| Most Ineffective (MI) | - | Not identifying information or problems.<br>Inquiring about information that has been provided.<br>Forming inaccurate relationships. |

---

CRITERIA: Specificity of questioning - the more specific the questions, the more effective the behavior. Information incorporated into the analysis of a problem - the more information incorporated, the more effective the behavior.



Problem Solution

|                       |   |  |
|-----------------------|---|--|
| Most Effective (ME)   | - | Specific and detailed solutions to specific problems.<br>Multiple solutions to a single problem.                     |
| Effective (E)         | - | Specific solutions to specific problems.<br>Making decisions after checking the needed information.                  |
| Average (A)           | - | General solutions and general actions to a problem.<br>Solutions with general actions for carrying out the solution. |
| Ineffective (I)       | - | Obvious solutions.<br>Solutions with no action plans for carrying them out.  |
| Most Ineffective (MI) | - | Making decisions without checking the needed information.<br>Not forming solutions.<br>Inaccurate solutions.         |

---

CRITERIA: Specificity of solution - the more specific the solution, the more effective the behavior.  
Complexity of solution - the more detailed the solution (number of distinct steps), the more effective the behavior.  
Amount of information used to form a solution - the more information used, the more effective the behavior.

Sensitivity

|                       |   |   |
|-----------------------|---|---|
| Most Effective (ME)   | - | Sensitive actions.<br>Sensitivity towards the person being addressed.   |
| Effective (E)         | - | Sensitivity towards a product or aspect of the person being addressed.<br>Showing concern for the needs of others.            |
| Average (A)           | - | General consideration and courtesy behaviors.<br>Supporting others who are not present.<br>Putting others at ease.            |
| Ineffective (I)       | - | Criticisms of a product or aspect of a person with justification.<br>Being unaware of the concerns and/or opinions of others. |
| Most Ineffective (MI) | - | Insensitive behavior without justification.<br>Criticisms directed at a person.   |

---

**CRITERIA:** Sensitive behaviors are more effective than behaviors which show a lack of sensitivity and these are more effective than insensitive behaviors.  
Sensitive actions are most effective; then comes sensitive words, then general consideration, then a lack of sensitivity, and finally insensitivity is least effective.

### Evaluating In-Basket Behaviors

Now that the Frame-of-References for each of the three dimensions have been explained to you, it is time to determine how well you understand them. This task asks you to indicate the effectiveness of each of the behaviors for each dimension. On this sheet you will see that there are five behaviors listed under each dimension. Indicate the effectiveness of each behavior using the following scale:

|                   |           |         |             |                     |
|-------------------|-----------|---------|-------------|---------------------|
| Most<br>Effective | Effective | Average | Ineffective | Most<br>Ineffective |
| ME                | E         | A       | I           | MI                  |
| -----             | -----     | -----   | -----       | -----               |

Please choose the symbol that best represents each behavior. After you complete this task, feedback and rationale on your responses will be provided.

#### Problem Analysis

- \_\_\_ 1. Recognizes the relationship between the unavailable Val-U-Trac lights and their inclusion in the Summer Sale bulletin.
- \_\_\_ 2. Investigates whether other complaints of harassment have been made against Bill.
- \_\_\_ 3. Doesn't recognize the relationship between Lori's promotion and the customer complaint memos.
- \_\_\_ 4. Asks Frank (assistant) for information regarding the Manager's Meeting memo.
- \_\_\_ 5. Investigates or has Frank (assistant) investigate the possibility of employee theft.
- \_\_\_ 6. Recognizes the relationship between Phyllis' time-off request and the Summer Sale dates.
- \_\_\_ 7. Will call Steve (assistant store manager) to find out what should be done concerning employee theft.
- \_\_\_ 8. Investigates whether some faulty Val-U-Trac lights have already been sold.
- \_\_\_ 9. Recognizes the need to question Bill regarding the sexual harassment complaint.

| Most<br>Effective<br>ME | Effective<br>E | Average<br>A | Ineffective<br>I | Most<br>Ineffective<br>MI |
|-------------------------|----------------|--------------|------------------|---------------------------|
| -----                   | -----          | -----        | -----            | -----                     |

#### Problem Solution

- \_\_\_ 1. Delays action on the Sexual Harassment matter until return.
- \_\_\_ 2. Makes sure or has Frank (assistant) make sure adequate staff is scheduled for the Summer Sale.
- \_\_\_ 3. Arranges to have security or Frank (assistant) watch Mike in response to Lori's report that Mike is stealing.
- \_\_\_ 4. Arranges to meet with Glen Chandler and discuss the performance appraisal/transfer problem when he/she returns.
- \_\_\_ 5. Suggests training program for Lori in response to Brenda Miller's (customer) complaint about the delayed delivery of her sofa and rude treatment by Lori.
- \_\_\_ 6. Has Frank (assistant) remove the Val-U-Trac lights from the store shelves.
- \_\_\_ 7. Schedules a staff meeting (no date given) in response to the dirty condition of the department.
- \_\_\_ 8. Delegates the time-off request matter to Frank (assistant) without instructions.
- \_\_\_ 9. Has Frank (assistant) call John Peters (Valley Furn. Rep.) to tell him that the order can be increased by 10%.
- \_\_\_ 10. Tells Frank (assistant) to meet with him on Monday (June 8th) concerning the departmental manager's meeting.

#### Sensitivity

- \_\_\_ 1. Questions the validity of Cindy's sexual harassment accusation.
- \_\_\_ 2. Takes action (discounts, free merchandise) to appease Brenda Miller (customer).

- |       | Most<br>Effective<br>ME  | Effective<br>E | Average<br>A | Ineffective<br>I | Most<br>Ineffective<br>MI |
|-------|--|----------------|--------------|------------------|---------------------------|
| _____ | 3. Apologizes to Cindy for the sexual harassment problem.  |                |              |                  |                           |
| _____ | 4. Doesn't give Phyllis the date off because it conflicts with the Summer Sale.                                      |                |              |                  |                           |
| _____ | 5. Thanks Sue Baker (personnel director) for the performance evaluations or the information on the Chandler problem. |                |              |                  |                           |
| _____ | 6. Has Frank (assistant) write a letter of apology to Brenda Miller (customer).                                      |                |              |                  |                           |

### Evaluating Role-Play Behaviors

Now that the Frame-of-References for each of the three dimensions have been explained to you, it is time to determine how well you understand them. This task asks you to indicate the effectiveness of each of the behaviors for each dimension. On this sheet you will see that there are five behaviors listed under each dimension. Indicate the effectiveness of each behavior using the following scale:

| Most<br>Effective | Effective | Average | Ineffective | Most<br>Ineffective |
|-------------------|-----------|---------|-------------|---------------------|
| ME                | E         | A       | I           | MI                  |
| -----             | -----     | -----   | -----       | -----               |

Please choose the symbol that best represents each behavior. After you complete this task, feedback and rationale on your responses will be provided.

#### Problem Analysis

- \_\_\_ 1. Assessee relates the employee's lack of patience in his dealings with his subordinates to his long hours.
- \_\_\_ 2. Assessee inquires whether the employee checked last year's inventory before ordering the picnic tables.
- \_\_\_ 3. Assessee investigates how the employee took care of the problem when his subordinates didn't do the work or didn't do it well.
- \_\_\_ 4. Assessee inquires about what the employee believes is the reason that his subordinates are not doing their work.
- \_\_\_ 5. Assessee asks the employee whether there is anything he would like to bring up.
- \_\_\_ 6. Assessee inquires whether the employee has any questions about his responsibilities.
- \_\_\_ 7. Assessee inquires whether there is a reason why the employee always schedules the full-time staffers for weekend nights.
- \_\_\_ 8. Assessee inquires whether the employee had ever received any complaints from his subordinates.

| Most<br>Effective<br>ME | Effective<br>E | Average<br>A | Ineffective<br>I | Most<br>Ineffective<br>MI |
|-------------------------|----------------|--------------|------------------|---------------------------|
| -----                   | -----          | -----        | -----            | -----                     |

- \_\_\_ 9. Identifies that at the old store where the employee worked was smaller and he didn't have to delegate as much.
- \_\_\_ 10. Asks the employee for input about an issue that was brought up.
- \_\_\_ 11. Inquires whether some staffers don't belong.
- \_\_\_ 12. Identifies that the employee has done a good job in the past.

#### Problem Solution

- \_\_\_ 1. Assessee outlines what the employee should have done when describing errors.
- \_\_\_ 2. Assessee suggests that the employee explain to the staffers how the inventory system works.
- \_\_\_ 3. Assessee suggests that a goal could be accomplished without specifying the manner in which it could be accomplished.
- \_\_\_ 4. Assessee suggests that the employee might want to share his knowledge so that his subordinates would have a better understanding of how the company works.
- \_\_\_ 5. Assessee suggests that the employee is going to have to develop better communications with his subordinates.
- \_\_\_ 6. Assessee suggests that if the staffers did not want to work nights and weekends that he should rotate them.
- \_\_\_ 7. Assessee suggests that the employee talk with his subordinates and find out how they feel about working nights and weekends.
- \_\_\_ 8. Assessee suggests that the employee could threaten to reduce the hours of the staffers if they did not do their jobs.

| Most<br>Effective<br>ME | Effective<br>E | Average<br>A | Ineffective<br>I | Most<br>Ineffective<br>MI |
|-------------------------|----------------|--------------|------------------|---------------------------|
| ----- ----- ----- ----- |                |              |                  |                           |

- \_\_\_ 9. Suggests that the employee groom his staffers, then the employee can move up in the company and have someone to take his place.
- \_\_\_ 10. Suggests that the employee needs more patience in dealing with his staffers.
- \_\_\_ 11. Proposes that the employee show his staffers how to do a task and be with them until they've done it a few times and are comfortable with it.
- \_\_\_ 12. Suggests that the employee needs to teach the staffers how to do the job.

#### Sensitivity

- \_\_\_ 1. Assessee expresses the desire to work with the employee to remedy the problems.
- \_\_\_ 2. Assessee acknowledges that the employee's past performance appraisals were good.
- \_\_\_ 3. Assessee conveys the impression that the employee is guilty until proven innocent.
- \_\_\_ 4. Assessee indicates that he/she is impressed by all the hours the employee has been working.
- \_\_\_ 5. Assessee doesn't accept one of the employee's excuses with justification.
- \_\_\_ 6. Assessee acknowledges that a lot of employees are apprehensive about the appraisal process.
- \_\_\_ 7. Assessee supports the employee by wanting to see how they can make his performance even better.
- \_\_\_ 8. Acknowledges that it is tough to have patience.
- \_\_\_ 9. Agrees with the employee that the staffers should come to him with their complaints.
- \_\_\_ 10. Believes that the employee will do well in the future.



| Most<br>Effective<br>ME | Effective<br>E | Average<br>A | Ineffective<br>I | Most<br>Ineffective<br>MI |
|-------------------------|----------------|--------------|------------------|---------------------------|
| -----                   | -----          | -----        | -----            | -----                     |

\_\_\_ 11. States that the employee can come to him or her if the employee needs any help or advice.

### Evaluating Leaderless Group Discussion Behaviors

Now that the Frame-of-References for each of the three dimensions have been explained to you, it is time to determine how well you understand them. This task asks you to indicate the effectiveness of each of the behaviors for each dimension. On this sheet you will see that there are five behaviors listed under each dimension. Indicate the effectiveness of each behavior using the following scale:

| Most<br>Effective | Effective | Average | Ineffective | Most<br>Ineffective |
|-------------------|-----------|---------|-------------|---------------------|
| ME                | E         | A       | I           | MI                  |
| -----             | -----     | -----   | -----       | -----               |

Please choose the symbol that best represents each behavior. After you complete this task, feedback and rationale on your responses will be provided.

#### Problem Analysis

- \_\_\_ 1. Relates Data Processing's request for increased computer capacity and their request for additional personnel.
- \_\_\_ 2. Identifies problems that affect the entire organization.
- \_\_\_ 3. Inquires about information that is on the summary sheet.
- \_\_\_ 4. Identifies that some departments were underbudget in the past.
- \_\_\_ 5. Identifies the priorities of the department's requests.
- \_\_\_ 6. Identifies possible future problems if R & D's requests are not met.
- \_\_\_ 7. Inquires about the need to remodel R & D.
- \_\_\_ 8. Does not recognize some of the problems/requests in the department.
- \_\_\_ 9. Recognizes and accounts for being 5% overbudget by adding it into the present budget to form a revised base budget.

| Most Effective | Effective | Average | Ineffective | Most Ineffective |
|----------------|-----------|---------|-------------|------------------|
| ME             | E         | A       | I           | MI               |
| -----          | -----     | -----   | -----       | -----            |

- \_\_\_ 10. Identifies the need that R & D has for computers and Data Processing.
- \_\_\_ 11. Recognizes the dollar increase from last year's budget to this year's budget (\$1.8 million).
- \_\_\_ 12. Identifies information that has already been brought up.

#### Problem Solution

- \_\_\_ 1. Proposes that the departments prioritize their budgets.
- \_\_\_ 2. Proposes that they decide on departmental budgets by examining the requests of each department, its past performance, and its future needs.
- \_\_\_ 3. Proposes issues that have already been discussed.
- \_\_\_ 4. Proposes that other members justify their requested budgets.
- \_\_\_ 5. Proposes to allow each member a certain length of time to speak for their departments.
- \_\_\_ 6. Suggests to another member what requests should be cut from the department's budget without hearing from the other members.
- \_\_\_ 7. Proposes that the personnel problems of other departments be handled by the Human Resources department.
- \_\_\_ 8. Proposes that each department receive an additional \$300,000 as a compromise if the group cannot agree on a budget.
- \_\_\_ 9. Eliminates a request from the department's budget without hearing the opinions of the other members.

#### Sensitivity

- \_\_\_ 1. Downplays the past work of another department.

- |         | Most<br>Effective<br>ME   | Effective<br>E | Average<br>A | Ineffective<br>I | Most<br>Ineffective<br>MI |
|---------|---|----------------|--------------|------------------|---------------------------|
|         | -----   | -----          | -----        | -----            | -----                     |
| ___ 2.  | Acknowledges the importance of other department's needs and requested programs.                 |                |              |                  |                           |
| ___ 3.  | Acknowledges that compromises must be made by all departments.                                  |                |              |                  |                           |
| ___ 4.  | Acknowledges the views and opinions of the other members.                                       |                |              |                  |                           |
| ___ 5.  | States that the department is not going to make any budget cuts.                                |                |              |                  |                           |
| ___ 6.  | Compliments other members for bringing up good points.  |                |              |                  |                           |
| ___ 7.  | Kept the department's requested budget reasonable to let other departments satisfy their needs. |                |              |                  |                           |
| ___ 8.  | Interrupts other members while they are talking.  |                |              |                  |                           |
| ___ 9.  | Asks if everyone is agreeable to a proposal.  |                |              |                  |                           |
| ___ 10. | Acknowledges that the assessee has to work with the other group members.                        |                |              |                  |                           |

Appendix F  
Part Training Script for the Role-Play

## Part Training Script for Role Play

### Introduction

For this first session, the emphasis is on observing, recording, and writing reports based on the behaviors displayed in your exercise. Once completed, these reports will be presented to two other assessors in a second session. During the second session, ratings for each assessee will be generated, based on reports of exercise performance written by you and two other assessors. Thus, all reports must contain the information needed to form accurate ratings. It is important for you to produce a report that contains accurate information on behaviors displayed in your exercise.

Before beginning formal training, a brief discussion of behavior is needed. What you are going to be observing, recording, and reporting are behaviors. There is an important distinction between behaviors and impressions. Behaviors are actions, mainly what the assessee says, does, or writes down. Impressions reflect irrelevant factors: how the assessee dresses or looks; the assessee's speech mannerisms; or feelings that you have about the assessee. Impressions such as, "I think this guy is a jerk," without any behaviors to back it up, should not be included in your reports. Instead you should just report the behaviors that you have observed, whether they are good or bad.

### The Exercise

In order to better understand your task, I will now describe the exercise. The exercise that you will observe is called a Staffer Role-Play. The assessee is role playing the manager of a large department store in charge of all store operations. The assessee is conducting a performance appraisal interview with a subordinate who is the new manager of the furniture department.

The new department manager is having performance problems. This is the assessee's first performance appraisal interview with the new subordinate. The basic goal for the assessee is to identify performance problems and develop some action plans to resolve them.

You will be observing videotapes of assessees conducting performance appraisal interviews with the new employee. In the videotapes you will view different assessees who play the role of the store manager, however, the same person will always play the role of the subordinate.

Before beginning the role-play, the assessees were provided with information about the role and given time to prepare for the exercise. After reviewing the role-plays, they conducted the appraisal interview in the method they felt most appropriate. The next handout contains the information given to the assessees and describes the

exercise. What I would like you to do now is to read through the role-play. If you are uncertain about the role-play instructions, feel free to ask questions for further clarification.

HAND OUT ROLE-PLAYS

PAUSE

### Training

Before viewing the videotapes, I will first present the distinct parts of this task. By presenting the task in parts, allowing you to practice each part, and providing feedback on each part, your understanding of the aspects of observation, recording, and reporting behaviors will improve. Within this training session each part will be addressed as follows: Present the information, Practice, Feedback, and Questions. We will now begin examining the parts.

### Understanding the Dimensions

To be considered an effective performer, a manager must show several characteristics. The manager must be considerate of others. An effective manager must also be able to break a problem into parts and recognize what information is needed to solve a problem. The manager must also be able to formulate effective solutions. These characteristics of effective performance are referred to as dimensions. Basically, dimensions represent categories of



similar behaviors that are used to classify behaviors. You will use three dimensions: Problem Analysis, Problem Solution, and Sensitivity.

#### HAND OUT DIMENSION DEFINITIONS

Please look at the definition for Problem Analysis that is on the handout. The definition reads, "breaking up a problem into parts such that the parts can be examined for their importance, interrelationships, or need for additional information." In addition, summary behaviors are also provided. Please look at these behaviors. For example, Problem Analysis occurs when "an individual identifies, integrates, or inquires about components of the problem with the intent of determining the nature of the problem." As you can see, the dimension has three major components: 1) identifying needed information, 2) identifying relationships, and 3) questioning for additional information. Some key words relevant to Problem Analysis include: "recognizing", "asking", "relating", "inquiring", "investigating", and "checking".

The second dimension is Problem Solution. Please look at its definition on the handout. The definition states, "the assessee suggests, recommends, or outlines actions, methods, or strategies that help in the resolution of problems." Now look at the summary behaviors on the handout. Problem Solution is involved when "an individual

suggests one or more specific ways to resolve problems or organize discussion. The individual may recommend or decide on a course of action that remedies several problems or issues." Behaviors matched to Problem Solution mostly consist of proposing a plan of action for addressing a particular problem. Key words for Problem Solution include: "proposes", "suggests", "recommends", and "delegates".

The third dimension is Sensitivity. Please look at its definition on the handout. The definition states, "showing concern for the feelings, needs, and points of view of others. Letting people know you are aware of their individual situations." Now please read the summary behaviors. Sensitivity is involved when "an individual acknowledges others' concerns, problems, opinions, and requests and supports them." Behaviors matched to Sensitivity consist of being aware of the concerns and problems of others, supporting them, and general consideration. Key words for Sensitivity include: "apologizes", "supports", "acknowledges", "thanks", and "respects".

Now I will take a few minutes to answer any questions that you may have regarding the dimension definitions.

PAUSE

Matching Behaviors with Dimensions

In order to better understand the dimensions, we will examine the behaviors that represent each dimension. The next handout consists of three behavioral checklists that contain several behaviors that could be exhibited in the role-plays. This list is not an exhaustive one, but it does provide examples of behaviors that are relevant to the dimensions in the role-plays.

#### HAND OUT CHECKLISTS

What I would like to do now is to examine the behaviors that are listed on the checklists. Again, let me remind you that these are not all behaviors relevant to the three dimensions that occur in the role play.

First, let's look at Problem Analysis. The first statement on the checklist reads, "assessee inquires whether the employee has had any problems adjusting to the store." This behavior is considered Problem Analysis because it is attempting to uncover additional information. If the assessee, at any point during the role-play, asks a question concerning whether the employee was having problems adjusting to the store, you should make a note of this behavior. It is not necessary that the question be phrased in the exact same way as it is here. What is important is what is being said, not how it is said.

The second item reads, "assessee asks the employee whether there is anything that he would like to bring up."

Again, the assessee is attempting to gather additional information in order to generate an effective solution.

The third item states, "assessee inquires whether the employee checked last year's inventory before ordering the picnic tables." This behavior is another that attempts to gather additional information. However, it is a specific request for information in response to a specific problem (the ordering of picnic tables).

The fourth item states, "assessee inquires whether the employee had ever received any complaints from his subordinates."

The fifth item reads, "assessee inquires whether the employee consulted his subordinates regarding their scheduling preferences." This item also attempts to gather additional information in response to the specific problem of scheduling staffers.

The sixth item reads, "assessee inquires whether there is a reason why the employee always schedules the full-time employees for weekend nights."

The seventh item reads, "assessee inquires about what the employee believes is the reason that his subordinates are not doing their work."

The eighth item reads, "assessee inquires whether the employee's subordinates needed more training."

The ninth item states, "assessee inquires what the

employee has to say about a complaint."

Up to now, all the Problem Analysis items have addressed one aspect of Problem Analysis; obtaining additional information. Item 10 deals with another aspect of Problem Analysis. It reads, "assessee relates the employee's adjustment to the new store to the problems that he is experiencing." This item relates two separate pieces of information in order to better understand a particular problem or situation (i.e., subordinate being new and problems he is experiencing).

Item 11 is another one that addresses obtaining additional information. It states, "assessee inquires as to the reason the employee works so many hours."

Item 12 reads, "assessee relates the employee's lack of patience in his dealings with his subordinates to his long hours." Two separate incidents have been related in order to better analyze one of the problems (i.e., lack of patience and long hours). Anytime separate pieces of information are related, the behavior can be considered Problem Analysis.

Item 13 reads, "assessee asks the employee what he thinks could be done to improve his relations with his subordinates."

Item 14 states, "assessee investigates how the employee took care of the problem when his subordinates

didn't do the work or didn't do it well." This item may be a bit trickier than the others, since it may or may not involve a series of questions or just one. This behavior may occur through a line of questioning that addresses a particular problem or a single question.

Item 15 states, "assessee inquires whether the employee has any questions about his responsibilities."

What we just read was a representative list of behaviors classified as Problem Analysis. The next handout is a list of Problem Analysis behaviors that can be expected to occur in the role plays. At this time, please look through these behaviors and try to determine why these behaviors are considered Problem Analysis. Feel free to ask any questions if you are uncertain about any of the behaviors.

PAUSE

On the next handout is a list of behaviors classified as Problem Solution that can be expected to occur in the role plays. Again, this list is not exhaustive, it represents a sampling of the Problem Solution behaviors.

The first item states, "assessee suggests that the employee talk with his subordinates and find out how they feel about working nights and weekends." This item describes a specific action to be taken in response to a problem. Thus, it is considered Problem Solution.

The second item states, "assessee suggests that if the staffers did not want to work nights and weekends that he should rotate them." Again, this is another action plan in response to a specific problem.

The third item reads, "assessee suggests that the employee explain to the staffers how the inventory system works."

The fourth item reads, "assessee recommends that the employee exert more authority and let the staffers know who is boss."

The fifth item states, "assessee suggests that the employee sit down with his subordinates and attempt to develop a better working relationship."

The sixth item states, "assessee suggests that the employee might want to share his knowledge so that his subordinates would have a better understanding of how the company works."

Item 7 is slightly different than the first six. It states, "assessee outlines what the employee should have done when describing errors." Outlining a plan of action means that the assessee should describe a detailed sequence of steps that should be taken in solving a problem.

The eighth item is another that suggests a plan of action for a specific problem. It states, "assessee recommends that the employee try delegating more

responsibility to his subordinates."

Item 9 reads, "assessee suggests to the employee that he could threaten to reduce the hours of the staffers if they did not do their jobs."

Item 10 reads, "assessee suggests that the employee show his subordinates what he wants them to do rather than doing it himself."

Item 11 reads, "assessee suggests that a goal could be obtained without specifying the manner in which it could be accomplished." What is meant by a goal is that there is some standard of performance that the assessee would like the subordinate to obtain. In addition, this item has two parts. The first part is suggesting a goal. The second part is the lack of specification about how the goal is to be reached. In order to note that this particular behavior occurred, both parts must be exhibited. However, if just a goal was stated, it would still be considered Problem Solution.

Item 12 states, "assessee suggests that the employee is going to have to develop better communications with his subordinates."

Item 13 states, "assessee suggests that the employee hand out notecards with responsibilities listed on them to his subordinates as a solution to the delegation problem."

Item 14 reads, "assessee suggests that the employee



needs to take time to do a better job on his scheduling and ordering." Again, this is another specific solution to one of the problems being addressed in the interview.

The last Problem Solution item states, "assessee outlines action plans for employee development." As in item 7, what is meant by outlining action plans is that a specific sequence of steps is described. For this item, the problem being referred to involves professional development of the subordinate or his staffers.

The next handout is a list of additional Problem Solution behaviors that can be expected to occur in the role plays. At this time, please look through these behaviors and determine why these behaviors are considered Problem Solution. Feel free to ask any questions if you are uncertain about any of the behaviors.

PAUSE

On the next handout is a list of behaviors classified as Sensitivity that can be expected to occur in the role plays. Again, this list is not exhaustive, it represents a sampling of the Sensitivity behaviors.

The first Sensitivity item states, "assessee puts the employee at ease by asking him how he likes being at the new store." This item is considered Sensitivity because the assessee is showing concern by attempting to reduce some of the subordinates's apprehension.

The second item states that the "assessee acknowledges that a lot of employees are apprehensive about the appraisal process." This item shows that the assessee is aware that the employee may feel a little uneasy about the interview. Thus, this item represents Sensitivity.

The third item reads, "assessee puts the employee at ease by acknowledging that his past performance appraisals were good."

Item 4 states, "assessee acknowledges the difficulty of adjusting to a new store." Again, this item shows that the assessee is aware of the employee's situation.

Item 5 reads, "assessee states that he/she has confidence in the employee." This is an item that shows support for the employee which makes this behavior Sensitivity.

Item 6 reads, "assessee indicates that he/she is impressed by all of the hours the employee has been working."

Item 7 reads, "assessee compliments the employee on the responsibility he feels for his position." In addition to supporting or showing concern, complimenting the employee is also seen as Sensitivity.

Item 8 states, "assessee supports the employee by wanting to see how they can make his performance even better." This item suggests that the assessee is willing

to get involved in working with the subordinate to alleviate his concerns and improve his situation.

Similar to item 8, item 9 states, "assessee expresses the desire to work with the employee to remedy the problems."

Item 10 reads, "assessee conveys the impression that the employee is guilty until proven innocent." This item reflects poor Sensitivity. When a behavior expresses little or no concern or support for others, the behavior is still considered Sensitivity.

Item 11 reads, "assessee listens intently to what the employee has to say." This item is not one that you will hear the assessee state. However, you can tell if the assessee listens intently if information is used that the subordinate mentions, restates what the subordinate has said for clarification, or doesn't interrupt him while he is talking.

Item 12 states, "assessee asks the employee about his feelings of the issues that had been discussed."

Item 13 states, "assessee tells the employee that he is ultimately responsible for insuring that all of the work is done properly." Similar to item 10, this item reflects poor Sensitivity.

Item 14 reads, "assessee acknowledges that it is difficult to turn over responsibility."

The final Sensitivity item reads, "assessee doesn't thank the employee for his time at the conclusion of the interview."

The next handout is a list of Sensitivity behaviors that can be expected to occur in the role plays. At this time please look through these behaviors and determine why these behaviors are considered Sensitivity. Feel free to ask any questions if you are uncertain about any of the behaviors.

PAUSE

Now, I would like to give you practice in matching behaviors to the dimensions. On the next handout is a list of behaviors expected to occur in the role plays. What I would like you to do is match each behavior to its appropriate dimension. Please match each behavior to only one dimension. I will give you a few minutes to complete the task, then I will provide you with feedback and rationale on the correct responses.

PAUSE

Item 1 is considered Problem Analysis, because the assessee is questioning the employee in order to obtain additional information.

Item 2 is Sensitivity. This item is considered Sensitivity because the assessee is not showing concern for the employee's situation. Remember insensitivity is

considered Sensitivity.

Item 3 is Problem Analysis. Here, the assessee is relating separate pieces of information (i.e., lack of patience and long hours) in order to better understand a problem.

Item 4 is Sensitivity. Listening intently to the employee, although not directly observable, shows consideration.

Item 5 is considered a Problem Solution behavior. Here, the assessee is suggesting a plan of action (e.g., rotate employees on the schedule) in response to a problem.

Item 6 is also Problem Solution. Again, the assessee is suggesting an action plan.

Item 7 was matched to Sensitivity. The assessee is showing awareness of the employee's situation and concerns.

Item 8 is Problem Solution. Here, the assessee is providing a specific solution to the delegation problem.

Item 9 is considered Sensitivity. Here, the assessee is attempting to lessen the employee's apprehension about the interview.

Item 10 is Problem Analysis. The assessee is trying to obtain information about how the employee schedules his staffers.

Item 11 is also Problem Analysis. Again, the assessee is trying to obtain additional information through

questioning.

Item 12 is Problem Analysis. In response to a particular problem, the assessee is investigating how the employee handles a specific situation.

Item 13 is considered Sensitivity. Here, the assessee is supporting the employee and wants the employee to improve.

Item 14 is considered Problem Solution. Here, the assessee is suggesting a solution to the employee.

Item 15 is also Problem Solution, because the assessee is recommending a solution.

Item 16 is matched to Sensitivity. The assessee is showing support for the employee and will help him improve his current situation and address his concerns.

Item 17 is also a Sensitivity behavior. Specifically, the assessee is showing a lack of concern.

Item 18 is Problem Analysis. Here, the assessee is questioning the employee to obtain information about why the employee works so many hours.

Item 19 is also Problem Analysis. Again, the assessee is questioning the employee for more information.

Item 20 is considered Problem Solution. The assessee is proposing an action plan in order to solve a particular problem.

Item 21 is considered Problem Analysis. Here, the

assessee is relating separate pieces of information in order to have a better understanding of the problem.

Item 22 is also a Problem Analysis behavior. The assessee is probing for more information.

Item 23 is considered Problem Solution. The assessee is suggesting to the employee that he carry out a specific plan of action.

Item 24 is Problem Analysis, because the assessee is identifying a relationship between two pieces of information.

Item 25 is also Problem Analysis. Here, the assessee is probing for more information.

Item 26 was matched to Sensitivity, because the assessee recognizes the employee's situation.

Item 27 was matched to Problem Analysis; the assessee is probing for information.

Item 28 was Problem Solution, since the behavior represents an action plan for developing the subordinate's staffers.

Item 29 was also Problem Solution. This is also a decision.

Item 30 reflects Problem Analysis. Here, the assessee has identified information (i.e., the employee's past performance ratings).

Item 31 was considered Sensitivity, because the

assessee is supporting the employee.

Item 32 was also Sensitivity, because the assessee is showing that he or she has confidence in the employee and supports him.

Item 33 was Sensitivity. This behavior shows a willingness on the part of the assessee to work with the employee to solve his problems.

Item 34 was matched to Problem Solution, because it is an action plan directed at a problem.

Item 35 was also Problem Solution, because it is a decision.

Now we will pause for a moment and let you ask any questions that you may have concerning the feedback, rationale, or with matching behaviors to dimensions in general.

#### Recognizing Good, Average, and Poor Behaviors

In addition to being able to match behaviors with dimensions, you must also judge the effectiveness of the behaviors. This involves judging the relative effectiveness of the behaviors exhibited. In order to judge the effectiveness of behaviors, you need a "frame-of-reference" or F-O-R for each dimension. In this section of training, I will present a F-O-R for each dimension to help you judge the effectiveness of behavior. This F-O-R will help you to place a dimension's behaviors into one of five



levels of effectiveness.

The first F-O-R we will discuss pertains to Problem Analysis. The most effective behaviors for Problem Analysis involve finding relationships between two or more separate pieces of information. These behaviors are considered most effective because identifying common themes between separate pieces of information shows greater use of information than identifying one piece of information or obtaining additional information about a single problem. In addition, a relationship can have a greater impact on a decision than identifying additional information. Examples of the most effective Problem Analysis behaviors include:

1. Assessee relates the employee's adjustment to the new store to the problems that he is experiencing.
2. Assessee relates the employee's lack of patience with his subordinates to the long hours that he has been working.

The next most effective behaviors consist of inquiries for more information about specific topics and taking the needed information into account when analyzing a problem. Specific questioning is effective because more useful information can be obtained when specific questions about specific issues and problems are asked than with general questions. In addition, when the assessee is taking into account the needed information when analyzing a problem, a better understanding of the problem and more

effective solutions may be formed as compared to when some information is omitted. For example, when an assessee identifies the impact of a decision on other problems, the assessee is exhibiting this level of behavior. Examples include:

1. Assessee inquires whether there is a reason why the employee always schedules the full-time employees for weekend nights.
2. Assessee probes for specific information about problems the employee is experiencing.
3. Assessee inquires whether the employee consulted his subordinates regarding their scheduling preferences.

The next lowest level of Problem Analysis behaviors consists of asking for general input about a specific issue; asking for opinions, but not information; and identifying an aspect of a problem. Behaviors like these are considered average. They are considered average because the behaviors are basically neutral in terms of effectiveness. More information is gained and a better understanding of the problem is obtained with specific questions or identifying relationships. However, these behaviors do not lead to inappropriate or inaccurate information. In summary, these behaviors are not as probing as the more effective behaviors mentioned earlier, but this line of questioning is more effective than inaccurate or no probing. Examples of these average behaviors include:

1. Assessee inquires whether the employee has any questions regarding how the inventory system works.
2. Assessee inquires about what the employee believes is the reason that his subordinates are not doing their work.
3. Assessee asks the employee what he thinks could be done to improve his relations with his subordinates.

The next level of Problem Analysis behaviors gets into the ineffective behaviors. These behaviors consist of identifying information that has already been provided, asking for clarification about some information, and asking general questions that cut across issues or problems (e.g., are you having any problems). As can be seen, these behaviors, in general, do not add to the investigation for additional information. Although they do not detract from the investigation of problems, they do not add to it either. Identifying information that has been provided and asking for clarification slow the investigative process, because this information has already been brought up. General questions that cut across issues or problems are also likely not to add useful information that address a specific problem. Examples of this type of behavior include:

1. Assessee inquires whether the employee has had any problems adjusting to the new store.
2. Assessee inquires whether the employee has any problems with his subordinates.
3. Assessee inquires whether the employee has any questions about his responsibilities.

The lowest level of Problem Analysis behaviors are those that detract from the investigation for information or provide inaccurate information. General examples include: Not identifying information or problems that have been provided to them; inquiries about information that has been provided; and forming inaccurate relationships. As you can see these behaviors either 1) add no new information to solve the problems or 2) lead to the use of inaccurate information. Specific behaviors include:

1. Assessee inquires whether the employee has anything that he would like to bring up.
2. Assessee fails to investigate a problem that was identified.
3. Assessee relates the employee's good references to good work on his present job.

I recognize that this F-O-R may be difficult to understand. Some behaviors may not cleanly fit into any of the five effectiveness categories. However, the F-O-R can be used to judge the effectiveness of a majority of behaviors.

In summary, the F-O-R for Problem Analysis goes as follows: Forming accurate relationships are the most effective behaviors. Specific questions also form an hierarchy of effectiveness; specific questions about specific issues are more effective than general questions about specific issues, or general questions about general

issues. Remember, the more specific the question, the more effective the behavior. In addition, the information considered to analyze a problem also forms a hierarchy. Remember, the more information incorporated into the analysis of a problem, the better. Finally, not recognizing needed information and inaccurate information reflect the least effective behaviors. I will now answer any questions that you may have concerning the F-O-R for Problem Analysis.

PAUSE

The next F-O-R we will discuss is Problem Solution. For Problem Solution, three hierarchies were identified that can be used to judge behavioral effectiveness. The first hierarchy is specific solutions to nonspecific solutions. This means that the more specific the solution, the more effective the behavior. The second hierarchy concerns the amount of information used to form solutions. More effective Problem Solution behaviors are generated when the assessee has all needed information. The third hierarchy concerns solution complexity. More detailed solutions are superior to simpler solutions (e.g., a number of specific steps to solve multiple problems).

The most effective Problem Solution behaviors involve solutions that are complex and specific. For example, if a number of specific actions are proposed to solve a single

problem, the solution is considered very effective.

Another behavior is: Providing a detailed method for organizing a meeting or outlining a specific plan of action. These behaviors are considered most effective because 1) detailed plans are clearer and easier to carry out than general ones; 2) proposing multiple solutions provides the opportunity for others to choose an option; 3) multiple solutions show that greater thought went into forming the decision. Examples of effective behaviors include:

1. Assessee outlines plans for employee development.
2. Assessee provides multiple solutions in response to the employee scheduling problem.
3. Assessee outlines what the employee should have done when describing errors.

The next level of effective Problem Solution consists of specific solutions and making decisions after checking the needed information. These behaviors are considered effective because they 1) are specific solutions to specific issues and 2) take into account the information needed to generate an accurate solution. They are not as effective as the behaviors mentioned earlier, because these solutions are not as detailed or only one solution is proposed. With the most effective Problem Solution behaviors, a number of solutions may be offered to address a single problem. Example behaviors for this level

include:

1. Assessee suggests that the employee remind his subordinates of the open door policy via a memo or meeting.
2. Assessee suggests that the employee post a chart with the responsibilities of the staffers listed.
3. Assessee suggests that the employee establish a policy covering the roles and responsibilities of the subordinates.

The next level of Problem Solution reflects average behaviors. Average Problem Solution behaviors involve general solutions, suggestions, and proposals of general action. General solutions or action plans are not as effective as more specific solutions, because they possess greater ambiguity (i.e., the instructions for carrying out the solution are not as clear cut). However, they are solutions and they are appropriate. Examples of average Problem Solution behaviors include:

1. Assessee suggests that the employee give his subordinates more responsibility and hold them to it.
2. Assessee suggests training sessions/workshops to remedy some of the employee's weaknesses.
3. Assessee suggests that the employee attempt to be more specific in his instructions to subordinates.

The next level begins to get into the ineffective behaviors. Problem Solution behaviors at this level is the very general and obvious solutions. A very general solution may be the setting of a goal without specifying how to obtain it. These solutions are ineffective because

they provide little or no suggestions as to how to carry them out. Obvious solutions also add little because they may have already been tried and are most likely already known. Some examples are:

1. Assessee suggests that the company may need to offer more training for the staffers.
2. Assessee suggests that the employee needs to take time to do a better job on his scheduling and ordering.
3. Assessee establishes a goal of reduced hours.

The most ineffective Problem Solution behaviors are those that involve a) not checking the needed information, b) delegation without instructions, c) inappropriate or inaccurate solutions, d) providing no solution for a problem, and e) stating that a problem can be solved without saying how. These behaviors are the most ineffective, because one of two things can result from these solutions. First, the problem is incorrectly solved, or second, the problem is not solved and the problem remains. Not addressing a problem or not attempting to solve a problem constitutes a poor Problem Solution behavior. Examples include:

1. Assessee recommends that the employee exert more authority and let the staffers know who is the boss.
2. Assessee suggests that the problem with the employee's subordinates not using the open door policy could be easily resolved, but does not provide a solution.
3. Assessee suggests that a goal could be established, but does not provide a goal or the manner in which it could be accomplished.



The F-O-R for Problem Solution considers three hierarchies that should be examined concurrently when judging behavioral effectiveness; no one hierarchy is superior to any of the others. The first hierarchy pertains to specific solutions. The more specific the solution, the more effective the behavior. The second hierarchy is the amount of information used to generate the solution. The more information incorporated into the solution, the more effective the behavior. The third hierarchy pertains to complex solutions. Complex solutions involve multiple steps and can be applied to multiple problems. I will now answer any questions that you may have concerning the F-O-R for Problem Solution.

PAUSE

The final F-O-R to be discussed concerns Sensitivity. The F-O-R for Sensitivity goes from sensitive to insensitive behaviors. Differentiating between behaviors that are sensitive goes as follows. The most effective behaviors exhibit sensitive action or show sensitivity towards the individual being addressed. These sensitivity behaviors pertain to the individual, not aspects of the individual. Other behaviors at this level are those that exhibit action rather than just words. The adage "action speaks louder than words" applies here. Examples of the most effective behaviors for Sensitivity include:

1. Assessee assures the employee that he/she believes that he can improve.
2. Assessee supports the employee by wanting to see how they can make his performance even better.
3. Assessee supports the employee by expressing the desire to work with the employee to remedy the problems.

The next level of effective Sensitivity behaviors are compliments or support of some aspect of individuals. What is meant by aspects is the work the individual has done. Also at this level are those behaviors that show awareness or concern for some aspect of another individual. These behaviors are effective, but not as effective as those mentioned above, because they are statements, not actions, and they are less "central" to the individual. These behaviors do not should concern for others as individuals, rather they show concern for some product or aspect of the individual. In other words, behaviors here don't strike as close to home as those mentioned earlier. Examples of these behaviors include:

1. Assessee acknowledges the difficulty of adjusting to a larger store.
2. Assessee compliments the employee for the responsibility he feels for his position.
3. Assessee indicates that he/she is impressed by all of the hours the employee has been working.

The next level of behaviors represent average Sensitivity. These behaviors reflect general consideration, attempts to put other people at ease, or

support for other people who are not being directly addressed. With general consideration, we are talking about thanking people for providing information, reinforcing people for providing suggestions, or acknowledging that one must work with others. Examples of behaviors at this level include:

1. Assessee puts the employee at ease by remarking that his past performance appraisals were good.
2. Assessee thanks the employee for his time at the conclusion of the interview.
3. Assessee reinforces the employee for providing suggestions on ways to correct his problems.

The next level of Sensitivity gets into the insensitive behaviors. These behaviors show a lack of support for the concerns of others and being unaware of others' concerns and opinions. For behaviors that exhibit a lack of support or criticisms, the behaviors must be accompanied by justification or a reason for such behavior. With justification, the behaviors are not as insensitive when compared with criticisms without justification. In addition, the criticisms here pertain only to those criticisms of aspects of individuals, not the individual him or herself. Examples of this level of Sensitivity include:

1. Doesn't accept one of the employee's excuses with justification.
2. Views the employee's subordinates as the reason for the

problems.

The lowest level of Sensitivity are those behaviors that exhibit any type of insensitivity without justification. The key in distinguishing between these behaviors and those just mentioned is justification. Without justification, the behavior represents an attack on an individual. In addition, any criticism directed at an individual, with or without justification, reflects ineffectiveness. Most ineffective behaviors are beyond showing no awareness of others' concerns. With these behaviors, the assessee is aware, but downplays or criticizes the concerns. Examples of this level of Sensitivity include:

1. Assessee acknowledges that the employee is ultimately responsible for insuring that all of the work is done.
2. In asking questions, the assessee conveys the impression that the employee is guilty until proven innocent.

In summary, the F-O-R for Sensitivity is as follows. Actions depicting sensitive behaviors are the most effective behaviors along with sensitivity directed at the individual. The next most effective behaviors are complimenting and acknowledging of some aspect or product of the individual (e.g., their work, their requests). Behaviors such as putting others at ease, general consideration, and supporting other individuals not present make up the average Sensitivity behaviors. The last two

levels of Sensitivity are ineffective behaviors that reflect a lack of sensitivity or insensitivity. The fourth level consists of criticisms directed at aspects or products of individuals with justification. The lowest level of Sensitivity involves behaviors which criticize without justification or criticisms directed at individuals with or without justification. I will now answer any questions that you may have about this F-O-R.

PAUSE

Now that we have discussed the F-O-R for each dimension, we will see how well you understand them. You will judge the effectiveness of a list of behaviors for each dimension. What I want you to do is to indicate the effectiveness of each behavior using the following scale:

|                         |                |              |                  |                           |
|-------------------------|----------------|--------------|------------------|---------------------------|
| Most<br>Effective<br>ME | Effective<br>E | Average<br>A | Ineffective<br>I | Most<br>Ineffective<br>MI |
| -----                   | -----          | -----        | -----            | -----                     |

Please choose the symbol (ME, E, A, I, MI) that best represents each behavior. After you complete this task, feedback and rationale on your responses will be provided.

PAUSE

Beginning with Problem Analysis, Item 1 was considered ME, because the assessee recognized a relationship between two separate pieces of information. Anytime a relationship is recognized, it is a most effective behavior. Remember,

relationships do not have to be acted upon, just recognized.

Item 2 was considered E. Here, the assessee is asking a specific question about a specific problem. Anytime an assessee is asking a specific question about a specific problem it is an effective Problem Analysis behavior.

Item 3 was given an E for the same reasons given for Item 2.

Item 4 was considered A. Notice how this question is more general than Items 2 and 3. Here, the assessee is asking for any suggestions from the employee, not specific information.

Item 5 was considered MI on the basis of its generality. The assessee is probing for information about no question in particular and is not giving the employee any direction in what information is wanted.

Item 6 was an I behavior, because the question is general and not directed at any specific problem or issue.

Item 7 was considered an E, because it reflects specific probing for information about a specific problem (i.e., scheduling).

Item 8 was given an A. This is a general question about a problem (i.e., staffer complaints).

Item 9 was an ME behavior. Here, a relationship between the employee's old store and his current delegation

problems has been identified.

Item 10 was considered an A. Here, the assessee is asking a general question about a specific issue that was just discussed.

Item 11 was also an A behavior, because it is a general question about a fairly specific issue.

Item 12 was given an A. Here, the assessee has identified some needed information.

Next dimension, Problem Solution.

Item 1 was considered ME. Remember outlining pertains to laying out a sequence of specific steps to be followed. Thus, this solution is detailed and complex. Item 2 was given an E, because it is a specific solution in response to a particular problem (the employee knows the topic that needs to be explained).

Item 3 was considered MI. First, the assessee says a goal can be obtained. We do not know whether a goal has been set or not. Second, the assessee provides no explanation how this goal can be accomplished. Thus, the problem will most likely remain unsolved.

Item 4 was considered an A. This behavior is directed at a general matter (i.e., how the company works). However, what makes this average rather than ineffective is that the assessee provided some insight into what needed to be communicated to the staffers (i.e., his knowledge).

Item 5 was given an I. Notice how the assessee doesn't say how to develop better communications. However, the behavior is directed at a somewhat specific problem (i.e., manager - employee communications).

Item 6 was considered an E behavior, since the solution is specific and directed at a specific problem.

Item 7 was also an E for the same reasons given for Item 6.

Item 8 was considered an MI, because it is a rash decision that would, most likely, lead to more problems rather than the solving of problems.

Item 9 was an A, because the solution is general rather than specific.

Item 10 was given an I, because it is a general solution and proposes no action for carrying out the solution.

Item 11 was considered an E, because of the solution's specificity.

Item 12 was an A behavior for the same reasons as Item 9.

Now for Sensitivity.

The first item was considered ME, because the behavior is showing sensitive action. Remember sensitive actions are most effective Sensitivity behaviors. Item 2 was given an A, because it represents general consideration.



It was not considered effective, because the assessee is just aware of the good performance appraisals and not complimentary.

Item 3 was given an MI. It is an insensitive behavior directed at the employee.

Item 4 was considered an E. Notice here that the assessee is complimentary of the employee's hours. In item 2 that was not present. This is the reason that this item was considered effective and Item 2 average.

Item 5 was given an I. This is insensitive behavior, however, the assessee has reason to dispute the employee's excuse. The justification is what makes this behavior ineffective rather than most ineffective.

Item 6 was given an A, because the behavior is attempting to put the employee at ease. It is not an E, because it is a general statement rather than pertaining exclusively to the employee.

Item 7 was considered ME. This behavior shows the willingness to work with the employee, thus it is sensitive action.

Item 8 was an A behavior. This is general sensitivity that is not directed at the employee.

Item 9 was also an A. The behavior shows general support for the employee.

Item 10 was an E behavior, because it shows support

and confidence in the employee.

Item 11 was considered ME, since the behavior reflects sensitive action.

Now we will pause for a moment so you can ask any questions pertaining to judging behavioral effectiveness or the feedback just provided.

#### Observation and Note Taking

In the role-play exercise you are going to observe an assessee conducting an interview. The assessee may exhibit many behaviors and do a great deal of talking. This is a reason why observation is difficult. However, observation is just half the story. In addition to observation, you also need to be taking notes on the assessee's behavior. The combination of observing and note taking places a great demand on you. In order to make this process a bit easier, I will provide you with some advice on observation and note taking that experts have used. These pointers should help you observe and take notes more accurately.

One piece of advice for observation is to focus on the behaviors that are relevant to the dimensions under investigation. Lookout for behaviors that can be considered Problem Analysis, Problem Solution, or Sensitivity. This advice should not be interpreted to mean that you can ignore everything but those behaviors. You can ignore the irrelevant behaviors, if you can identify

them quickly enough. Behaviors may be manifested by the assessee at a rapid-fire pace, and you may not have time to determine whether a particular behavior is relevant. When this occurs, you should follow all behaviors and try to match them to dimensions them later. If you try to match behaviors while observing, there may be times where you miss subsequent behaviors. So, by paying attention to the progression of the meeting and most of the assessee's behaviors you will miss fewer relevant behaviors.

A second tip for effective observation is to be aware of the context of the meeting. You shouldn't block out the context for two reasons. First, context makes it easier to understand behaviors (what was the behavior in response to; what problem does the solution address). Second, behaviors occur at certain times during the meeting. If you are aware of the context, it will help you to anticipate those behaviors that are likely to occur at a particular stage of the exercise. With the role-play, the assessee will usually attempt to put the employee at ease at the beginning of the meeting. So, you should be on the lookout for sensitivity-type behaviors at the beginning of the meeting. In sum, be aware of what is going on around the assessee as well as what the assessee is doing.

Note taking is an integral part of the observation - report writing process. Since you will be relying on your

notes to write the reports, your notes must be clear and complete. With complete notes you do not have to rely on memory, which is fallible. All the information you need for writing the reports should be in your notes. Now I will provide you with some advice for effective note taking.

Your first priority when taking notes is to record the behavior the assessee has displayed. Recording behavior is what note taking is all about. Your second priority is to record some contextual information to clarify the behavior. Recording contextual information is not the most important part of note taking (recording behavior is), but noting contextual information is important and should be done whenever possible. By recording behavior with context, you will have sufficient detail on the assessee's behavior.

When taking notes try to provide as much detail as possible. Sometimes it will be difficult because the assessee may be exhibiting a number of behaviors in quick succession. At these times, the only advice that I can give you is to write rapidly and try to be concise in summarizing behaviors. It is okay to write brief summaries of behavior, as long as you understand it. Furthermore, don't worry about grammar and spelling when taking notes, as long as you can write a report from the notes.

What you are trying to do while note taking is to

record all the relevant behaviors that the assessee exhibited. When taking notes, you don't need to match the behaviors to dimensions; all you need to do is record behaviors. You will have time to match and judge the effectiveness of the behaviors at the conclusion of the videotapes. By just concentrating on recording behaviors you will be able to generate more detailed notes and miss fewer behaviors. In sum, the objectives are to record all relevant behaviors and provide some clarifying context for the behaviors. Now I will answer any questions that you may have about note taking and observation.

PAUSE

You will now see a videotape of an actual role-play. What I would like for you to do is to observe the assessee and take notes on the performance. During the exercise, I would like you to record the behaviors you observe. After you have completed this task, I will provide you with a list of the behaviors observed by experts.

HANDOUT LIST OF BEHAVIORS

On the next handout are the behaviors recorded by the experts in chronological order. Please read through this list and see how well you were able to record behavior.

PAUSE

### Reporting Behavior

The final part of the observation and judging

behavioral effectiveness process is writing reports. The reports are read to other assessors in the second session, who use this information to generate ratings of assessee performance across the three exercises. So, the accuracy and completeness of the reports are essential to accurate overall ratings.

You are the person who is going to present your reports. So, as long as you can read your reports and make sense out of it and think that others will be able to understand it, the report is fine. The presentation is not a formal presentation in the sense that you do not have to stand up and speak without reading your report. All the presentation requires is that you read your report, word-for-word. You can read the entire report aloud without looking up and that would be okay. In addition, the other two assessors will also read reports and these assessors, and myself, will be the only ones who will hear you read. Finally, please remember that you will not be evaluated on your writing or reading ability, the only concern is getting the needed information communicated to the other assessors.

Now I would like to cover the guidelines for writing the report. These guidelines provide the questions that you will answer in the report. In addition, the guidelines will provide consistency across different reports, making

it easier for others. You do not need to have these guideline questions memorized; the guidelines will be available while you are writing the reports. We will now go through each question in the guidelines and clarify them. At the end of this presentation, I will answer any questions that you have about the guidelines and report writing.

The first question in the Guidelines states, "Did the assessee address all the problems?" Additional parts of the question include: "If not, which problems were omitted? Which problems did the assessee resolve"? In the handout given to the assessee that explains the role and situation the performance problems of the employee were listed. These problems include: Poor decision making judgments (e.g., overordering of picnic tables), scheduling problems, working 60 hours a week, employee doing the staffer's work, complaints of lack of responsibility from the staffers, and poor relations with his staffers. These are all problems that were identified in the handout and need to be addressed in the interview. Response examples for this question are:

1. Assessee did not address two of the problems; the problem of the employee working 60 hours a week and the staffer scheduling problem. In addition, the assessee did not resolve, but did address the overordering of picnic tables issue. All other problems were resolved.
2. Assessee did not address one problem; the overordering of picnic tables. The assessee addressed, but did not

resolve, the problems of scheduling and subordinate responsibility. All other problems were resolved.

Question 2 states, "Did the assessee exhibit any relevant behaviors on multiple occasions? If yes, please specify what these behaviors were." What you are looking for are those behaviors that the assessee used on multiple occasions (e.g., solutions generated, method in which problems are analyzed, method in which questions are asked, awareness of concerns). What this question is trying to uncover is whether the assessee has any particular style for making decisions, gathering information, analyzing problems, or dealing with people. Example responses include:

1. Assessee used a questioning strategy that began with general questions and then got progressively more specific when addressing a number of problems.
2. Assessee proposed that the employee should improve communications with his staffers as a solution to the scheduling and employee-staff relations problem.

Question 3 of the guidelines reads, "Did the assessee recognize any relationships between requests or other pieces of information? If yes, please list the examples observed." Here, you are listing all the relationships recognized by the assessee. If no relationships were observed, then indicate that "no relationships were recognized by the assessee." If the assessee did recognize relationships, note the behavior, what pieces of information were being related, and the particular problem



or issue. Response examples include:

1. Assessee relates the overordering of picnic tables to the problems that the employee is having with the inventory system.
2. Assessee relates the problems that the employee is having to being new at the store when trying to determine why the employee is having problems.

If the assessee used the same relationship more than once, you should indicate it in Questions 2 and 3 of the guidelines.

The final three questions ask for dimension information. The questions vary in the dimension of concern. Question 4a reads, "What behaviors did you observe that were relevant to Problem Analysis? Please list them and provide the context in which they occurred." Questions 4b and 4c refer to Problem Solution and Sensitivity, respectively. The intent of these questions is to provide a list of behaviors corresponding to each dimension. Here are some Problem Analysis examples:

1. Assessee asks specific questions to get at the heart of the overordering of picnic tables problem.
2. Assessee did not identify all the employee's problems during the interview.

Problem Solution examples:

1. Assessee suggests that the employee hand out note cards with responsibilities listed on them to his subordinates as a solution to the delegation problem and the subordinates complaint of lack of responsibility.
2. Assessee suggests solutions to a number of problems

before getting input from the employee at the beginning of the interview.

Sensitivity examples:

1. Assessee attempts to put the employee at ease at the beginning of the interview.
2. At the end of the interview, the assessee reassures that employee by saying that he/she is confident that the employee can improve on his performance.

One thing to remember about these three questions is that if you think a behavior fits more than one dimension, you should still list the behavior. Include the behavior on all appropriate lists and indicate that it was included on multiple lists. You may also have behaviors in your notes that can't be matched to any of the three dimensions. With these behaviors, don't force them into a dimension. Don't list these behaviors.

This completes the presentation on the guidelines for writing reports. Now I will answer any questions that you may have regarding the guidelines and writing reports.

PAUSE

Okay, now we will determine how well you understand the guidelines and how well you can write reports. Using the notes that you generated earlier and the list of behaviors provided, you will write a report about the assessee. After you have completed this task, I will provide you with feedback about your report.

PAUSE

## Question #1

Assessee did not address or resolve two problems (poor decision making [inventory, picnic tables] and working 60 hours per week). Four problems were addressed (staffer complaints of lack of responsibility, employee doing the staffer's work, poor relations with staffers, and scheduling). Two problems (staffer complaints of lack of responsibility and employee doing the staffer's work) were resolved through suggestions of increasing delegation, teaching them how to do a task, and showing the staffers how to do a task. Poor relations with staffers was resolved by the assessee suggesting that the employee have a meeting with his staff to bring problems into the open and open the lines of communication. The scheduling problem was resolved by the assessee stating how scheduling is commonly done at the store.

Remember here that you need to distinguish between the problems that were addressed and those that were resolved. You also should indicate how a problem was resolved.

## Question #2

Assessee mentioned that the employee has done a good job on three occasions, and showed confidence in the employee by stating that his performance will improve in the future on three occasions.

Assessee suggested that the employee needed more patience in dealing with his staff on two occasions and acknowledged that it is difficult to have patience on three occasions.

Assessee proposed opening the lines of communication with his staffers on two occasions in order to improve relations with his staffers.

Assessee suggested that the employee needed to delegate some responsibility to his staffers five times and proposed that the employee needs to teach his staffers rather than just tell them on two occasions. Both of these behaviors were used to resolve the problems of staffer complaints of lack of responsibility and the employee doing the staffer's work.

The only behaviors that should be mentioned for question 2 are those that are relevant to the dimensions.

Behaviors that do not correspond to any of the three dimensions should not be recorded. Also remember to indicate the frequency of the behavior. If you do not recall the exact number of times a behavior occurred, use a qualifier (e.g., consistently, from time to time, occasionally).

#### Question #3

Assessee recognized two relationships. The first one related the employee's delegation of responsibility problems to his previous position at a smaller store where the employee did not have to delegate as much. This relationship was used to explain why the employee may have had problems delegating. The second relationship identified the employee's adjustment to a new store and situation as a possible cause of some of the problems that the employee is experiencing. This relationship was used to justify the average rating given by the assessee and to put the employee at ease.

In addition to recording the relationship, you should also indicate what the relationship was being used for (solving which problem, justification for what).

#### Question #4

##### PROBLEM ANALYSIS

Identifies that there is room for improvement in the employee's performance.

Identifies that at the old store where the employee worked was smaller and he didn't have to delegate as much.

Inquires whether some people in the employee's department don't belong.

Inquires whether some people in the employee's department are destructive to the department.

In response to hearing that the staffers don't do their work, the assessee asks what happens when they don't do their work.

Asks the employee for input about an issue that was discussed. (Also Sensitivity).

Inquires how the employee handles the scheduling of his staffers.

Relates the problems that the employee is having to the adjustment to a new situation.

Identifies that the employee has done a good job in the past.

#### PROBLEM SOLUTION

Suggests the need to open the lines of communication.

Suggests that the employee delegate responsibility more thoroughly.

Wants the employee to delegate, let the staffers do their work and have the employee guide them.

Suggests that the employee expand his delegation.

Suggests that the employee delegate some decisions. Let the staffers handle some of the lesser decisions.

Wants the employee to groom the staffers, then the employee can move up in the company and have someone to take his place.

Suggests that the employee can't just tell them to do something, he needs to teach them through the delegation of responsibility.

Suggests that the employee needs more patience in dealing with his staffers.

Proposes that the employee provide his experience and training to his staffers, so that they can improve.

Suggests that the employee sit down with the staffers and teach them in a patience manner how to do the job.

Proposes that the employee tell the staffers what needs to be done, set a goal, and let them accomplish it.

States that, at this store, they rotate the weekend schedule to give everyone a weekend off.

Proposes that the employee have a meeting with his staffers to bring some problems into the open. That way we can open the lines of communication.

Proposes that the employee needs to work with the staffers.

Proposes that the employee needs to have patience with the staffers.

Suggests that the employee delegate more responsibility to his staffers.

Proposes that the employee show the staffers how to do a task and be with them until they've done it a few times and are comfortable with it.

States that the employee come to him if the employee needs any help or advice. (Also Sensitivity).

#### SENSITIVITY

Asks how the employee likes working at the new store.

Acknowledges that the employee has, overall, done a decent job.

States that the employee knows his job and does it well.

Acknowledges that it is tough to have patience. Assessee also has problems with patience. But, it needs to be worked on.

Agrees with the employee that the staffers should come to him with their complaints.

Acknowledges that it is not the employee's fault if the staffers don't bring their problems to him.

After giving the employee an average rating, the assessee acknowledges that the employee is used to higher ratings.

Has confidence in the employee; expects the employee to get higher ratings in the future.

States that they cannot wipe out all the staffers when a new manager comes in. The employee needs to work with the staffers.

Acknowledges that it is tough to have patience.

Acknowledges that having patience is tough.

States that the employee come to him if the employee needs any help or advice. (Also Problem Solution).

Acknowledges that it is tough to get started at a new store.

Believes that things will improve for the employee.

Expects employee to do well in the future.

Thanks the employee for his time.

There are two things that must be considered here.

First, if you are in doubt about whether a behavior is relevant to a single dimension, you should still include it in the dimension list. If you believe a behavior applies to more than one dimension, include it under the dimensions that you believe it corresponds to. If you do this, indicate that the behavior is included in more than one dimension list.

Now I will answer any questions that you may have about the guidelines, report writing, or the feedback just provided. After your questions have been answered, you will begin observing, taking notes, and writing reports for the four experimental assessees. These are the reports that you will present in this study's second session.

Appendix G  
Training Materials Used During Whole Training



Problems to be Addressed by the Assessee in the Role-Play

1. Poor decision-making judgments

Overordering of picnic tables; ordering them without checking last year's inventory records.

Scheduling full-time employees to work weekends and nights.

2. Things are not getting done in the department even though the employee works 60 hours a week.

Staffers complained about a lack of responsibility.

Employee is doing the work of a staffer.

3. Lack of patience and concern for the staffers.

Employee yelled at a staffer.

Employee told staffers to find out how the inventory system works on their own.

## Checklist for the In-Basket

Problem Analysis

Definition. Breaking up a problem into parts such that the parts can be examined for their importance, interrelationships, or need for additional information.

- \_\_\_ 1. Recognizes the need to investigate whether other complaints of harassment have been made against Bill.
- \_\_\_ 2. Recognizes the need to question Bill about the harassment complaint.
- \_\_\_ 3. Has Frank (assistant) investigate the possibility of employee theft.
- \_\_\_ 4. Recognizes the relationship between Brenda Miller's (customer) complaint and the manager's suggestion that she be promoted to fill the opening for a Buyer.
- \_\_\_ 5. Will question Lori or has Frank (assistant) question Lori about the customer complaint.
- \_\_\_ 6. Has someone check to insure the Summer Sale ad is correct.
- \_\_\_ 7. Recognizes the relationship between the unavailable Val-U-Trac lights and their inclusion in the Summer Sale bulletin.
- \_\_\_ 8. Asks staff for suggestions on how to improve the department in response to the manager's request for this information.
- \_\_\_ 9. Recognizes the need to investigate the problem of the dress-code violations further.
- \_\_\_ 10. Recognizes the conflict between Phyllis's time-off request and the Summer Sale dates.
- \_\_\_ 11. Checks Chandler's performance rating in response to his complaint and request for transfer.
- \_\_\_ 12. Asks Frank (assistant) for input on the Chandler performance appraisal/transfer problem.

- \_\_\_ 13. Recognizes the need to investigate the possibility of other performance appraisal problems.
- \_\_\_ 14. Recognizes the relationship between the Training Workshop memo and the customer complaint against Lori.
- \_\_\_ 15. Recognizes the relationship between Pat (store manager) asking about the possible promotion of Lori and the customer complaint.

### Problem Solution

Definition. The assessee suggests, recommends, or outlines actions, methods, or strategies that help in the resolution of problems.

- \_\_\_ 1. Warns, will warn, or has Frank (assistant) warn Bill regarding the sexual harassment complaint.
- \_\_\_ 2. Makes arrangements to get lights to replace the Val-U- Trac lights.
- \_\_\_ 3. Schedules a weekly cleaning inspection in response to the manager's complaint about the dirty condition of the department.
- \_\_\_ 4. Arranges to have security or Frank (assistant) watch Mike in response to Lori's report that he is stealing.
- \_\_\_ 5. Has security strengthened in response to Lori's report that Mike has been stealing.
- \_\_\_ 6. Suggests offering Brenda Miller (customer) additional merchandise or a discount in response to her complaint about the delayed delivery of her sofa and rude treatment by Lori.
- \_\_\_ 7. Has the Val-U-Trac lights removed from the sales bulletin.
- \_\_\_ 8. Makes sure or has Frank (assistant) make sure adequate staff is scheduled for the Summer Sale.
- \_\_\_ 9. Delegates the entire Summer Sale matter to Frank (assistant) without specific suggestions.

- \_\_\_ 10. Delegates the entire matter of the dress-code violations to Frank (assistant) without specific suggestions.
- \_\_\_ 11. Ok's the time off request without assuring Phyllis can be spared for the day.
- \_\_\_ 12. Recommends Phyllis arrange to trade time off with another employee in response to her request for a day off to attend the wedding of a friend.
- \_\_\_ 13. Grants Glen Chandler's request.
- \_\_\_ 14. Suggests training program for Lori in response to Brenda Miller's (customer) complaint about the delayed delivery of her sofa and rude treatment by Lori.
- \_\_\_ 15. Protests Pat's (store manager) suggestion of promoting Lori.

### Sensitivity

Definition. Showing concern for the feelings, needs, and points of view of others. Letting people know you are aware of their individual situations.

- \_\_\_ 1. Acknowledges the sexual harassment problem for Cindy.
- \_\_\_ 2. Apologizes to Cindy for the sexual harassment problem.
- \_\_\_ 3. Thanks Lori for the information regarding the employee theft problem.
- \_\_\_ 4. Apologizes to Brenda Miller (customer) for the delayed delivery of her sofa or her rude treatment by Lori.
- \_\_\_ 5. Has Frank (assistant) apologize to Brenda Miller (customer) for the delayed delivery of her sofa or her rude treatment by Lori.

## Checklist for the Role-Play

Problem Analysis

Definition. Breaking up a problem into parts such that the parts can be examined for their importance, interrelationships, or need for additional information.

- 1. Assessee inquires whether the employee has had any problems adjusting to the store.
- 2. Assessee asks the employee whether there is anything that he would like to bring up.
- 3. Assessee inquires whether the employee checked last year's inventory before ordering the picnic tables.
- 4. Assessee inquires whether the employee had ever received any complaints from his subordinates.
- 5. Assessee inquires whether the employee consulted his subordinates regarding their scheduling preferences.
- 6. Assessee inquires whether there is a reason why the employee always schedules the full-time employees for weekend nights.
- 7. Assessee inquires about what the employee believes is the reason that his subordinates are not doing their work.
- 8. Assessee inquires whether the employee's subordinates needed more training.
- 9. Assessee inquires what the employee has to say about a complaint.
- 10. Assessee relates the employee's adjustment to the new store to the problems that he is experiencing.
- 11. Assessee inquires as to the reason the employee works so many hours.
- 12. Assessee relates the employee's lack of patience in his dealings with his subordinates to his long hours.

- \_\_\_ 13. Assessee asks the employee what he thinks could be done to improve his relations with his subordinates.
- \_\_\_ 14. Assessee investigates how the employee took care of the problem when his subordinates didn't do the work or didn't do it well.
- \_\_\_ 15. Assessee inquires whether the employee has any questions about his responsibilities.

#### Problem Solution

Definition. The assessee suggests, recommends, or outlines actions, methods, or strategies that help in the resolution of problems.

- \_\_\_ 1. Assessee suggests that the employee talk with his subordinates and find out how they feel about working nights and weekends.
- \_\_\_ 2. Assessee suggests that if the staffers did not want to work nights and weekends that he should rotate them.
- \_\_\_ 3. Assessee suggests that the employee explain to the staffers how the inventory system works.
- \_\_\_ 4. Assessee recommends that the employee exert more authority and let the staffers know who is boss.
- \_\_\_ 5. Assessee suggests that the employee sit down with his subordinates and attempt to develop a better working relationship.
- \_\_\_ 6. Assessee suggests that the employee might want to share his knowledge so that his subordinates would have a better understanding of how the company works.
- \_\_\_ 7. Assessee outlines what the employee should have done when describing errors.
- \_\_\_ 8. Assessee recommends that the employee try delegating more responsibility to his subordinates.

- \_\_\_ 9. Assessee suggests to the employee that he could threaten to reduce the hours of the staffers if they did not do their jobs.
- \_\_\_ 10. Assessee suggests that the employee show his subordinates what he wants them to do rather than doing it himself.
- \_\_\_ 11. Assessee suggests that a goal could be obtained without specifying the manner in which it could be accomplished.
- \_\_\_ 12. Assessee suggests that the employee is going to have to develop better communications with his subordinates.
- \_\_\_ 13. Assessee suggests that the employee hand out notecards with responsibilities listed on them to his subordinates as a solution to the delegation problem.
- \_\_\_ 14. Assessee suggests that the employee needs to take time to do a better job on his scheduling and ordering.
- \_\_\_ 15. Assessee outlines action plans for employee development.

### Sensitivity

Definition. Showing concern for the feelings, needs, and points of view of others. Letting people know you are aware of their individual situations.

- \_\_\_ 1. Assessee puts the employee at ease by asking him how he likes being at the new store.
- \_\_\_ 2. Assessee acknowledges that a lot of employees are apprehensive about the appraisal process.
- \_\_\_ 3. Assessee puts the employee at ease by acknowledging that his past performance appraisals were good.
- \_\_\_ 4. Assessee acknowledges the difficulty of adjusting to a new store.
- \_\_\_ 5. Assessee states that he/she has confidence in the employee.

- \_\_\_ 6. Assessee indicates that he/she is impressed by all of the hours the employee has been working.
- \_\_\_ 7. Assessee compliments the employee on the responsibility he feels for his position.
- \_\_\_ 8. Assessee supports the employee by wanting to see how they can make his performance even better.
- \_\_\_ 9. Assessee expresses the desire to work with the employee to remedy the problems.
- \_\_\_ 10. Assessee conveys the impression that the employee is guilty until proven innocent.
- \_\_\_ 11. Assessee listens intently to what the employee has to say.
- \_\_\_ 12. Assessee asks the employee about his feelings of the issues that had been discussed.
- \_\_\_ 13. Assessee tells the employee that he is ultimately responsible for insuring that all of the work is done properly.
- \_\_\_ 14. Assessee acknowledges that it is difficult to turn over responsibility.
- \_\_\_ 15. Assessee doesn't thank the employee for his time at the conclusion of the interview.



## Checklist for the Leaderless Group Discussion

### Problem Analysis

Definition. Breaking up a problem into parts such that the parts can be examined for their importance, interrelationships, or need for additional information.

- \_\_\_ 1. Identifies the percentage increase of the budget over last year's departmental budget.
- \_\_\_ 2. Identifies that some departments were underbudget in the past.
- \_\_\_ 3. Inquires about information that is on the summary sheet.
- \_\_\_ 4. Identifies the priorities of the department's requests.
- \_\_\_ 5. Relates the increased departmental budget and organizational growth.
- \_\_\_ 6. Defines the relationship between the requested marketing strategy to the past (unsuccessful) marketing strategy.
- \_\_\_ 7. Does not relate past departmental problems with present requests.
- \_\_\_ 8. Identifies the primary markets of the organization (government, wholesalers, not individual consumers).
- \_\_\_ 9. Relates Data Processing's request for increased computer capacity and their request for additional personnel.
- \_\_\_ 10. Relates the computing needs of Accounting and Data Processing.
- \_\_\_ 11. Identifies problems that affect the entire organization.
- \_\_\_ 12. Relates the requests of different departments that are stated on the summary sheets.
- \_\_\_ 13. Inquires about other members' views to obtain more information.

- \_\_\_ 14. Identifies the justifications for and against the budgeting of a program or need.
- \_\_\_ 15. Forms inaccurate relationships.

### Problem Solution

Definition. The assessee suggests, recommends, or outlines actions, methods, or strategies that help in the resolution of problems.

- \_\_\_ 1. Proposes various methods to organize the meeting.
- \_\_\_ 2. Proposes that each department first mention their departmental budget totals, then explain the needs for the money, then make compromises on their budgets.
- \_\_\_ 3. Proposes that they decide on departmental budgets by examining the requests of the department, its past performance, and its future needs.
- \_\_\_ 4. Proposes that each department get a 40% increase over last year's budgets.
- \_\_\_ 5. Proposes to allow each member a certain length of time for everyone to speak for their departments.
- \_\_\_ 6. Proposes issues that have already been discussed.
- \_\_\_ 7. Proposes a solution that is inefficient or inappropriate.
- \_\_\_ 8. Proposes to the group that the departments prioritize their budgets.
- \_\_\_ 9. Proposes that the members do not allocate all the available funds, suggests placing some funds in a "kitty" or "pot".
- \_\_\_ 10. Proposes that money should go to requested programs and needs that are most important to the entire organization.
- \_\_\_ 11. Proposes budgets for other departments that are far below the requests from the departmental representatives.

- 12. Proposes to eliminate some of the department's requests before hearing the opinions of other members.
- 13. Proposes that another department, besides his/hers, should make cuts in their budget.
- 14. Proposes an alternative method to satisfy a request of another department in order to reduce that department's budget.
- 15. Proposes to the other members a method to lower the budget of the assessee's department.

### Sensitivity

Definition. Showing concern for the feelings, needs, and points of view of others. Letting people know you are aware of their individual situations.

- 1. Acknowledges that one must work with other members.
- 2. Acknowledges the contributions the other departments made to the organization.
- 3. Acknowledges the importance of other departments' needs and requested programs.
- 4. Downplays the past work of another department.
- 5. Supports the increased budget of another department.
- 6. Supports the departmental representatives (they know more about their departments than do the other members).
- 7. Does not support some of the requests from other departments since these departments have had failures in the past.
- 8. Supports the need for more R & D researchers.
- 9. Acknowledges that compromises will have to be made by all departments.
- 10. States that the assessee's department is not going to make any cuts.

- \_\_\_ 11. Acknowledges the importance of other departments to the organization.
- \_\_\_ 12. Acknowledges the views and opinions of the other members.
- \_\_\_ 13. Downplays the validity of another member's criticisms.
- \_\_\_ 14. Does not acknowledge the mentioned justifications of another member against the department's budget.

## Summary Frame-of-References

Problem Analysis

Definition. Breaking up a problem into parts such that the parts can be examined for their importance, interrelationships, or need for additional information.

Key Words. Recognizes, Asks, Relates, Inquires, Checks, Investigates.

|                       |   |  |
|-----------------------|---|--|
| Most Effective (ME)   | - | Relationships of information.<br>Integration of separate pieces of information.  |
| Effective (E)         | - | Specific questions about specific issues.<br>Taking the needed information into account.   |
| Average (A)           | - | General questions about specific issues.<br>Identifying some piece of information about an issue.                                    |
| Ineffective (I)       | - | General questions that cut across different issues.<br>Identifying information that has been provided.                               |
| Most Ineffective (MI) | - | Not identifying information or problems.<br>Inquiring about information that has been provided.<br>Forming inaccurate relationships. |

---

CRITERIA: Specificity of questioning - the more specific the questions, the more effective the behavior. Information incorporated into the analysis of a problem - the more information incorporated, the more effective the behavior.

Problem Solution

**Definition.** The assessee suggests, recommends, or outlines actions, methods, or strategies that help in the resolution of problems.

**Key Words.** Proposes, Suggests, Recommends, Delegates.

|                       |   |  |
|-----------------------|---|--|
| Most Effective (ME)   | - | Specific and detailed solutions to specific problems.<br>Multiple solutions to a single problem.                     |
| Effective (E)         | - | Specific solutions to specific problems.<br>Making decisions after checking the needed information.                  |
| Average (A)           | - | General solutions and general actions to a problem.<br>Solutions with general actions for carrying out the solution. |
| Ineffective (I)       | - | Obvious solutions.<br>Solutions with no action plans for carrying them out.  |
| Most Ineffective (MI) | - | Making decisions without checking the needed information.<br>Not forming solutions.<br>Inaccurate solutions.         |

---

**CRITERIA:** Specificity of solution - the more specific the solution, the more effective the behavior.  
Complexity of solution - the more detailed the solution (number of distinct steps), the more effective the behavior.  
Amount of information used to form a solution - the more information used, the more effective the behavior.

Sensitivity

Definition. Showing concern for the feelings, needs, and points of view of others. Letting people know you are aware of their individual situations.

Key Words. Apologizes, Acknowledges, Supports, Respects, Thanks.

|                       |   |
|-----------------------|---|
| Most Effective (ME)   | - Sensitive actions.<br>Sensitivity towards the person being addressed.   |
| Effective (E)         | - Sensitivity towards a product or aspect of the person being addressed.<br>Showing concern for the needs of others.            |
| Average (A)           | - General consideration and courtesy behaviors.<br>Supporting others who are not present.<br>Putting others at ease.            |
| Ineffective (I)       | - Criticisms of a product or aspect of a person with justification.<br>Being unaware of the concerns and/or opinions of others. |
| Most Ineffective (MI) | - Insensitive behavior without justification.<br>Criticisms directed at a person.   |

---

CRITERIA: Sensitive behaviors are more effective than behaviors which show a lack of sensitivity and these are more effective than insensitive behaviors.  
Sensitive actions are most effective; then comes sensitive words, then general consideration, then a lack of sensitivity, and finally insensitivity is least effective.

## List of In-Basket Behaviors Matched to Dimensions

## Sexual Harassment:

- Problem Analysis** - Assessee sees the need to question Bill about the sexual harassment complaint.
- Problem Solution** - Assessee will meet with Bill (Monday, 6/8) to question him, then talk to Cindy (Tuesday, 6/9) about what went on in the meeting with Bill to resolve the sexual harassment complaint.
- Sensitivity** - Thanked Cindy for the information about the sexual harassment complaint. Apologized to Cindy because of the incident.

## Val-U-Trac lights:

- Problem Analysis** - Has Frank (assistant) investigate whether some faulty lights have been already sold. If some faulty lights have been sold, has Frank (assistant) inquire about what action will be taken to recall the faulty lights sold.
- Problem Solution** - Has Frank (assistant) remove the Val-U-Trac lights from the shelves immediately. Follows up on the removal of the lights by calling Frank (assistant) to check if they were removed on Monday 6/1.

## Quality Inspection Report:

- Problem Solution** - Assessee schedules a staff meeting (with no specific date) in response to the report about the dirty condition of the department.

## Employee Theft:

- Problem Analysis** - Proposes to call John (assistant store manager) on Monday 6/1 to find out what should be done about employee theft in his department.
- Sensitivity** - Thanks Lori for her information about employee theft in the department.



**Customer Complaint:**

**Problem Analysis** - Has Frank (assistant) talk to Lori about this complaint with no additional instructions.

**Problem Solution** - Has Frank (assistant) write a letter of apology to Brenda Miller (customer).  
Has Frank (assistant) talk to Lori about this complaint with no additional instructions.

**Sensitivity** - Has Frank (assistant) write a letter of apology to Brenda Miller (customer).  
(Same as Problem Solution).

**Summer Sale:**

**Problem Analysis** - Assessee recognizes the relationship between the faulty Val-U-Trac lights and their inclusion in the Summer Sale bulletin.

**Problem Solution** - Removes the Val-U-Trac lights from the Summer Sale bulletin.

**Departmental Manager's Meeting:**

**Problem Solution** - Schedules a meeting with Frank (assistant) on Tuesday, 6/9, to discuss the departmental manager's meeting.

**Dress-code Violations:**

**Problem Solution** - Assessee schedules a meeting for Monday, 6/8, in response to the report of dress code violations in his department.

**Employee Time off request:**

**Problem Solution** - Delegates the time-off request to Frank (assistant) without any instructions.

**Performance Rating/Transfer Complaint:**

**Problem Analysis** - Wants to question Glen Chandler to obtain information in response to Glen's request for transfer.

**Problem Solution** - Schedules a meeting with Glen Chandler on Wednesday, 6/10, to resolve the performance/transfer issue.

**Staff Training:**

**Problem Solution** - Assessee made a note on the calendar as to when the recommendations for training needed to be handed in.

**Valley Furniture:**

**Problem Solution** - Has Frank (assistant) call John Peters (Valley Furn. Sales Rep) without any instructions in response to Valley Furniture asking to increase its order by 10%.

**Promotion Recommendation:**

**Problem Solution** - Assessee made a note on the calendar noting the date when a recommendation for Lori was needed.

## List of Role Play Behaviors Categorized by Dimension

## PROBLEM ANALYSIS

Identifies that there is room for improvement in the employee's performance.

Identifies that at the old store where the employee worked was smaller and he didn't have to delegate as much.

Inquires whether some people in the employee's department don't belong.

Inquires whether some people in the employee's department are destructive to the department.

In response to hearing that the staffers don't do their work, the assessee asks what happens when they don't do their work.

Asks the employee for input about an issue that was discussed. (Also Sensitivity).

Inquires how the employee handles the scheduling of his staffers.

Relates the problems that the employee is having to the adjustment to a new situation.

Identifies that the employee has done a good job in the past.

## PROBLEM SOLUTION

Suggests the need to open the lines of communication.

Suggests that the employee delegate responsibility more thoroughly.

Wants the employee to delegate, let the staffers do their work and have the employee guide them.

Suggests that the employee expand his delegation.

Suggests that the employee delegate some decisions. Let the staffers handle some of the lesser decisions.

Wants the employee to groom the staffers, then the employee can move up in the company and have someone to take his place.

Suggests that the employee can't just tell them to do something, he needs to teach them through the delegation of responsibility.

Suggests that the employee needs more patience in dealing with his staffers.

Proposes that the employee provide his experience and training to his staffers, so that they can improve.

Suggests that the employee sit down with the staffer and teach in a patience manner how to do the job.

Proposes that the employee tell the staffers what needs to be done, set a goal, and let them accomplish it.

States that, at this store, they rotate the weekend schedule to give everyone a weekend off.

Proposes that the employee have a meeting with his staffers to bring some problems into the open. That way we can open the lines of communication.

Proposes that the employee needs to work with the staffers.

Proposes that the employee needs to have patience with the staffers.

Suggests that the employee delegate more responsibility to his staffers.

Proposes that the employee show the staffers how to do a task and be with them until they've done it a few times and are comfortable with it.

States that the employee come to him if the employee needs any help or advice. (Also Sensitivity).

#### SENSITIVITY

Asks how the employee likes working at the new store.

Acknowledges that the employee has, overall, done a decent job.

States that the employee knows his job and does it well.

Acknowledges that it is tough to have patience. Assessee also has problems with patience. But, it needs to be worked on.

Asks the employee for input about an issue that was discussed. (Also Problem Analysis).

Agrees with the employee that the staffers should come to him with their complaints.

Acknowledges that it is not the employee's fault if the staffers don't bring their problems to him.

After giving the employee an average rating, the assessee acknowledges that the employee is used to higher ratings.

Has confidence in the employee; expects the employee to get higher ratings in the future.

States that they cannot wipe out all the staffers when a new manager comes in. The employee needs to work with the staffers.

Acknowledges that it is tough to have patience.

Acknowledges that having patience is tough.

States that the employee come to him if the employee needs any help or advice. (Also Problem Solution).

Acknowledges that it is tough to get started at a new store.

Believes that things will improve for the employee.

Expects employee to do well in the future.

Thanks the employee for his time.

## LGD Behaviors Matched to Dimensions

## PROBLEM ANALYSIS

Identifies the total amount of money allocated for this year (\$6 million).

Recognizes the dollar amount increase from last year's budget to this year's budget (\$1.8 million).

Acknowledges that compromises will have to be made by all departments.

Mentions the need that R & D has for computers and data processing.

Asks another member to prioritize his budget requests.

States that Data Processing was overbudget in the past due to price increases of data processing equipment.

Recognizes and accounts for being overbudget by adding in 5% of his present budget to form a revised base budget.

Identifies three requests for his department (three data processors, software training, increased computer capacity).

Justifies his personnel request by saying that they will help to improve service.

Justifies his software training request by saying that the software will be useless if people aren't trained to use it.

Justifies his request for increased computer capacity by mentioning its importance to the company and the problems that may result if this request is not funded.

Identifies how much additional money (above his base budget) he needs to fund his department's requests.

Prioritizes his budget requests.

Identifies the future impact of the decision mentioned above (eliminating the three data processors will lessen the quality of service).

Asks another member for additional information.

Asks another member for additional information.

Clarifies information (how much money needs to be cut from the total budget) for the other members.

Asks for clarification on some dollar figures for the requests of another department.

Identifies information that has already been brought up (need to cut \$500,000 from the total budget).

Explains why he can't cut the cost of the computer capacity request to another member (this is the cost of the next update for the computer).

Clarifies his dollar requests for another member.

Identifies the impact of the decision mentioned above (training will take longer).

Provides dollar figures for the requests of another department.

Identifies how much money Public Relations will have for a sporting event when taking into account that they were 30% overbudget and staying within a 40% increase.

#### PROBLEM SOLUTION

Proposes that each department receive an additional \$300,000 as a compromise if the group cannot agree on a budget.

Finalizes a decision about allocating funds (everybody gets a 40% increase) if they can't come to a consensus. Asks if this plan is agreeable to everyone.

Suggests that a request in his department can be eliminated and that money used to fund another request in order to lower his department's budget.

Proposes to the other members a way to cut down on his software training request (train half of the data processors now and half later) in order to reduce his department's and the overall budget.

Eliminates his request for three data processors to lower his department's and the overall budget. Eliminated this request without hearing any criticisms about this request from the other members.

Identifies how much money Public Relations will have for a sporting event when taking into account that they were 30% overbudget and staying within a 40% increase.

#### SENSITIVITY

Acknowledges that compromises will have to be made by all departments.

Acknowledges that he must work with the other group members.

Acknowledges that compromises will have to be made by all departments.

Acknowledges the opinions of others by withdrawing his proposal of a \$300,000 increase and switching to a 40% increase.

Asks if everyone is agreeable to the proposal of a 40% increase.

Sees if everyone is agreeable to the decision to eliminate his personnel request.



List of In-Basket Behaviors Matched to  
Dimensions and Evaluated

**Sexual Harassment:**

- Problem Analysis - Assessee sees the need to question Bill  
A about the sexual harassment complaint.
- Problem Solution - Assessee will meet with Bill (Monday,  
I 6/8) to question him, then talk to Cindy  
(Tuesday, 6/9) about what went on in  
the meeting with Bill to resolve the  
sexual harassment complaint.
- Sensitivity - Thanked Cindy for the information about  
A the sexual harassment complaint.  
A Apologized to Cindy because of the  
incident.

**Val-U-Trac lights:**

- Problem Analysis - Has Frank (assistant) investigate  
E whether some faulty lights have been  
already sold.  
E If some faulty lights have been sold,  
has Frank (assistant) inquire about what  
action will be taken to recall the  
faulty lights sold.
- Problem Solution - Has Frank (assistant) remove the Val-U-  
E Trac lights from the shelves  
immediately.  
E Follows up on the removal of the lights  
by calling Frank (assistant) to check if  
they were removed on Monday 6/1.

**Quality Inspection Report:**

- Problem Solution - Assessee schedules a staff meeting (with  
I no specific date) in response to the  
report about the dirty condition of the  
department.

**Employee Theft:**

- Problem Analysis - Proposes to call John (assistant store  
A manager) on Monday 6/1 to find out what  
should be done about employee theft in  
his department.
- Sensitivity - Thanks Lori for her information about  
A employee theft in the department.

**Customer Complaint:**

**Problem Analysis -** Has Frank (assistant) talk to Lori about  
I this complaint with no additional  
instructions.

**Problem Solution -** Has Frank (assistant) write a letter of  
A apology to Brenda Miller (customer).  
A Has Frank (assistant) talk to Lori about  
this complaint with no additional  
instructions.

**Sensitivity -** Has Frank (assistant) write a letter of  
E apology to Brenda Miller (customer).  
(Same as Problem Solution).

**Summer Sale:**

**Problem Analysis -** Assessee recognizes the relationship  
E between the faulty Val-U-Trac lights and  
their inclusion in the Summer Sale  
bulletin.

**Problem Solution -** Removes the Val-U-Trac lights from the  
ME Summer Sale bulletin.

**Departmental Manager's Meeting:**

**Problem Solution -** Schedules a meeting with Frank  
A (assistant) on Tuesday, 6/9, to discuss  
the departmental manager's meeting.

**Dress-code Violations:**

**Problem Solution -** Assessee schedules a meeting for Monday,  
I 6/8, in response to the report of dress  
code violations in his department.

**Employee Time off request:**

**Problem Solution -** Delegates the time-off request to Frank  
I (assistant) without any instructions.

**Performance Rating/Transfer Complaint:**

**Problem Analysis -** Wants to question Glen Chandler to  
A obtain information in response to Glen's  
request for transfer.

**Problem Solution -** Schedules a meeting with Glen Chandler  
A on Wednesday, 6/10, to resolve the  
performance/transfer issue.

**Staff Training:**

**Problem Solution** - Assessee made a note on the calendar as to when the recommendations for training needed to be handed in.  
MI

**Valley Furniture:**

**Problem Solution** - Has Frank (assistant) call John Peters (Valley Furn. Sales Rep) without any instructions in response to Valley Furniture asking to increase its order by 10%.  
MI

**Promotion Recommendation:**

**Problem Solution** - Assessee made a note on the calendar noting the date when a recommendation for Lori was needed.  
MI

List of Role Play Behaviors Categorized  
by Dimension and Evaluated

PROBLEM ANALYSIS

- A Identifies that there is room for improvement in the employee's performance.
- ME Identifies that at the old store where the employee worked was smaller and he didn't have to delegate as much.
- A Inquires whether some people in the employee's department don't belong.
- I Inquires whether some people in the employee's department are destructive to the department.
- E In response to hearing that the staffers don't do their work, the assessee asks what happens when they don't do their work.
- A Asks the employee for input about an issue that was discussed.
- A Inquires how the employee handles the scheduling of his staffers.
- ME Relates the problems that the employee is having to the adjustment to a new situation.
- A Identifies that the employee has done a good job in the past.

PROBLEM SOLUTION

- I Suggests the need to open the lines of communication.
- I Suggests that the employee delegate responsibility more thoroughly.
- A Wants the employee to delegate, let the staffers do their work and have the employee guide them.
- I Suggests that the employee expand his delegation.
- A Suggests that the employee delegate some decisions. Let the staffers handle some of the lesser decisions.

- A Wants the employee to groom the staffers, then the employee can move up in the company and have someone to take his place.
- E Suggests that the employee can't just tell them to do something, he needs to teach them through the delegation of responsibility.
- I Suggests that the employee needs more patience in dealing with his staffers.
- A Proposes that the employee provide his experience and training to his staffers, so that they can improve.
- E Suggests that the employee sit down with the staffer and teach in a patience manner how to do the job.
- A Proposes that the employee tell the staffers what needs to be done, set a goal, and let them accomplish it.
- E States that, at this store, they rotate the weekend schedule to give everyone a weekend off.
- E Proposes that the employee have a meeting with his staffers to bring some problems into the open. That way we can open the lines of communication.
- I Proposes that the employee needs to work with the staffers.
- I Proposes that the employee needs to have patience with the staffers.
- I Suggests that the employee delegate more responsibility to his staffers.
- E Proposes that the employee show the staffers how to do a task and be with them until they've done it a few times and are comfortable with it.
- A States that the employee come to him if the employee needs any help or advice.

#### SENSITIVITY

- A Asks how the employee likes working at the new store.
- E Acknowledges that the employee has, overall, done a decent job.

- E States that the employee knows his job and does it well.
- A Acknowledges that it is tough to have patience. Assessee also has problems with patience. But, it needs to be worked on.
- A Asks the employee for input about an issue that was discussed.
- A Agrees with the employee that the staffers should come to him with their complaints.
- E Acknowledges that it is not the employee's fault if the staffers don't bring their problems to him.
- A After giving the employee an average rating, the assessee acknowledges that the employee is used to higher ratings.
- E Has confidence in the employee; expects the employee to get higher ratings in the future.
- A States that they cannot wipe out all the staffers when a new manager comes in. The employee needs to work with the staffers.
- A Acknowledges that it is tough to have patience.
- A Acknowledges that having patience is tough.
- ME States that the employee come to him if the employee needs any help or advice.
- E Acknowledges that it is tough to get started at a new store.
- E Believes that things will improve for the employee.
- E Expects employee to do well in the future.
- A Thanks the employee for his time.

## LGD Behaviors Matched to Dimensions

## PROBLEM ANALYSIS

Identifies the total amount of money allocated for this year (\$6 million). (I)

Recognizes the dollar amount increase from last year's budget to this year's budget (\$1.8 million). (A)

Acknowledges that compromises will have to be made by all departments. (I)

Mentions the need that R & D has for computers and data processing. (ME)

Asks another member to prioritize his budget requests. (A)

States that Data Processing was overbudget in the past due to price increases of data processing equipment. (A)

Recognizes and accounts for being overbudget by adding in 5% of his present budget to form a revised base budget. (E)

Identifies three requests for his department (three data processors, software training, increased computer capacity). (A)

Justifies his personnel request by saying that they will help to improve service. (A)

Justifies his software training request by saying that the software will be useless if people aren't trained to use it. (I)

Justifies his request for increased computer capacity by mentioning its importance to the company and the problems that may result if this request is not funded. (ME)

Identifies how much additional money (above his base budget) he needs to fund his department's requests. (A)

Prioritizes his budget requests. (A)

Identifies the future impact of the decision mentioned above (eliminating the three data processors will lessen the quality of service). (E)

Asks another member for additional information. (A)

Asks another member for additional information. (A)

Clarifies information (how much money needs to be cut from the total budget) for the other members. (A)

Asks for clarification on some dollar figures for the requests of another department. (I)

Identifies information that has already been brought up (need to cut \$500,000 from the total budget). (MI)

Explains why he can't cut the cost of the computer capacity request to another member (this is the cost of the next update for the computer). (E)

Clarifies his dollar requests for another member. (A)

Identifies the impact of the decision mentioned above (training will take longer). (E)

Provides dollar figures for the requests of another department. (A)

Identifies how much money Public Relations will have for a sporting event when taking into account that they were 30% overbudget and staying within a 40% increase. (A)

#### PROBLEM SOLUTION

Proposes that each department receive an additional \$300,000 as a compromise if the group cannot agree on a budget. (MI)

Finalizes a decision about allocating funds (everybody gets a 40% increase) if they can't come to a consensus. Asks if this plan is agreeable to everyone. (A)

Suggests that a request in his department can be eliminated and that money used to fund another request in order to lower his department's budget. (E)

Proposes to the other members a way to cut down on his software training request (train half of the data processors now and half later) in order to reduce his department's and the overall budget. (E)



Eliminates his request for three data processors to lower his department's and the overall budget. Eliminated this request without hearing any criticisms about this request from the other members. (MI)

Identifies how much money Public Relations will have for a sporting event when taking into account that they were 30% overbudget and staying within a 40% increase. (A)

#### SENSITIVITY

Acknowledges that compromises will have to be made by all departments. (A)

Acknowledges that he must work with the other group members. (A)

Acknowledges that compromises will have to be made by all departments. (A)

Acknowledges the opinions of others by withdrawing his proposal of a \$300,000 increase and switching to a 40% increase. (E)

Asks if everyone is agreeable to the proposal of a 40% increase. (A)

Sees if everyone is agreeable to the decision to eliminate his personnel request. (A)

Appendix H  
Whole Training Script for the Role-Play

## Whole Training Script for Role Play

### Introduction

For this first session, the emphasis is on observing, recording, and writing reports based on the behaviors displayed in your exercise. Once completed, these reports will be presented to two other assessors in a second session. During the second session, ratings for each assessee will be generated, based on reports of exercise performance written by you and two other assessors. Thus, all reports must contain the information needed to form accurate ratings. It is important for you to produce a report that contains accurate information on behaviors displayed in your exercise.

Before beginning formal training, a brief discussion of behavior is needed. What you are going to be observing, recording, and reporting are behaviors. There is an important distinction between behaviors and impressions. Behaviors are actions, mainly what the assessee says, does, or writes down. Impressions reflect irrelevant factors: how the assessee dresses, or looks; the assessee's speech mannerisms; or feelings that you have about the assessee. Impressions such as, "I think this guy is a jerk," without any behaviors to back it up, should not be included in your reports. Instead you should just report the behaviors that you have observed, whether they are good or bad.

### The Exercise

In order to better understand your task, I will now describe the exercise. The exercise you will observe is called a staffer role-play. The assessee is role playing the manager of a large department store in charge of all store operations. The assessee is conducting a performance appraisal interview with a subordinate who is the new manager of the furniture department.

The new department manager is having performance problems. This is the first performance appraisal interview with the new subordinate. The basic goal for the assessee is to identify performance problems and develop some action plans to resolve them.

You will be observing videotapes of assessees conducting performance appraisal interviews with the new employee. In the videotapes you will view different assessees who play the role of the store manager, however, the same person will always play the role of the subordinate.

Before beginning the role-play, the assessees were provided with information about the role and given time to prepare for the exercise. After reviewing the role-plays, they conducted the appraisal interview in the method they felt most appropriate. The next handout contains the information given to the assessees and describes the

exercise. What I would like you to do now is to read through the role-play.

#### HAND OUT ROLE-PLAYS

First, let's talk about the subordinate. The subordinate is new to the store and this is his first performance appraisal interview with the store manager (i.e., with the assessee). The new store is larger than the previous store at which the subordinate worked. He had good performance appraisals at the previous store. The new subordinate has found working in a larger store to be more demanding. However, he believes that he has adjusted well and done a good job. Thus, the subordinate expects to receive a good evaluation at the interview. The subordinate knows that he has had some problems, but working extra hours has corrected them.

The handout given to the assessee mentions the problems associated with the employee's performance. These problems include: Poor decision-making judgments (e.g., ordering of picnic tables without checking last year's inventory; scheduling the same full-time employees to work weekend nights about which they have complained); not getting things done in the department even though the employee works 60 hours a week (e.g., doing the work of a staffer); staffers complaining about their lack of responsibility; and no patience and concern for the

staffers (e.g., yelled at a staffer, and told staffers to find how the inventory system works for themselves).

With this scenario, you should be aware of several things. First, the subordinate thinks that he has done a good job and is going to get a good performance appraisal rating. So, when the problems are brought up by the assessee, the subordinate is going to be surprised and try to make excuses. The assessee must make the subordinate aware of these problems and try to convince him that he has to take action to resolve these problems. The assessee should do this by analyzing the problems and using the information provided. The assessee can't just bring up the problems and expect the subordinate to accept them. So, the assessee must show him that these problems do exist through examples and analysis of the problems.

Second, the effective assessee should address all the problems that have been mentioned on the instruction sheet. The intent of the meeting is to discuss the subordinate's performance and try to solve the problems. If problems are omitted, the interview doesn't meet its objective. In addition, if the assessee doesn't attempt to solve these problems, the interview is not as effective as it could be.

What the assessee should do in this interview is bring up problems associated with the subordinate's performance, try to determine their causes, and form solutions designed

to remedy the problems. When determining causes and forming solutions, the effective assessee should work with the subordinate. The assessee should ask him for information and input, and get the subordinate's feelings concerning problems and solutions. The assessee should exchange information and look to the subordinate for input.

Finally, an effective assessee should recognize relationships between the subordinate's background (e.g., new to a larger store, working long hours) and the performance problems. The relationships between these two information sources may explain probable causes for the subordinate's problems. In addition, it shows that the assessee is using the available information to analyze problems.

The progression of the interview is usually as follows. The assessee begins with introductory comments (e.g., welcoming the subordinate, trying to put him at ease, recognizing past performance appraisals). After this, the assessee will begin to address the problems. At this point, the assessee may use one of two strategies. The first strategy is gathering information and analyzing the performance problems. After going through this process for all problems, the assessee will then begin to generate solutions to the problems. The second strategy will have the assessee gathering information about a particular

problem, analyzing it, and forming a solution for that problem. Then, the assessee will move on to another problem. After completing a strategy, the assessee will wrap up the interview. Here, the assessee may summarize what was discussed, provide the subordinate with encouragement, schedule another meeting, or simply say that the interview is completed.

Knowing how the interview progresses and knowing what behaviors can be exhibited in the exercise will help to focus your observation, note taking, and report writing on relevant behaviors.

If you are uncertain about the role-play instructions or the information that I have provided, feel free to ask any questions pertaining to the role-play for further clarification.

PAUSE

### Training

Before viewing the videotapes, I will provide you with information needed to write reports. Report Writing is made up of a number of different components (e.g., knowledge of dimensions, matching behaviors to dimensions, judging the effectiveness of behaviors, observation, and note taking). These components will be reviewed in this training session. However, one thing that you should recognize, and I will emphasize throughout the training



session is that all the components are interrelated. In order to be effective at report writing, knowledge of each component is needed. The quality of the report depends on how well you understand the exercise and dimensions, match behaviors to dimensions, judge the effectiveness of behavior, observe, and take notes. Inaccuracy in any of these components can lead to incomplete or inaccurate reports. What I will attempt to show you in this training session are the relationships between components, and report writing is an integration of the separate components.

#### Understanding the Dimensions

To be considered an effective performer, a manager must show several characteristics. The manager must be considerate of others. An effective manager must also be able to break a problem into parts and recognize what information is needed to solve a problem. The manager must also be able to formulate effective solutions. These characteristics of effective performance are referred to as dimensions. Basically, dimensions represent categories of similar behaviors that are used to classify behaviors. Dimensions make up a large part of judging the effectiveness of behaviors. The use of dimensions makes judgment easier. When describing behaviors in the report, behaviors will need to be matched according to dimensions.

Your understanding of the dimensions will improve your ability to match behaviors to dimensions, judge behaviors in terms of effectiveness, observe behaviors, and take notes. So, how well you understand what the dimensions represent, will influence how well you can perform all aspects of report writing.

Your exercise was designed to tap certain dimensions. These dimensions represent the majority of behaviors observed in the exercise. You will use three dimensions: Problem Analysis, Problem Solution, and Sensitivity.

#### HAND OUT DIMENSION DEFINITIONS

Please look at the definition for Problem Analysis that is on the handout. The definition reads, "breaking up a problem into parts such that the parts can be examined for their importance, interrelationships, or need for additional information." In addition, summary behaviors are also provided. Please look at these behaviors. For example, Problem Analysis occurs when "an individual identifies, integrates, or inquires about components of the problem with the intent of determining the nature of the problem. As you can see, the dimension has three major components: 1) identifying needed information, 2) recognizing relationships, and 3) questioning for additional information.

The second dimension is Problem Solution. Please look

at its definition on the handout. The definition states, "the assessee suggests, recommends, or outlines actions, methods, or strategies that help in the resolution of problems." Now look at the summary behaviors on the handout. Problem Solution is involved when "an individual suggests one or more specific ways to resolve problems or organize discussion. The individual may recommend or decide on a course of action that remedies several problems or issues." Behaviors matched to Problem Solution mostly consist of proposing a plan of action for addressing a particular problem.

The third dimension is Sensitivity. Please look at its definition on the handout. The definition states, "showing concern for the feelings, needs, and points of view of others. Letting people know you are aware of their individual situations." Now please read the summary behaviors. Sensitivity is involved when "an individual acknowledges others' concerns, problems, opinions, and requests and supports them. For example, the individual may attempt to ease others' concerns, support or respect others' concerns and viewpoints." Behaviors matched to Sensitivity consist of being aware of the concerns and problems of others, supporting them, and general consideration.

I will now take a few minutes to answer any questions

that you may have regarding the dimension definitions.

PAUSE

### Matching Behaviors to Dimensions

In order to better understand the dimensions, we will examine the behaviors that represent each dimension. The dimension definitions serve as a guide for matching behaviors to dimensions. This task of matching behaviors to dimensions is important for report writing. If you cannot accurately match behaviors to dimensions, you will not be able to observe, take notes or report the behavior accurately. So, in order to write effective reports, you must be able to match behaviors to dimensions.

The next handout consists of three behavioral checklists that contain several behaviors that could be exhibited in the role plays. This list is not an exhaustive one, but it does provide examples of behaviors that are relevant to the dimensions in the role-plays.

### HAND OUT CHECKLISTS

What I would like to do now is to examine the behaviors that are listed on the checklists. Again, let me remind you that these are not all behaviors relevant to the three dimensions that occur in the role play.

First, let's look at Problem Analysis. Remember that Problem Analysis has three major aspects: 1) recognizing relationships; 2) questioning to obtain additional information; and 3) identifying what information is needed

in order to resolve an issue. Thus, "recognizing," "asking," "relating," "inquiring," "investigating," and "checking" are all key words that are relevant to Problem Analysis. Using these key words can help match behaviors to dimensions. If a behavior can be described using one of the key words, the behavior most likely fits into Problem Analysis.

The first statement on the Problem Analysis checklist reads, "assessee inquires whether the employee has had any problems adjusting to the store." This behavior is considered Problem Analysis because it is attempting to uncover additional information. If the assessee, at any point during the role-play, asks a question concerning whether the employee was having problems adjusting to the store, you should make a note of this behavior. It is not necessary that the question be phrased in the exact same way as it is here. What is important is what is being said, not how it is said.

The second item reads, "assessee asks the employee whether there is anything that he would like to bring up." Again, the assessee is attempting to gather additional information in order to generate an effective solution.

The third item states, "assessee inquires whether the employee checked last year's inventory before ordering the picnic tables." This behavior is another that attempts to

gather additional information. However, it is a specific request for information in response to a specific problem (the ordering of picnic tables).

The fourth item states, "assessee inquires whether the employee had ever received any complaints from his subordinates."

The fifth item reads, "assessee inquires whether the employee consulted his subordinates regarding their scheduling preferences." This item also attempts to gather additional information in response to the specific problem of scheduling staffers.

The sixth item reads, "assessee inquires whether there is a reason why the employee always schedules the full-time employees for weekend nights."

The seventh item reads, "assessee inquires about what the employee believes is the reason that his subordinates are not doing their work."

The eighth item reads, "assessee inquires whether the employee's subordinates needed more training."

The ninth item states, "assessee inquires what the employee has to say about a complaint."

Up to now, all the Problem Analysis items have addressed one aspect of Problem Analysis; obtaining additional information. Item 10 deals with another aspect of Problem Analysis. It reads, "assessee relates the

employee's adjustment to the new store to the problems that he is experiencing." This item relates two separate pieces of information in order to better understand a particular problem or situation (i.e., subordinate being new and problems he is experiencing).

Item 11 is another one that addresses obtaining additional information. It states, "assessee inquires as to the reason the employee works so many hours."

Item 12 reads, "assessee relates the employee's lack of patience in his dealings with his subordinates to his long hours." Two separate incidents have been related in order to better analyze one of the problems (i.e., lack of patience and long hours). Anytime separate pieces of information are related, the behavior can be considered Problem Analysis.

Item 13 reads, "assessee asks the employee what he thinks could be done to improve his relations with his subordinates."

Item 14 states, "assessee investigates how the employee took care of the problem when his subordinates didn't do the work or didn't do it well." This item may be a bit trickier than the others, since it may or may not involve a series of questions or just one. This behavior may occur through a line of questioning that addresses a particular problem or a single question.

Item 15 states, "assessee inquires whether the employee has any questions about his responsibilities."

What we just read was a representative list of behaviors categorized as Problem Analysis. The next handout is a list of Problem Analysis behaviors that can be expected to occur in the role plays. At this time, please look through these behaviors and try to determine why these behaviors are considered Problem Analysis. Feel free to ask any questions if you are uncertain about any of the behaviors.

PAUSE

On the next handout is a list of behaviors classified as Problem Solution that can be expected to occur in the role plays. Again, this list is not exhaustive, it represents a sampling of the Problem Solution behaviors.

Recall that Problem Solution consists of proposing a plan of action for addressing a particular problem. Keywords for this dimension include: "proposes," "suggests," "recommends," and "delegates". These keywords are used to match behaviors to dimensions. Any behavior that can be described by using one of the keywords is, most likely, Problem Solution.

The first Problem Solution item states, "assessee suggests that the employee talk with his subordinates and find out how they feel about working nights and weekends."



This item describes a specific action to be taken in response to a problem. Thus, it is considered Problem Solution.

The second item states, "assessee suggests that if the staffers did not want to work nights and weekends that he should rotate them." Again, this is another action plan in response to a specific problem.

The third item reads, "assessee suggests that the employee explain to the staffers how the inventory system works."

The fourth item reads, "assessee recommends that the employee exert more authority and let the staffers know who is boss."

The fifth item states, "assessee suggests that the employee sit down with his subordinates and attempt to develop a better working relationship."

The sixth item states, "assessee suggests that the employee might want to share his knowledge so that his subordinates would have a better understanding of how the company works."

Item 7 is slightly different than the first six. It states, "assessee outlines what the employee should have done when describing errors." Outlining a plan of action means that the assessee should describe a detailed sequence of steps that should be taken in solving a problem.

The eighth item is another that suggests a plan of action for a specific problem. It states, "assessee recommends that the employee try delegating more responsibility to his subordinates."

Item 9 reads, "assessee suggests to the employee that he could threaten to reduce the hours of the staffers if they did not do their jobs."

Item 10 reads, "assessee suggests that the employee show his subordinates what he wants them to do rather than doing it himself."

Item 11 reads, "assessee suggests that a goal could be obtained without specifying the manner in which it could be accomplished." What is meant by a goal is that there is some standard of performance that the assessee would like the subordinate to obtain. In addition, this item has two parts. The first part is suggesting a goal. The second part is the lack of specification about how the goal is to be reached. In order to note that this particular behavior occurred, both parts must be exhibited. However, if just a goal was stated without the second part, it would still be considered Problem Solution.

Item 12 states, "assessee suggests that the employee is going to have to develop better communications with his subordinates."

Item 13 states, "assessee suggests that the employee

hand out notecards with responsibilities listed on them to his subordinates as a solution to the delegation problem."

Item 14 reads, "assessee suggests that the employee needs to take time to do a better job on his scheduling and ordering." Again, this is another specific solution to one of the problems being addressed in the interview.

The last Problem Solution item states, "assessee outlines action plans for employee development." As in item 7, what is meant by outlining action plans is that a specific sequence of steps is described. For this item, the problem being referred to involves professional development of the subordinate or staffers.

The next handout is a list of additional Problem Solution behaviors that can be expected to occur in the role plays. At this time please look through these behaviors and determine why these behaviors are considered Problem Solution. Feel free to ask any questions if you are uncertain about any of the behaviors.

PAUSE

On the next handout is a list of behaviors classified as Sensitivity that can be expected to occur in the role plays. Again, this list is not exhaustive, it represents a sampling of the Sensitivity behaviors.

Remember that Sensitivity behaviors consist of being aware of others' concerns and problems, supporting them,

and respecting others' opinions and concerns. Some keywords for Sensitivity are "apologizes," "supports," "acknowledges," "thanks," and "respects". Any behavior that can be described using one of these keywords is likely to be Sensitivity.

The first Sensitivity item states, "assessee puts the employee at ease by asking him how he likes being at the new store." This item is considered Sensitivity because the assessee is showing concern by attempting to reduce some of the subordinate's apprehension.

The second item states that the "assessee acknowledges that a lot of employees are apprehensive about the appraisal process." This item shows that the assessee is aware that the employee may feel a little uneasy about the interview. Thus, this item represents Sensitivity.

The third item reads, "assessee puts the employee at ease by acknowledging that his past performance appraisals were good."

Item 4 states, "assessee acknowledges the difficulty of adjusting to a new store." Again, this item shows that the assessee is aware of the employee's situation.

Item 5 reads, "assessee states that he/she has confidence in the employee." This is an item that shows support for the employee which makes this behavior Sensitivity.

Item 6 reads, "assessee indicates that he/she is impressed by all of the hours the employee has been working."

Item 7 reads, "assessee compliments the employee on the responsibility he feels for his position." In addition to supporting or showing concern, complimenting the employee is also seen as Sensitivity.

Item 8 states, "assessee supports the employee by wanting to see how they can make his performance even better." This item suggests that the assessee is willing to get involved in working with the subordinate to alleviate his concerns and improve his situation.

Related to item 8, item 9 states, "assessee expresses the desire to work with the employee to remedy the problems."

Item 10 reads, "assessee conveys the impression that the employee is guilty until proven innocent." This item reflects poor Sensitivity. When a behavior expresses little or no concern or support for others, the behavior is still classified as Sensitivity.

Item 11 reads, "assessee listens intently to what the employee has to say." This item is not one that you will hear the assessee state. However, you can tell if the assessee listens intently if information is used that the subordinate mentions, restates what the subordinate has

said for clarification, or doesn't interrupt him while he is talking.

Item 12 states, "assessee asks the employee about his feelings of the issues that had been discussed."

Item 13 states, "assessee tells the employee that he is ultimately responsible for insuring that all of the work is done properly." Similar to item 10, this item reflects poor Sensitivity.

Item 14 reads, "assessee acknowledges that it is difficult to turn over responsibility."

The final Sensitivity item reads, "assessee doesn't thank the employee for his time at the conclusion of the interview."

The next handout is a list of Sensitivity behaviors that can be expected to occur in the role plays. At this time please look through these behaviors and determine why these behaviors are considered Sensitivity. Feel free to ask any questions if you are uncertain about any of the Sensitivity behaviors.

PAUSE

#### Recognizing Good, Average, and Poor Behaviors

In addition to being able to match behaviors with dimensions, you must also judge the effectiveness of the behaviors. This involves determining the relative effectiveness of the behaviors exhibited. Your judgments

will be reflected in the report. In describing the assessee's performance in the report, judging the effectiveness of behavior as well as matching behavior to dimensions must be accurate. Inaccurate judgments will result in a distorted picture of the assessee's performance.

In order to judge the effectiveness of behaviors, you need a "frame-of-reference" or F-O-R for each dimension. In this section of training, I will present a F-O-R for each dimension to help you judge behaviors. This F-O-R will help you to place a dimension's behaviors into one of five levels of effectiveness.

Before presenting the F-O-R for Problem Analysis, I will repeat its definition. The Problem Analysis definition reads, "breaking up a problem into parts such that the parts can be examined for their importance, interrelationships, or need for additional information." What you should be aware of is how the definition corresponds with the F-O-R. In general, more effective behaviors show use of information, recognizing relationships, and specific questioning.

The most effective behaviors for Problem Analysis involve finding relationships between two or more separate pieces of information. These behaviors are considered most effective because identifying common themes between

separate pieces of information shows greater use of information than identifying one piece of information or obtaining additional information about a single problem. In addition, a relationship can have a greater impact on a decision than identifying additional information. Examples of the most effective Problem Analysis behaviors include:

1. Assessee relates the employee's adjustment to the new store to the problems that he is experiencing.
2. Assessee relates the employee's lack of patience with his subordinates to the long hours that he has been working.

The next most effective behaviors consist of specific inquiries for more information and taking the needed information into account when analyzing a problem. Specific questioning is effective because more useful information can be obtained when specific questions about specific issues and problems are asked than with general questions. In addition, when the assessee is taking into account the needed information when analyzing a problem, a better understanding of the problem and more effective solutions may be formed as compared to when some information is omitted. For example, when an assessee identifies the impact of a decision on other problems, the assessee is exhibiting this level of behavior. Other examples include:

1. Assessee inquires whether there is a reason why the employee always schedules the full-time employees for



weekend nights.

2. Assessee probes for specific information about problems the employee is experiencing.
3. Assessee inquires whether the employee consulted his subordinates regarding their scheduling preferences.

The next lowest level of Problem Analysis behaviors consists of asking for general input about a specific issue; asking for opinions, but not information; and identifying an aspect of a problem. Behaviors like these are considered average. They are considered average because the behaviors are basically neutral in terms of effectiveness. More information is gained and a better understanding of the problem is obtained with specific questions or identifying relationships. However, these behaviors do not lead to inappropriate or inaccurate information. In summary, these behaviors are not as probing as the more effective behaviors mentioned earlier, but, this line of questioning is more effective than inaccurate or no probing. Examples of these average behaviors include:

1. Assessee inquires whether the employee has any questions regarding how the inventory system works.
2. Assessee inquires about what the employee believes is the reason that his subordinates are not doing their work.
3. Assessee asks the employee what he thinks could be done to improve his relations with his subordinates.

The next level of Problem Analysis behaviors get into

the ineffective behaviors. These behaviors consist of identifying information that has already been provided, asking for clarification about some information, and asking general questions that cut across issues or problems (e.g., are you having any problems). As can be seen, these behaviors, in general, do not add to the investigation for additional information. Although they do not detract from the investigation of problems, they do not add to it either. Identifying information that has been provided and asking for clarification slow the investigative process, because this information has already been brought up. General questions that cut across issues or problems are also likely not to add useful information that can address a specific problem. Examples of this type of behavior include:

1. Assessee inquires whether the employee has had any problems adjusting to the new store.
2. Assessee inquires whether the employee has any problems with his subordinates.
3. Assessee inquires whether the employee has any questions about his responsibilities.

The lowest level of Problem Analysis behaviors are those that detract from the investigation for information or provide inaccurate information. General examples include: Not identifying information, problems, issues, or requests that have been provided to them; Inquiries about information that has been provided; and Forming inaccurate

relationships. As you can see these behaviors either 1) add no new information to solve the problems or 2) lead to the use of inaccurate information. Specific behaviors include:

1. Assessee inquires whether the employee has anything that he would like to bring up.
2. Assessee fails to investigate a problem that was identified.
3. Assessee relates the employee's good references to good work on his present job.

I recognize that this F-O-R may be difficult to understand. Some behaviors may not cleanly fit into any of the five effectiveness categories. However, the F-O-R can be used to judge the effectiveness of a majority of behaviors.

Another thing to be aware of when judging the effectiveness of behavior is the context of the situation. The context of the discussion can, at times, dictate whether a behavior is effective or not. I mentioned earlier that identifying information that was already provided is ineffective. However, there may be situations in which the behavior is more effective. For example, if the subordinate has not recognized this information. Accounting for context makes judging behavioral effectiveness more difficult. However, it should be taken into account.

In summary, the F-O-R for Problem Analysis goes as follows: Forming accurate relationships are the most effective behaviors. Specific questions also form an hierarchy of effectiveness; specific questions about specific issues are more effective than general questions about specific issues, or general questions about general issues. Remember, the more specific the question, the more effective the behavior. In addition, the information considered to analyze a problem also forms a hierarchy. Remember, the more information incorporated into the analysis of a problem, the better. Finally, not recognizing needed information and inaccurate information reflect the least effective behaviors. I will now answer any questions that you may have concerning the F-O-R for Problem Analysis.

PAUSE

The next F-O-R we will discuss is Problem Solution. The definition for Problem Solution states, "the assessee suggests, recommends, or outlines actions, methods, or strategies that help in the resolution of problems." Of course, behaviors that are more likely to result in the successful resolution of a problem must be considered effective. What needs to be considered when determining the effectiveness of a Problem Solution behavior is "what does an effective solution consist of"? Using this

rationale, the F-O-R for Problem Analysis was generated.

For Problem Solution, three hierarchies were identified that can be used to judge behavioral effectiveness. The first hierarchy is specific solutions to nonspecific solutions. This means that the more specific the solution, the more effective the behavior. The second hierarchy concerns the amount of information used to form solutions. More effective Problem Solution behaviors are generated when the assessee has all needed information. The third hierarchy concerns solution complexity. More detailed solutions are superior to simpler solutions (e.g., a number of specific steps to solve multiple problems).

The most effective Problem Solution behaviors involve solutions that are complex and specific. For example, if a number of specific actions are proposed to solve a single problem, the solution is considered very effective. Another behavior is: Providing a detailed method for organizing a meeting or outlining a specific plan of action. These behaviors are considered most effective because 1) detailed plans are clearer and easier to carry out than general ones; 2) proposing multiple solutions provides the opportunity for others to choose an option; 3) multiple solutions show that greater thought went into forming the decision. Examples of these types of behaviors

include:

1. Assessee outlines plans for employee development.
2. Assessee provides multiple solutions in response to the employee scheduling problem.
3. Assessee outlines what the employee should have done when describing errors.

The next level of effective Problem Solution consists of providing specific solutions and making decisions after checking the needed information. These behaviors are considered effective because they 1) are specific solutions to specific issues and 2) take into account the information needed to generate an accurate solution. They are not as effective as the behaviors mentioned earlier, because these solutions are not as detailed or only one solution is proposed. With the most effective Problem Solution behaviors, a number of solutions may be offered to address a single problem. Example behaviors for this level include:

1. Assessee suggests that the employee remind his subordinates of the open door policy via a memo or meeting.
2. Assessee suggests that the employee post a chart with the responsibilities of the staffers listed.
3. Assessee suggests that the employee establish a policy covering the roles and responsibilities of the subordinates.

The next level of Problem Solution reflects average behaviors. Average Problem Solution behaviors involve general solutions, suggestions, and proposals of general

action. General solutions or action plans are not as effective as more specific solutions, because they possess greater ambiguity (i.e., the instructions for carrying out the solution are not as clear cut). However, they are solutions and are appropriate. Examples of average Problem Solution behaviors include:

1. Assessee suggests that the employee give his subordinates more responsibility and hold them to it.
2. Assessee suggests training sessions/workshops to remedy some of the employee's weaknesses.
3. Assessee suggests that the employee attempt to be more specific in his instructions to subordinates.

The next lowest level begins to get into the ineffective behaviors. Problem Solution behaviors at this level are the very general or obvious solutions. A very general solution may be the setting of a goal without specifying how to obtain it. These solutions are ineffective because they provide little or no suggestions as to how to carry them out. Obvious solutions also add little because they may have already been tried and are most likely already known. Some examples are:

1. Assessee suggests that the company may need to offer more training for the staffers.
2. Assessee suggests that the employee needs to take time to do a better job on his scheduling and ordering.
3. Assessee establishes a goal of reduced hours.

The most ineffective Problem Solution behaviors are

those behaviors that involve a) not checking the needed information, b) delegation without instructions, c) inappropriate or inaccurate solutions, d) providing no solution for a problem, and e) stating that a problem can be solved without saying how. These behaviors are the most ineffective, because one of two things can result from these solutions. First, the problem is incorrectly solved, or second, the problem is not solved and the problem remains. Not addressing a problem or not attempting to solve a problem constitutes a poor Problem Solution behavior. Examples include:

1. Assessee recommends that the employee exert more authority and let the staffers know who is the boss.
2. Assessee suggests that the problem with the employee's subordinates not using the open door policy could be easily resolved, but does not provide a solution.
3. Assessee suggests that a goal could be established, but does not provide a goal or the manner in which it could be accomplished.

The F-O-R for Problem Solution follows three hierarchies that should be examined concurrently when judging behavioral effectiveness; no one hierarchy is superior to any of the others. The first pertains to specific solutions. The more specific the solution, the more effective the behavior. The second hierarchy is the amount of information used to generate the solution. The more information incorporated into the solution, the more effective the behavior. The third hierarchy pertains to



complex solutions. Complex solutions involve multiple steps and can be applied to multiple problems. I will now answer any questions that you may have concerning the F-O-R for Problem Solution.

PAUSE

Now I will present the F-O-R for Sensitivity. The definition for Sensitivity goes as follows: "showing concern for the feelings, needs, and points of view of others. Letting people know you are aware of their individual situations."

The F-O-R for Sensitivity goes from sensitive to insensitive behaviors. Differentiating between behaviors that are sensitive goes as follows. The most effective behaviors exhibit sensitive action or show sensitivity towards the individual being addressed. These sensitivity behaviors pertain to the individual him or herself, not aspects of the individual. Other behaviors at this level are those that exhibit action rather than just words. The adage "action speaks louder than words" applies here. Examples of the most effective behaviors for Sensitivity include:

1. Assessee assures the employee that he/she believes that he can improve.
2. Assessee supports the employee by wanting to see how they can make his performance even better.
3. Assessee supports the employee by expressing the desire

to work with the employee to remedy the problems.

The next level of effective Sensitivity behaviors are compliments or support of some aspect of individuals. What is meant by aspects is the work the individual has done. Also at this level are those behaviors that show awareness or concern for some aspect of another individual. These behaviors are effective, but not as effective as those mentioned above, because they are statements, not actions, and they are less "central" to the individual. These behaviors do not show concern for others as individuals, rather they show concern for some product or aspect of the individual. In other words, behaviors here don't strike as close to home as those mentioned earlier. Examples of these behaviors include:

1. Assessee acknowledges the difficulty of adjusting to a larger store.
2. Assessee compliments the employee for the responsibility he feels for his position.
3. Assessee indicates that he/she is impressed by all of the hours the employee has been working.

The next level of behaviors represent average Sensitivity. These behaviors reflect general consideration, attempts to put other people at ease, or support for other people not being directly addressed. With general consideration, we are talking about thanking people for providing information, reinforcing people for providing suggestions, or acknowledging that one must work

with others. Examples of behaviors at this level include:

1. Assessee puts the employee at ease by remarking that his past performance appraisals were good.
2. Assessee thanks the employee for his time at the conclusion of the interview.
3. Assessee reinforces the employee for providing suggestions on ways to correct his problems.

The next level of Sensitivity gets into the insensitive behaviors. These behaviors show a lack of support for the concerns of others' and being unaware of the concerns of others. For behaviors that exhibit a lack of support, the behaviors must be accompanied by justification or a reason for such behavior. With justification, the behaviors are not as insensitive when compared with criticisms without justification. In addition, the criticisms here pertain only to those criticisms of aspects of individuals, not the individual him or herself. Examples of this level of Sensitivity include:

1. Doesn't accept one of the employee's excuses with justification.
2. Views the employee's subordinates as the reason for the problems.

The lowest level of Sensitivity are those behaviors that exhibit any type of insensitivity without justification. The key in distinguishing between these behaviors and those just mentioned is justification.

Without justification, the behavior represents an attack on an individual. In addition, any criticism directed at an individual, with or without justification, reflects ineffectiveness. Most ineffective behaviors are beyond showing no awareness of others' concerns. With these behaviors, the assessee is aware, but downplays or criticizes the concerns. Examples of this level of Sensitivity include:

1. Assessee acknowledges that the employee is ultimately responsible for insuring that all of the work is done.
2. In asking questions, the assessee conveys the impression that the employee is guilty until proven innocent.

In summary, the F-O-R for Sensitivity is as follows. Actions depicting sensitive behaviors are the most effective behaviors along with sensitivity directed at the individual. The next most effective behaviors are complimenting and acknowledging some aspect or product of the individual (e.g., their work, their requests). Behaviors such as putting others at ease, general consideration, and supporting other individuals not present make up the average Sensitivity behaviors. The last two levels of Sensitivity are ineffective behaviors that reflect a lack of sensitivity or insensitivity. The fourth level consists of criticisms directed at aspects or products of individuals with justification. The lowest level of Sensitivity involves behaviors which criticize

without justification or criticisms directed at individuals with or without justification. I will now answer any questions that you may have about this F-O-R. In addition, if you have any questions about judging the effectiveness of behavior using the three F-O-R feel free to ask them.

PAUSE

### Observation and Note Taking

In the role-play exercise you are going to observe an assessee conducting an interview. The assessee may exhibit many behaviors and do a great deal of talking. This is a reason why observation is difficult. However, observation is just half the story. In addition to observation, you also need to be taking notes on the assessee's behavior. The combination of observing and note taking places a great demand on you. In order to make this process a bit easier, I will provide you with some advice on observation and note taking that experts have used. These pointers should help you observe and take notes more accurately.

When observing behavior you should incorporate what you know about matching behaviors to dimensions into your observation process. When observing, you are primarily looking for those behaviors that are relevant. The relevant behaviors for this exercise are those behaviors that represent Problem Analysis, Problem Solution, or Sensitivity. However, you shouldn't just focus in on these

behaviors and ignore everything else. I mentioned that the context of the situation can influence the effectiveness of a behavior. If you just focus on the relevant behaviors, you would not be able to incorporate context into your observations. Failure to incorporate context will make your reports not as accurate or complete as they could be. Thus, being aware of the progression of your exercise, as well as focusing on relevant behavior will improve the accuracy of your observations, behavioral judgments, notes, and, as a result, your reports.

It should be repeated that you can ignore irrelevant behaviors, if you can identify them quickly enough. Behaviors may be manifested by the assessee at a rapid-fire pace, and you may not have time to determine whether a particular behavior is relevant. When this occurs, you should be aware of all behaviors and try to match them to dimensions later. If you try to match behaviors while observing there may be times where you miss subsequent behaviors.

A second tip for effective observation is to be aware of the context of the meeting. You shouldn't block out the context for two reasons. First, context makes it easier to understand behaviors (what was the behavior in response to; what problem does the solution address). Second, behaviors occur at certain times during the meeting. If you are

aware of the context, it will help you to anticipate those behaviors that are likely to occur at a particular stage in the exercise. With the role-play, the assessee will usually attempt to put the employee at ease at the beginning of the meeting. So, you should be on the lookout for sensitivity-type behaviors at the beginning of the meeting. In sum, be aware of what is going on around the assessee as well as what the assessee is doing.

Note taking is an integral part of the observation - report writing process. Since you will be relying on your notes to write the reports, your notes must be clear and complete. With complete notes you do not have to rely on memory, which is fallible. All the information you need for writing the reports should be in your notes. Now I will provide you with some advice for effective note taking.

Your first priority when taking notes is to record the behavior the assessee has displayed. Recording behavior is what note taking is all about. Your second priority is to record some contextual information to clarify the behavior. Recording contextual information is not the most important part of note taking (recording behavior is), but noting contextual information is important and should be done whenever possible. By recording behavior with context, you will have sufficient detail on the assessee's behavior.

When taking notes try to provide as much detail as possible. Sometimes it will be difficult because the assessee may be exhibiting a number of behaviors in quick succession. At these times, the only advice that I can give you is to write rapidly and try to be concise in summarizing behaviors. It is okay to write brief summaries of behavior, as long as you understand it. Furthermore, don't worry about grammar and spelling when taking notes, as long as you can write a report from the notes.

What you are trying to do while note taking is to record all the relevant behaviors that the assessee exhibited. When taking notes, you don't need to describe the behaviors by dimension; all you need to do is record behaviors. You will have time to match and judge the behaviors at the conclusion of the videotapes. By just concentrating on recording behaviors you will be able to generate more detailed notes and miss fewer behaviors.

At other times, there may be "gaps" in relevant assessee behaviors. These next tips should only be used when behavior is not being exhibited at a rapid pace by the assessee. The first tip deals with matching behaviors by dimension. One way to match behaviors by dimensions is through the use of the keywords. When observing a behavior, you can ask yourself, "can that behavior be accurately restated using one of the keywords?" If it can,



the behavior probably represents the dimension that corresponds with that keyword. When writing this behavior down in your notes, you may also want to use the keyword. Another method for matching behaviors while taking notes is to write down a code for a dimension next to the appropriate behavior (e.g., PA, PS, SE).

You can incorporate these tips into your note taking process if you wish, but remember that the first priority is to record all relevant behaviors that the assessee exhibits. If you find that matching behaviors to dimensions slows your note taking and makes you miss subsequent behaviors, do not use these tips. You will have time after the exercise to match and judge behaviors. In sum, the objectives are to record relevant behaviors and provide some clarifying context for the behaviors. Now I will answer any questions that you may have about note taking and observation.

PAUSE

You will now see a videotape of an actual role play. What I would like for you to do is to observe the assessee and take notes on the performance. During the exercise, I would like you to record the behaviors observed. After you have completed this task, I will provide you with a list of the behaviors observed by experts.

PAUSE

On the next handout are the behaviors recorded by the experts in chronological order. Please read through this list and see how well you were able to record behavior.

PAUSE

Now I would like to see how well you can match behaviors to dimensions. What I would like you to do is match the behaviors on the expert's observation list to the three dimensions. After you have completed this task, I will provide feedback.

PAUSE

#### PROBLEM ANALYSIS

Identifies that there is room for improvement in the employee's performance.

This is Problem Analysis, because the assessee identified some needed information.

Identifies that at the old store where the employee worked was smaller and he didn't have to delegate as much.

Here, the assessee identified that the employee has come from a smaller store.

Inquires whether some people in the employee's department don't belong.

Inquires whether some people in the employee's department are destructive to the department.

In response to hearing that the staffers don't do their work, the assessee asks what happens when they don't do their work.

Asks the employee for input about an issue that was discussed. (Also Sensitivity).

Inquires how the employee handles the scheduling of his staffers.

For these five behaviors, the assessee is probing for more information. Probing for more information is Problem Analysis.

Relates the problems that the employee is having to the adjustment to a new situation.

Anytime the assessee forms a relationship, a Problem Analysis behavior has been exhibited.

Identifies that the employee has done a good job in the past.

Here, the assessee has identified information (that the employee's previous performance evaluations were good).

#### PROBLEM SOLUTION

Suggests the need to open the lines of communication.

Suggests that the employee delegate responsibility more thoroughly.

Wants the employee to delegate, let the staffers do their work and have the employee guide them.

Suggests that the employee expand his delegation.

Suggests that the employee delegate some decisions. Let the staffers handle some of the lesser decisions.

All five of these behaviors are similar in that they represent some resolution to a problem. Although some solutions may be very general, they are still solutions. Anytime a solution is formed it represents Problem Solution, regardless of its effectiveness.

Wants the employee to groom the staffers, then the employee can move up in the company and have someone to take his

place.

Suggests that the employee can't just tell them to do something, he needs to teach them through the delegation of responsibility.

Suggests that the employee needs more patience in dealing with his staffers.

Proposes that the employee provide his experience and training to his staffers, so that they can improve.

Suggests that the employee sit down with the staffers and teach them in a patience manner how to do the job.

Proposes that the employee tell the staffers what needs to be done, set a goal, and let them accomplish it.

As you've probably noticed, these behaviors are all some sort of solution to a problem.

States that, at this store, they rotate the weekend schedule to give everyone a weekend off.

Although this was not a direct suggestion directed at the employee, it does represent a possible solution to the scheduling problem.

Proposes that the employee have a meeting with his staffers to bring some problems into the open. That way we can open the lines of communication.

Proposes that the employee needs to work with the staffers.

Proposes that the employee needs to have patience with the staffers.

Suggests that the employee delegate more responsibility to his staffers.

Proposes that the employee show the staffers how to do a task and be with them until they've done it a few times and are comfortable with it.

States that the employee come to him if the employee needs ant help or advice. (Also Sensitivity).

This behavior can be considered a solution in that if the subordinate has future problems, a possible solution may be to talk to the assessee.

#### SENSITIVITY

Asks how the employee likes working at the new store.

Acknowledges that the employee has, overall, done a decent job.

These two behaviors show that the assessee is trying to put the employee at ease. Putting someone at ease is considered Sensitivity.

States that the employee knows his job and does it well.

Here, the assessee shows his support for the employee.

Showing support is Sensitivity.

Acknowledges that it is tough to have patience. Assessee also has problems with patience. But, it needs to be worked on.

The assessee has acknowledged the concerns and needs of the employee with this behavior.

Asks the employee for input about an issue that was discussed. (Also Problem Analysis).

This behavior is considered Sensitivity because the assessee has attempted to hear any concerns about this problem that the employee may have.

Agrees with the employee that the staffers should come to him with their complaints.

Acknowledges that it is not the employee's fault if the staffers don't bring their problems to him.

For these two behaviors, the assessee has recognized

the opinions of the employee and has supported him.

After giving the employee an average rating, the assessee acknowledges that the employee is used to higher ratings.

Here, the assessee has acknowledged the concern of the employee and is also trying to put him at ease.

Has confidence in the employee; expects the employee to get higher ratings in the future.

Showing confidence in the abilities of others is considered Sensitivity.

States that they cannot wipe out all the staffers when a new manager comes in. The employee needs to work with the staffers.

This behavior is considered Sensitivity because the assessee is showing support for people not present (e.g., the staffers).

Acknowledges that it is tough to have patience.

Acknowledges that having patience is tough.

States that the employee come to him if the employee needs any help or advice. (Also Problem Solution).

Here, the assessee is showing willingness to work with the employee to remedy his problems. Thus, this is considered Sensitivity.

Acknowledges that it is tough to get started at a new store.

The assessee has acknowledged the situation of the employee.

Believes that things will improve for the employee.

Expects employee to do well in the future.

For these two behaviors, the assessee has expressed confidence in the ability of the employee.

Thanks the employee for his time.

Now I will answer any questions that you may have concerning matching behaviors to dimensions or the feedback provided.

PAUSE

For the next task, I would like you to examine the behaviors listed under the dimensions and judge the effectiveness of each behavior. For this task you need to use the F-O-R for each dimension. What I would like you to do is place a symbol (ME, E, A, I, MI) next to each behavior, using the F-O-R as a guide. This scale shows the effectiveness level that corresponds to each symbol. After this I will provide feedback on your responses.

HAND OUT SCALE

PROBLEM ANALYSIS

A Identifies that there is room for improvement in the employee's performance.

Here, the assessee has identified a piece of information. On the F-O-R, identifying some information is considered an average behavior.

ME Identifies that at the old store where the employee worked was smaller and he didn't have to delegate as much.

The behavior was considered most effective, because the assessee has formed a relationship between the

employee's old store (which was smaller) and his problems with delegation.

A Inquires whether some people in the employee's department don't belong.

This behavior is considered a general inquiry which reflects average Problem Analysis.

I Inquires whether some people in the employee's department are destructive to the department.

This is another general inquiry, however it was considered ineffective, because this information was not followed up on by the assessee.

E In response to hearing that the staffers don't do their work, the assessee asks what happens when they don't do their work.

This behavior was considered effective, because this is a specific question in response to a specific problem.

A Asks the employee for input about an issue that was discussed.

A Inquires how the employee handles the scheduling of his staffers.

These behaviors represent general inquiry, they are general questions.

ME Relates the problems that the employee is having to the adjustment to a new situation.

Here, the assessee formed a relationship between two pieces of information. Forming relationships reflect the most effective Problem Analysis behaviors.

A Identifies that the employee has done a good job in the past.



Here, the assessee has identified a piece of information.

PROBLEM SOLUTION

- I Suggests the need to open the lines of communication.
- I Suggests that the employee delegate responsibility more thoroughly.

These two behaviors were considered ineffective, because they represent very general solutions with no mention of how to carry out these solutions.

- A Wants the employee to delegate, let the staffers do their work and have the employee guide them.

This is also a general solution, however it was average, because there is some mention of how to carry out the solution, although general (let the staffers do their work and have the employee guide them).

- I Suggests that the employee expand his delegation.

Again, a general solution with no action plans.

- A Suggests that the employee delegate some decisions. Let the staffers handle some of the lesser decisions.
- A Wants the employee to groom the staffers, then the employee can move up in the company and have someone to take his place.

These behaviors are average, since they are general solutions with some mention of action plans.

- E Suggests that the employee can't just tell them to do something, he needs to teach them through the delegation of responsibility.

This behavior was considered effective, since it is

more specific. Notice how this solution is more specific than the earlier solutions. This solution provides an action (e.g., teach them) for carrying out the solution.

I Suggests that the employee needs more patience in dealing with his staffers.

This is a general solution with no mention of an action plan.

A Proposes that the employee provide his experience and training to his staffers, so that they can improve.

This solution was considered average, because it is a general solution with an action plan (e.g., provide experience and training).

E Suggests that the employee sit down with the staffers and teach them in a patience manner how to do the job.

This solution exhibits a specific action plan for addressing the delegation problem.

A Proposes that the employee tell the staffers what needs to be done, set a goal, and let them accomplish it.

This behavior represents a general solution and action plan.

E States that, at this store, they rotate the weekend schedule to give everyone a weekend off.

E Proposes that the employee have a meeting with his staffers to bring some problems into the open. That way we can open the lines of communication.

These two behaviors show specificity in their action plans. They both show a specific method in which a problem can be resolved.

I Proposes that the employee needs to work with the

staffers.

- I Proposes that the employee needs to have patience with the staffers.
- I Suggests that the employee delegate more responsibility to his staffers.

These behaviors reflect general solutions with no action plans.

- ME Proposes that the employee show the staffers how to do a task and be with them until they've done it a few times and are comfortable with it.

This solution is very specific in that a few steps have been laid out for carrying out the solution. The action plan is also clear and specific.

- A States that the employee come to him if the employee needs any help or advice.

This is a general solution to no specific problem with a general action plan.

#### SENSITIVITY

- A Asks how the employee likes working at the new store.

Here, the assessee is trying to put the employee at ease. Putting others at ease is considered an average behavior.

- E Acknowledges that the employee has, overall, done a decent job.
- E States that the employee knows his job and does it well.

These behaviors reflect acknowledging a product (his work) of the employee. Acknowledging good work fits here and is considered an effective behavior.

- E Acknowledges that it is tough to have patience. Assessee also has problems with patience. But, it needs to be worked on.

Here, the assessee is acknowledging the concerns and situation of the employee, thus it was considered effective.

- A Asks the employee for input about an issue that was discussed.

This is a general courtesy behavior.

- E Agrees with the employee that the staffers should come to him with their complaints.
- E Acknowledges that it is not the employee's fault if the staffers don't bring their problems to him.

These behaviors show that the assessee recognizes the employee's situation and sees his point of view.

- A After giving the employee an average rating, the assessee acknowledges that the employee is used to higher ratings.

Here, the assessee is trying to put the employee at ease since the rating given may upset the employee.

- E Has confidence in the employee; expects the employee to get higher ratings in the future.

This behavior shows that the assessee supports the employee's work and has confidence in him.

- A States that they cannot wipe out all the staffers when a new manager comes in. The employee needs to work with the staffers.

Here, the assessee is supporting the concerns of other people who are not present (the staffers). This type of Sensitivity behavior is considered average.

A Acknowledges that it is tough to have patience.

A Acknowledges that having patience is tough.

These behaviors are general acknowledgments that are not exclusively directed at the employee. The assessee says that, in general, it is tough to have patience.

ME States that the employee come to him if the employee needs any help or advice.

This is sensitive action. Sensitive actions are the most effective Sensitivity behavior.

E Acknowledges that it is tough to get started at a new store.

Here, the assessee recognizes the situation of the employee.

E Believes that things will improve for the employee.

E Expects employee to do well in the future.

These behaviors show that the assessee supports the employee's work and has confidence his ability to improve.

A Thanks the employee for his time.

This is a general courtesy behavior.

I will now answer any questions that you may have about judging behavioral effectiveness or the feedback provided.

PAUSE

### Reporting Behavior

The final part of the observation and judging behavioral effectiveness process is writing reports. The

reports are read to other assessors in the second session, who use this information to generate ratings of assessee performance across the three exercises. So, the accuracy and completeness of the reports are essential to accurate overall ratings.

The previous steps that we went through are all represented in the report. Your knowledge of the exercise and dimensions, your ability to match behaviors to dimensions, judge the effectiveness of behavior, observe and take notes affect the accuracy and quality of your report.

You are the person who is going to present your reports. So, as long as you can read your reports and make sense out of it and think that others will be able to understand it, the report is fine. The presentation is not a formal presentation in the sense that you do not have to stand up and speak without reading your report. All the presentation requires is that you read your report, word-for-word. You can read the entire report aloud without looking up and that would be okay. In addition, the other two assessors will also read reports and these assessors, and myself, will be the only ones who will hear you read. Finally, please remember that you will not be evaluated on your writing or reading ability, the only concern is getting the needed information communicated to the other

assessors.

Now I would like to cover the guidelines for writing the report. These guidelines provide the questions that you will answer in the report. In addition, the guidelines will provide consistency across different reports, making them easier for others to follow. You do not need to have these guideline questions memorized; the guidelines will be available while you are writing the reports. We will now go through each question in the guidelines and clarify them. At the end of this presentation, I will answer any questions that you have about the guidelines and report writing.

The first question in the Guidelines states, "Did the assessee address all the problems?" Additional parts of the question include: "If not, which problems were omitted? Which problems did the assessee resolve"? In the handout given to the assessee that explains the role, the performance problems of the employee were listed. These problems include: Poor decision making judgments (e.g., overordering of picnic tables), scheduling problems, working 60 hours a week, employee doing the staffer's work, complaints of lack of responsibility from the staffers, and poor relations with his staffers. These are all problems that were identified in the handout and need to be addressed in the interview. The first question asks

whether the assessee addressed all problems. If the assessee addressed all problems indicate this. If the assessee did not address all problems, then you must indicate which problems were not addressed. Next, you should indicate which of the problems addressed were resolved.

The purpose of a performance appraisal interview is to discuss the employee's performance and resolve problems and weaknesses. This question examines how well the assessee met the purpose of the meeting. The more problems addressed and resolved, the better the performance of the assessee. Response examples for this question are:

1. Assessee did not address two of the problems; the problem of the employee working 60 hours a week and the staffer scheduling problem. In addition, the assessee did not resolve, but did address the overordering of picnic tables issue. All other problems were resolved.
2. Assessee did not address one problem; the overordering of picnic tables. The assessee addressed, but did not resolve, the problems of scheduling and subordinate responsibility. All other problems were resolved.

You can tell whether a problem was addressed by determining whether the assessee mentioned the problem. If the problem was mentioned, the assessee addressed the problem. The assessee resolved a problem if the assessee provided a solution to the problem.

Question 2 states, "Did the assessee exhibit any relevant behaviors on multiple occasions? If yes, please specify what these behaviors were." What you are looking



for are behaviors that the assessee used on multiple occasions (e.g., solutions generated, method in which problems are analyzed, method in which questions are asked, awareness of concerns). What I mean by relevant behaviors are those behaviors that can be matched to Problem Analysis, Problem Solution, or Sensitivity. Repeated behaviors such as "used um's and ah's a great deal when speaking" or "frequently looked down at the notes" are not relevant behaviors and do not need to be described. What this question is trying to uncover is whether the assessee has any particular style for making decisions, gathering information, analyzing problems, or dealing with people.

Example responses include:

1. Assessee used a questioning strategy that began with general questions and then got progressively more specific when addressing a number of problems.
2. Assessee proposed that the employee should improve communications with his staffers as a solution to the scheduling and employee-staff relations problem.

What is more important for this question is the behavior, not the problems the behaviors were used to address. However, if you know what problems are associated with the behavior, mention it. Since the behavior is more important, it should be mentioned first (as shown in the examples). Furthermore, if you know the exact number of times the assessee exhibited the behavior, please mention it. If you don't know the exact number of times, use a

qualifier to make an estimate (e.g., frequently, occasionally, from time to time, consistently).

Question 3 of the guidelines reads, "Did the assessee recognize any relationships between requests or other pieces of information? If yes, please list the examples observed." Here, you are listing all the relationships recognized by the assessee. If no relationships were observed, then indicate that "no relationships were recognized by the assessee." If the assessee did recognize relationships, note the behavior, what pieces of information were being related, and the particular problem or issue.

Related to this question is the information about the role-play provided earlier. When we went through the role-play, we identified that the assessee may relate the information about the subordinate's background (e.g., new at the store, working long hours, adjusting to a larger store) to some of the problems the subordinate is having. Although these types of relationships will probably be observed most frequently, these relationships do not represent all the relationships that may be formed. Assesseees may form relationships between information that we did not discuss. In addition, relationships do not have to be correct. Although incorrect relationships are poor behaviors, they are, nonetheless, relationships. Response

examples include:

1. Assessee relates the overordering of picnic tables to the problems that the employee is having with the inventory system.
2. Assessee relates the problems that the employee is having to being new at the store when trying to determine why the employee is having problems.

If the assessee used the same relationship more than once, you should indicate it in Questions 2 and 3 of the guidelines.

The final three questions ask for dimension information. The questions vary in the dimension of concern. Question 4a reads, "What behaviors did you observe that were relevant to Problem Analysis? Please list them and provide the context in which they occurred". Questions 4b and 4c refer to Problem Solution and Sensitivity, respectively. The intent of these questions is to provide a list of behaviors corresponding to each dimension. All behaviors that you have matched to a particular dimension should be included in the list. In addition, you should provide the context in which the behavior occurred. For example, what issue was being discussed when the behavior was exhibited. Your understanding of the dimensions and your ability to match behaviors to dimensions will be important here. Remember that the dimension definition and keywords should be used to match behaviors to dimensions. Being able to

accomplish the matching task will have a direct impact on the quality of your responses to these questions. Here are some Problem Analysis examples:

1. Assessee asks specific questions to get at the heart of the overordering of picnic tables problem.
2. Assessee did not identify all the employee problems during the interview.

Problem Solution examples:

1. Assessee suggests that the employee hand out note cards with responsibilities listed on them to his subordinates as a solution to the delegation problem and the subordinates complaint of lack of responsibility.
2. Assessee suggests solutions to a number of problems before getting input from the employee at the beginning of the interview.

Sensitivity examples:

1. Assessee attempts to put the employee at ease at the beginning of the interview.
2. At the end of the interview, the assessee reassures that employee by saying that he/she is confident that the employee can improve on his performance.

One thing to remember about these three questions is that if you think a behavior fits more than one dimension, you should still list the behavior. Include the behavior on all appropriate lists and indicate that it was included on multiple lists. You may also have behaviors in your notes that can't be matched to any of the three dimensions. With these behaviors, don't force them into a dimension. Don't list these behaviors.

This completes the presentation on the guidelines for writing reports. Now I will answer any questions that you may have regarding the guidelines and writing reports.

PAUSE

Okay, now we will determine how well you understand the guidelines and how well you can write reports. You will now use the notes that you generated earlier and the feedback provided to write a report about the assessee. After you have completed this task, I will provide you with feedback about your report.

PAUSE

Question #1

Assessee did not address or resolve two problems (poor decision making [inventory, picnic tables] and working 60 hours per week). Four problems were addressed (staffer complaints of lack of responsibility, employee doing the staffer's work, poor relations with staffers, and scheduling). Two problems (staffer complaints of lack of responsibility and employee doing the staffer's work) were resolved through suggestions of increasing delegation, teaching them how to do a task, and showing the staffers how to do a task. Poor relations with staffers was resolved by the assessee suggesting that the employee have a meeting with his staff to bring problems into the open and open the lines of communication. The scheduling problem was resolved by the assessee stating how scheduling is commonly done at the store.

Remember here that you need to distinguish between the problems that were addressed and those that were resolved. You also should indicate how a problem was resolved. Addressing a problem occurs if the assessee mentions it, resolving a problem occurs when the assessee forms any solution directed at that problem.

## Question #2

Assessee mentioned that the employee has done a good job on three occasions, and showed confidence in the employee by stating that his performance will improve in the future on three occasions.

Assessee suggested that the employee needed more patience in dealing with his staff on two occasions and acknowledged that it is difficult to have patience on three occasions.

Assessee proposed opening the lines of communication with his staffers on two occasions in order to improve relations with his staffers.

Assessee suggested that the employee needed to delegate some responsibility to his staffers five times and proposed that the employee needs to teach his staffers rather than just tell them on two occasions. Both of these behaviors were used to resolve the problems of staffer complaints of lack of responsibility and the employee doing the staffer's work.

The only behaviors that should be mentioned for question 2 are those that are relevant to the dimensions being examined. In addition, you should indicate what problems were being addressed or resolved when the behavior was exhibited.

## Question #3

Assessee recognized two relationships. The first one related the employee's delegation of responsibility problems to his previous position at a smaller store where the employee did not have to delegate as much. This relationship was used to explain why the employee may have had problems delegating. The second relationship identified the employee's adjustment to a new store and situation as a possible cause of some of the problems that the employee is experiencing. This relationship was used to justify the average rating given by the assessee and to put the employee at ease.

In addition to recording the relationship, you should also indicate what the relationship was being used for

(solving which problem, justification for what) and the pieces of information that made up the relationship.

For question #4, I will not provide any feedback since the matching of these behaviors to dimensions and the feedback on this task was already discussed. However, your listing of behaviors should have been similar to the lists that were handed out earlier.

#### PROBLEM ANALYSIS

Identifies that there is room for improvement in the employee's performance.

Identifies that at the old store where the employee worked was smaller and he didn't have to delegate as much.

Inquires whether some people in the employee's department don't belong.

Inquires whether some people in the employee's department are destructive to the department.

In response to hearing that the staffers don't do their work, the assessee asks what happens when they don't do their work.

Asks the employee for input about an issue that was discussed. (Also Sensitivity).

Inquires how the employee handles the scheduling of his staffers.

Relates the problems that the employee is having to the adjustment to a new situation.

Identifies that the employee has done a good job in the past.

#### PROBLEM SOLUTION

Suggests the need to open the lines of communication.

Suggests that the employee delegate responsibility more

thoroughly.

Wants the employee to delegate, let the staffers do their work and have the employee guide them.

Suggests that the employee expand his delegation.

Suggests that the employee delegate some decisions. Let the staffers handle some of the lesser decisions.

Wants the employee to groom the staffers, then the employee can move up in the company and have someone to take his place.

Suggests that the employee can't just tell them to do something, he needs to teach them through the delegation of responsibility.

Suggests that the employee needs more patience in dealing with his staffers.

Proposes that the employee provide his experience and training to his staffers, so that they can improve.

Suggests that the employee sit down with the staffers and teach them in a patience manner how to do the job.

Proposes that the employee tell the staffers what needs to be done, set a goal, and let them accomplish it.

States that, at this store, they rotate the weekend schedule to give everyone a weekend off.

Proposes that the employee have a meeting with his staffers to bring some problems into the open. That way we can open the lines of communication.

Proposes that the employee needs to work with the staffers.

Proposes that the employee needs to have patience with the staffers.

Suggests that the employee delegate more responsibility to his staffers.

Proposes that the employee show the staffers how to do a task and be with them until they've done it a few times and are comfortable with it.

States that the employee come to him if the employee needs



any help or advice. (Also Sensitivity).

#### SENSITIVITY

Asks how the employee likes working at the new store.

Acknowledges that the employee has, overall, done a decent job.

States that the employee knows his job and does it well.

Acknowledges that it is tough to have patience. Assessee also has problems with patience. But, it needs to be worked on.

Agrees with the employee that the staffers should come to him with their complaints.

Acknowledges that it is not the employee's fault if the staffers don't bring their problems to him.

After giving the employee an average rating, the assessee acknowledges that the employee is used to higher ratings.

Has confidence in the employee; expects the employee to get higher ratings in the future.

States that they cannot wipe out all the staffers when a new manager comes in. The employee needs to work with the staffers.

Acknowledges that it is tough to have patience.

Acknowledges that having patience is tough.

States that the employee come to him if the employee needs any help or advice. (Also Problem Solution).

Acknowledges that it is tough to get started at a new store.

Believes that things will improve for the employee.

Expects employee to do well in the future.

Thanks the employee for his time.

There are two things that must be considered here.

First, if you are in doubt about whether a behavior is

relevant to a single dimension, you should still include it in the dimension list. If you believe a behavior applies to more than one dimension, include it under the dimensions that you believe it corresponds to. If you do this, indicate that the behavior is included in more than one dimension list. You should also use the dimension definitions and key words to help you.

As you probably noticed from the feedback, all the parts that were presented to you are interrelated. In order to write a report, you must be able to execute all tasks. Thus, report writing requires integrating a series of separate tasks. Understanding the exercise helps in the identification of dimensions and relevant behaviors. It provides contextual information which improves your ability to match and judge the effectiveness of behavior. Further understanding of the exercise, cues you to behaviors that occur at specific points in the exercise, and assists you in determining the relevant behaviors to include in the report. Knowledge of the dimensions is needed to match behaviors to dimensions. The ability to match behaviors to dimensions influences all subsequent tasks. If you are effective at matching behaviors to dimensions, you will be able to use the proper F-O-R and exercise information to judge behavioral effectiveness and your reports will include the correct information. The report is the

culmination of all previous tasks. The report will reflect how well you understand the exercise, dimensions, and the report writing guidelines as well as your ability to match and judge behaviors. Knowledge in just one or a few of these areas will not lead to accurate reports. The interrelationships between these tasks makes the overall task difficult: In order to be good at it, you have to be good at all the tasks addressed in training.

Now I will answer any questions that you may have about the guidelines, report writing, or the feedback just provided. After your questions have been answered, you will begin observing, taking notes, and writing reports for the four experimental assessees. These are the reports that you will present in this study's second session.

Appendix I  
Training Materials Common to Part  
and Whole Training

### Additional In-Basket Behaviors

#### Problem Analysis

Recognizes the need to question the Cindy about the harassment complaint.

Recognizes the need to investigate the customer complaint further.

Investigates whether or not Phyllis can be spared for the day.

Recognizes the need to discuss the performance appraisal/transfer problem with Chandler.

Recognizes the relationship between Valley Furniture's request to increase the cabinet order and the upcoming Manager's Meeting.

Recognizes the relationship between Pat (store manager) asking about the possible promotion of Lori and her last performance rating.

Has Frank (assistant) discuss Pat's (store manager) suggestion of promoting Lori with her.

#### Problem Solution

Describes a specific solution or plan to deal with the sexual harassment complaint.

Recommends the staff clean or replace items in response to the manager's complaint about the dirty condition of the department.

Recommends changing Mike's hours so he is not working at closing time in response to Lori's report that he is stealing.

Recommends immediate action against Lori in response to Brenda Miller's (customer) complaint about the delayed delivery of her sofa and rude treatment by Lori.

Has Frank (assistant) make sure adequate stock is ordered for the Summer Sale.

Has Frank (assistant) enforce the dress-code.

Recommends immediate action against the employees accused of dress-code violations.

Ok's the time off request after making sure Phyllis can be spared for the day.

Has Frank (assistant) arrange to have someone else work for Phyllis in response to her request for a day off to attend the wedding of a friend.

Refuses Phyllis's request for a day off to attend the wedding of a friend.

Refers Phyllis to Frank (assistant) or the Personnel Department about taking the day off.

Suggests employees for training in response to the Training Workshop memo.

Suggests other employee(s) for possible promotion.

## Additional Role-Play Behaviors

## Problem Analysis

Assessee inquires about the employee's experiences when he attempted to delegate authority.

Assessee inquires whether the employee is comfortable with the inventory system.

Assessee investigates the employee's method of scheduling his subordinates.

Assessee inquires about the reason that the employee does not delegate some responsibility.

Assessee inquires as to the reason the employee is doing the work of his subordinates.

Assessee inquires whether the employee has any questions regarding how the inventory system worked.

Assessee inquires whether the employee's subordinates were competent.

In response to the employee's comments about the poor quality of his subordinates' work, the assessee asks the employee whether he told his subordinates what his standards were.

Assessee inquires whether the employee has any problems with his subordinates.

Assessee inquires whether the employee has any other problems with John (subordinate).

Assessee inquires whether the employee thought he could give his subordinates more responsibility.

Assessee inquires whether it is harder to keep things in stock at this store than at his previous store.

Assessee probes for specific information on problems the employee is experiencing.

Assessee relates the employee's good references to good work on his present job.

### Problem Solution

Assessee recommends that the employee tell his subordinates how he wants the work done.

Assessee suggests that the employee give his subordinates more responsibility and hold them to it.

Assessee suggests that the employee remind his subordinates of the open door policy via a memo or meeting.

Assessee suggests that the problem of the employee's subordinates not using the open door policy could be resolved easily, but did not provide a solution.

Assessee suggests that the employee attempt to be more specific in his instructions to subordinates.

Assessee suggests that the company may need to offer more training for the staffers.

Assessee suggests that different people have to be handled differently and gives some examples.

Assessee states that if it is necessary to replace some of the staffers the company will do it.

Assessee recommends that the employee document the poor performance of those subordinates who were not working out.

Assessee suggests that the employee post a chart with the responsibilities of the staffers listed.

Assessee suggests training sessions/workshops to remedy some of the employee's weaknesses.

Assessee suggests that the employee establish a policy covering the roles and responsibilities of his subordinates.

Assessee suggests that the employee have regular meetings with his subordinates.

Assessee recommends that the employee ask his subordinates why they have not performed the work assigned to them.

Assessee establishes a goal of reduced hours.



### Sensitivity

Assessee assures the employee that he/she doesn't expect the employee to do everything.

Assessee acknowledges that the employee is new.

Assessee supports the employee's open door policy.

Assessee downplays the inventory problem by noting that the employee hasn't been at the store long.

Assessee thanks the employee for all of his hard work.

Assessee supports the employee by telling him to let him/her know if he has any problems.

Assessee encourages the employee to discuss his questions with him/her.

Assessee acknowledges that the staffers should go to the employee with their complaints and problems.

Assessee acknowledges the employee's favorable recommendations.

Assessee reinforces the employee for providing suggestions on ways to correct his problems.

Assessee acknowledges the number of hours worked by the employee.

Assessee acknowledges that the employee's intentions are good.

Assessee tells the employee to stop him/her if he has any questions.

Assessee mentions that he/she is happy to have the employee at the store.

### Additional Leaderless Group Discussion Behaviors

#### Problem Analysis

Inquires about the need to remodel R & D.

Takes the importance of the departments to the organization into account when formulating budgets.

Inquires about the spending of other departments.

Relates his/her department's previous budgets and the requested budget.

Identifies the money not used by the underbudget departments.

Inquires about the contributions another department makes for the organization.

Does not recognize some of the problems in his/her own department.

Identifies possible future problems if R & D's requests are not met.

Relates the increase in computer capacity with the growth of the organization.

Wants clarification of the other departments' total budgets, requests, and the amount of money required for each request.

Compares the requests of his/her department to the requests of other departments.

Relates past departmental budgets and departmental requests.

Identifies the past problems of his/her department, but does not relate it to present requests.

Asks other members for information on a requested program or need.

Identifies the greater public contact that Marketing and Public Relations have.

Relates R & D's and Marketing's office space needs.

Identifies the need to take into account the future goals of the organization when allocating funds.

Identifies the personnel requests of other departments as a responsibility of Human Resources.

#### Problem Solution

Proposes an effective method to organize the discussion.

Proposes that other members justify their requested budgets.

Proposes that each department give their requested budget, calculate an overall total, and then make budget cuts.

Proposes that other members choose their department's least important request.

Introduces the method of questioning other members to clarify their budget requests.

#### Sensitivity

Supports the organization (wants to do what is best for the organization).

Supports the past work done by other departments.

Acknowledges that the current Accounting personnel are good workers, but they have been overworked.

Respects opposing viewpoints

Compliments other members for bringing up good points.

Interrupts other members when they are talking.

Lets other members finish speaking before interjecting.

Wants everyone to support the final outcome.

Downplays the views/opinions of another member.

Downplays another member's suggested budget for his/her department.

Is concerned about the other departments' well-being.

Kept his/her department's requested budget reasonable to let other departments satisfy their requests.

Supports the requests of other departments.

Downplays some requests from other departments.

List of Relevant Behaviors Observed by Experts - In-Basket

**Sexual Harassment:**

Assessee sees the need to question Bill about the sexual harassment complaint.

Assessee will meet with Bill (Monday, 6/8) to question him, then talk to Cindy (Tuesday, 6/9) about what went on in the meeting with Bill to resolve the sexual harassment complaint.

Thanked Cindy for the information about the sexual harassment complaint.

Apologized to Cindy because of the incident.

**Val-U-Trac lights:**

Has Frank (assistant) investigate whether some faulty lights have been already sold.

If some faulty lights have been sold, has Frank (assistant) inquire about what action will be taken to recall the faulty lights sold.

Has Frank (assistant) remove the Val-U-Trac lights from the shelves immediately.

Follows up on the removal of the lights by calling Frank (assistant) to check if they were removed on Monday 6/1.

**Quality Inspection Report:**

Assessee schedules a staff meeting (with no specific date) in response to the report about the dirty condition of the department.

**Employee Theft:**

Proposes to call John (assistant store manager) on Monday 6/1 to find out what should be done about employee theft in his department.

Thanks Lori for her information about employee theft in the department.

**Customer Complaint:**

Has Frank (assistant) write a letter of apology to Brenda Miller (customer).

Has Frank (assistant) talk to Lori about this complaint with no additional instructions.

**Summer Sale:**

Assessee recognizes the relationship between the faulty Val-U-Trac lights and their inclusion in the Summer Sale bulletin.

Removes the Val-U-Trac lights from the Summer Sale bulletin.

**Departmental Manager's Meeting:**

Schedules a meeting with Frank (assistant) on Tuesday, 6/9, to discuss the departmental manager's meeting.

**Dress-code Violations:**

Assessee schedules a meeting for Monday, 6/8, in response to the report of dress code violations in his department.

**Employee Time off request:**

Delegates the time-off request to Frank (assistant) without any instructions.

**Performance Rating/Transfer Complaint:**

Wants to question Glen Chandler to obtain information in response to Glen's request for transfer.

Schedules a meeting with Glen Chandler on Wednesday, 6/10, to resolve the performance/transfer issue.

**Staff Training:**

Assessee made a note on the calendar as to when the recommendations for training needed to be handed in.

**Valley Furniture:**

Has Frank (assistant) call John Peters (Valley Furn. Sales Rep) without any instructions in response to Valley Furniture asking to increase its order by 10%.

**Promotion Recommendation:**

Assessee made a note on the calendar noting the date when a recommendation for Lori was needed.

## List of Relevant Behaviors Observed by Experts - Role Play

Asks how the employee likes working at the new store.

Acknowledges that the employee has, overall, done a decent job, but there is room for improvement.

Wants to improve everybody's performance through the interview.

Suggests the need to open the lines of communication.

Suggests that the employee delegate responsibility more thoroughly.

Identifies that at the old store where the employee worked was smaller and he didn't have to delegate as much.

Wants the employee to delegate, let the staffers do their work and have the employee guide them.

Suggests that the employee expand his delegation.

Suggests that the employee delegate some decisions. Let the staffers handle some of the lesser decisions.

Wants the employee to groom the staffers, then the employee can move up in the company and have someone to take his place.

Suggests that the employee can't just tell them to do something, he needs to teach them through the delegation of responsibility.

States that the employee knows his job and does it well.

Suggests that the employee needs more patience in dealing with his staffers.

Acknowledges that it is tough to have patience. Assessee also has problems with patience. But, it needs to be worked on.

Proposes that the employee provide his experience and training to his staffers, so that they can improve.

Inquires whether some people in the employee's department don't belong.

Inquires whether some people in the employee's department are destructive to the department.

In response to hearing that the staffers don't do their work, the assessee asks what happens when they don't do their work.

Suggests that the employee sit down with the staffer and teach in a patience manner how to do the job.

Proposes that the employee tell the staffers what needs to be done, set a goal, and let them accomplish it.

Asks the employee for input about an issue that was discussed.

Inquires how the employee handles the scheduling of his staffers.

States that, at this store, they rotate the weekend schedule to give everyone a weekend off.

Agrees with the employee that the staffers should come to him with their complaints.

Proposes that the employee have a meeting with his staffers to bring some problems into the open. That way we can open the lines of communication.

Acknowledges that it is not the employee's fault if the staffers don't bring their problems to him.

After giving the employee an average rating, the assessee acknowledges that the employee is used to higher ratings.

Relates the problems that the employee is having to the adjustment to a new situation.

Has confidence in the employee; expects the employee to get higher ratings in the future.

States that they cannot wipe out all the staffers when a new manager comes in. The employee needs to work with the staffers.

Proposes that the employee needs to have patience with the staffers.

Acknowledges that it is tough to have patience.



Suggests that the employee delegate more responsibility to his staffers.

Proposes that the employee show the staffers how to do a task and be with them until they've done it a few times and are comfortable with it.

Acknowledges that having patience is tough.

States that the employee come to him if the employee needs any help or advice.

Acknowledges that it is tough to get started at a new store.

Believes that things will improve for the employee.

Identifies that the employee has done a good job in the past and expects him to do well in the future.

Thanks the employee for his time.

## Behaviors Observed for the Practice LGD Assessee

Acknowledges that compromises will have to be made by all departments.

Acknowledges that he must work with the other group members.

Identifies the total amount of money allocated for this year (\$6 million).

Recognizes the dollar amount increase from last year's budget to this year's budget (\$1.8 million).

Proposes that each department receive an additional \$300,000 as a compromise if the group cannot agree on a budget.

Acknowledges that compromises will have to be made by all departments.

Acknowledges the opinions of others by withdrawing his proposal of a \$300,000 increase and switching to a 40% increase.

Finalizes a decision about allocating funds (everybody gets a 40% increase) if they can't come to a consensus. Asks if this plan is agreeable to everyone.

Mentions the need that R & D has for computers and data processing.

Asks another member to prioritize his budget requests.

States that Data Processing was overbudget in the past due to price increases of data processing equipment.

Recognizes and accounts for being overbudget by adding in 5% of his present budget to form a revised base budget.

Identifies three requests for his department (three data processors, software training, increased computer capacity).

Justifies his personnel request by saying that they will help to improve service.

Justifies his software training request by saying that the software will be useless if people aren't trained to use it.

Justifies his request for increased computer capacity by mentioning its importance to the company and the problems that may result if this request is not funded.

Identifies how much additional money (above his base budget) he needs to fund his department's requests.

Prioritizes his budget requests.

Suggests that a request in his department can be eliminated and that money used to fund another request in order to lower his department's budget.

Identifies the future impact of the decision mentioned above (eliminating the three data processors will lessen the quality of service).

Asks another member for additional information.

Asks another member for additional information.

Clarifies information (how much money needs to be cut from the total budget) for the other members.

Asks for clarification on some dollar figures for the requests of another department.

Identifies information that has already been brought up (need to cut \$500,000 from the total budget).

Explains why he can't cut the cost of the computer capacity request to another member (this is the cost of the next update for the computer).

Clarifies his dollar requests for another member.

Proposes to the other members a way to cut down on his software training request (train half of the data processors now and half later) in order to reduce his department's and the overall budget.

Identifies the impact of the decision mentioned above (training will take longer).

Eliminates his request for three data processors to lower his department's and the overall budget. Eliminated this request without hearing any criticisms about this request from the other members.

Sees if everyone is agreeable to the decision to eliminate his personnel request.

Provides dollar figures for the requests of another department.

Identifies how much money Public Relations will have for a sporting event when taking into account that they were 30% overbudget and staying within a 40% increase.

Narrative Report for the Practice In-Basket Assessee

Question #1:

The assessee omitted one memo. The memo omitted pertained to the Managerial Advancement Recommendations. The response to this memo indicated that the item was not completed.

Question #2:

The assessee delayed action until her return for the Sexual Harassment complaint, Manager's Meeting, Dress-code violations, and the Performance Rating complaint memos. Specifically, the assessee arranged to have meetings with the individuals associated with these matters upon her return.

For the Dress-code violations and the Quality Inspection report the assessee recommended a staff meeting to discuss the problems. These responses were general in that they said "staff meet".

The assessee also recorded notes on the calendar for the Staff Training and Promotion Recommendation memos. These notes basically served as reminders for the assessee on what needs to be responded to and when.

The assessee wrote memos to John Woods (assistant store manager) to keep him informed about the Sexual Harassment complaint and the possibility of employee theft.

Question #3:

On the Summer Sale memo, the assessee recognized the relationship between the problem with Val-U-Trac lights and their listing in the summer sale bulletin. Assessee notes that the Val-U-Trac lights must be deleted from the bulletin.

Question 4:

Sexual Harassment:

Problem Analysis - Assessee sees the need to question Bill about the sexual harassment complaint.

Problem Solution - Assessee will meet with Bill (Monday, 6/8) to question him, then talk to Cindy (Tuesday, 6/9) about what went on in the meeting with Bill to resolve the sexual harassment complaint.

- Sensitivity - Thanked Cindy for the information about the sexual harassment complaint. Apologized to Cindy because of the incident.
- Val-U-Trac lights:
- Problem Analysis - Has Frank (assistant) investigate whether some faulty lights have been already sold.  
If some faulty lights have been sold, has Frank (assistant) inquire about what action will be taken to recall the faulty lights sold.
- Problem Solution - Has Frank (assistant) remove the Val-U-Trac lights from the shelves immediately.  
Follows up on the removal of the lights by calling Frank (assistant) to check if they were removed on Monday 6/1.
- Quality Inspection Report:
- Problem Solution - Assessee schedules a staff meeting (with no specific date) in response to the report about the dirty condition of the department.
- Employee Theft:
- Problem Analysis - Proposes to call John (assistant store manager) on Monday 6/1 to find out what should be done about employee theft in his department.
- Sensitivity - Thanks Lori for her information about employee theft in the department.
- Customer Complaint:
- Problem Analysis - Has Frank (assistant) talk to Lori about this complaint with no additional instructions. (Also Problem Solution).
- Problem Solution - Has Frank (assistant) write a letter of apology to Brenda Miller (customer).  
Has Frank (assistant) talk to Lori about this complaint with no additional instructions. (Also Problem Analysis).
- Sensitivity - Has Frank (assistant) write a letter of apology to Brenda Miller (customer).  
(Same as Problem Solution).

**Summer Sale:**

**Problem Analysis** - Assessee recognizes the relationship between the faulty Val-U-Trac lights and their inclusion in the Summer Sale bulletin.

**Problem Solution** - Removes the Val-U-Trac lights from the Summer Sale bulletin.

**Departmental Manager's Meeting:**

**Problem Solution** - Schedules a meeting with Frank (assistant) on Tuesday, 6/9, to discuss the departmental manager's meeting.

**Dress-code Violations:**

**Problem Solution** - Assessee schedules a meeting for Monday, 6/8, in response to the report of dress code violations in his department.

**Employee Time off request:**

**Problem Solution** - Delegates the time-off request to Frank (assistant) without any instructions.

**Performance Rating/Transfer Complaint:**

**Problem Analysis** - Wants to question Glen Chandler to obtain information in response to Glen's request for transfer.

**Problem Solution** - Schedules a meeting with Glen Chandler on Wednesday, 6/10, to resolve the performance/transfer issue.

**Staff Training:**

**Problem Solution** - Assessee made a note on the calendar as to when the recommendations for training needed to be handed in.

**Valley Furniture:**

**Problem Solution** - Has Frank (assistant) call John Peters (Valley Furn. Sales Rep) without any instructions in response to Valley Furniture asking to increase its order by 10%.

**Promotion Recommendation:**

**Problem Solution** - Assessee made a note on the calendar noting the date when a recommendation for Lori was needed.

## Narrative Report for the Practice Role-Play

## Question #1

Assessee did not address or resolve two problems (poor decision making [inventory, picnic tables] and working 60 hours per week). Four problems were addressed (staffer complaints of lack of responsibility, employee doing the staffer's work, poor relations with staffers, and scheduling). Two problems (staffer complaints of lack of responsibility and employee doing the staffer's work) were resolved through suggestions of increasing delegation, teaching them how to do a task, and showing the staffers how to do a task. Poor relations with staffers was resolved by the assessee suggesting that the employee have a meeting with his staff to bring problems into the open and open the lines of communication. The scheduling problem was resolved by the assessee stating how scheduling is commonly done at the store.

## Question #2

Assessee mentioned that the employee has done a good job on three occasions, and showed confidence in the employee by stating that his performance will improve in the future on three occasions.

Assessee suggested that the employee needed more patience in dealing with his staff on two occasions and acknowledged that it is difficult to have patience on three occasions.

Assessee proposed opening the lines of communication with his staffers on two occasions in order to improve relations with his staffers.

Assessee suggested that the employee needed to delegate some responsibility to his staffers five times and proposed that the employee needs to teach his staffers rather than just tell them on two occasions. Both of these behaviors were used to resolve the problems of staffer complaints of lack of responsibility and the employee doing the staffer's work.

## Question #3

Assessee recognized two relationships. The first one related the employee's delegation of responsibility problems to his previous position at a smaller store where the employee did not have to delegate as much. This relationship was used to explain why the employee may have had problems delegating. The second relationship identified the employee's adjustment to a new store and



situation as a possible cause of some of the problems that the employee is experiencing. This relationship was used to justify the average rating given by the assessee and to put the employee at ease.

#### Question #4

##### PROBLEM ANALYSIS

Identifies that there is room for improvement in the employee's performance.

Identifies that at the old store where the employee worked was smaller and he didn't have to delegate as much.

Inquires whether some people in the employee's department don't belong.

Inquires whether some people in the employee's department are destructive to the department.

In response to hearing that the staffers don't do their work, the assessee asks what happens when they don't do their work.

Asks the employee for input about an issue that was discussed. (Also Sensitivity).

Inquires how the employee handles the scheduling of his staffers.

Relates the problems that the employee is having to the adjustment to a new situation.

Identifies that the employee has done a good job in the past.

##### PROBLEM SOLUTION

Suggests the need to open the lines of communication.

Suggests that the employee delegate responsibility more thoroughly.

Wants the employee to delegate, let the staffers do their work and have the employee guide them.

Suggests that the employee expand his delegation.

Suggests that the employee delegate some decisions. Let the staffers handle some of the lesser decisions.

Wants the employee to groom the staffers, then the employee can move up in the company and have someone to take his place.

Suggests that the employee can't just tell them to do something, he needs to teach them through the delegation of responsibility.

Suggests that the employee needs more patience in dealing with his staffers.

Proposes that the employee provide his experience and training to his staffers, so that they can improve.

Suggests that the employee sit down with the staffer and teach him/her in a patience manner how to do the job.

Proposes that the employee tell the staffers what needs to be done, set a goal, and let them accomplish it.

States that, at this store, they rotate the weekend schedule to give everyone a weekend off.

Proposes that the employee have a meeting with his staffers to bring some problems into the open. That way we can open the lines of communication.

Proposes that the employee needs to work with the staffers.

Proposes that the employee needs to have patience with the staffers.

Suggests that the employee delegate more responsibility to his staffers.

Proposes that the employee show the staffers how to do a task and be with them until they've done it a few times and are comfortable with it.

States that the employee come to him if the employee needs any help or advice. (Also Sensitivity).

#### SENSITIVITY

Asks how the employee likes working at the new store.

Acknowledges that the employee has, overall, done a decent job.

States that the employee knows his job and does it well.

Acknowledges that it is tough to have patience. Assessee also has problems with patience. But, it needs to be worked on.

Agrees with the employee that the staffers should come to him with their complaints.

Acknowledges that it is not the employee's fault if the staffers don't bring their problems to him.

After giving the employee an average rating, the assessee acknowledges that the employee is used to higher ratings.

Has confidence in the employee; expects the employee to get higher ratings in the future.

States that they cannot wipe out all the staffers when a new manager comes in. The employee needs to work with the staffers.

Acknowledges that it is tough to have patience.

Acknowledges that having patience is tough.

States that the employee come to him if the employee needs any help or advice. (Also Problem Solution).

Acknowledges that it is tough to get started at a new store.

Believes that things will improve for the employee.

Expects employee to do well in the future.

Thanks the employee for his time.

Feedback on the Narrative Report for  
the Practice LGD Assessee

The assessee represented the Data Processing department in this discussion.

Question #1

The assessee did not have an impact on the meeting. The assessee did help the group come to one consensus on dividing up the money (if we can't come to a consensus budget, give everyone a 40% increase) and he did start the meeting and propose how to divide up the money (everyone gets \$300,000). However, after the beginning of the meeting, with the exception of his presentation for his department, the assessee had little input in the meeting. Besides information about his department, the other members did not look to him for information or solutions. The assessee did not emerge as a leader (after the beginning of the meeting), keep track of the time or departmental budgets. Finally, he did not persuade other members to reduce their budgets or accept his proposal for dividing up the money. He was only persuasive when reducing his own budget.

Question #2

Assessee acknowledged that compromises needed to be made by all departments on two occasions.

Justified each of his three requests (three data processors, software training, increased computer capacity).

Provided clarifying information about his budget figures and total budget figures on three occasions.

Asked for clarifying or additional information about other departments and their funding on two occasions.

Identified the impact of a particular decision (not increasing computer capacity, not hiring the data processors, cutting back on software training) on future departmental or organizational functioning on three occasions.

Sees if everyone is agreeable to a decision (taking a 40% increase, cutting back on software training) twice.

## Question #3

Assessee related the need for increased computer capacity to the functioning of other departments when proposing this request.

Assessee related the request for additional data processors to the service that other departments would receive.

## Question #4

## PROBLEM ANALYSIS

Identifies the total amount of money allocated for this year (\$6 million).

Recognizes the dollar amount increase from last year's budget to this year's budget (\$1.8 million).

Acknowledges that compromises will have to be made by all departments. (Also Sensitivity).

Mentions the need that R & D has for computers and data processing.

Asks another member to prioritize his budget requests.

States that Data Processing was overbudget in the past due to price increases of data processing equipment.

Recognizes and accounts for being overbudget by adding in 5% of his present budget to form a revised base budget.

Identifies three requests for his department (three data processors, software training, increased computer capacity).

Justifies his personnel request by saying that they will help to improve service.

Justifies his software training request by saying that the software will be useless if people aren't trained to use it.

Justifies his request for increased computer capacity by mentioning its importance to the company and the problems that may result if this request is not funded.

Identifies how much additional money (above his base budget) he needs to fund his department's requests.

Prioritizes his budget requests.

Identifies the future impact of the decision mentioned above (eliminating the three data processors will lessen the quality of service).

Asks another member for additional information.

Asks another member for additional information.

Clarifies information (how much money needs to be cut from the total budget) for the other members.

Asks for clarification on some dollar figures for the requests of another department.

Identifies information that has already been brought up (need to cut \$500,000 from the total budget).

Explains why he can't cut the cost of the computer capacity request to another member (this is the cost of the next update for the computer).

Clarifies his dollar requests for another member.

Identifies the impact of the decision mentioned above (training will take longer).

Provides dollar figures for the requests of another department.

Identifies how much money Public Relations will have for a sporting event when taking into account that they were 30% overbudget and staying within a 40% increase. (Also Problem Solution).

#### PROBLEM SOLUTION

Proposes that each department receive an additional \$300,000 as a compromise if the group cannot agree on a budget.

Finalizes a decision about allocating funds (everybody gets a 40% increase) if they can't come to a consensus. Asks if this plan is agreeable to everyone.

Suggests that a request in his department can be eliminated and that money used to fund another request in order to lower his department's budget.

Proposes to the other members a way to cut down on his software training request (train half of the data processors now and half later) in order to reduce his department's and the overall budget.

Eliminates his request for three data processors to lower his department's and the overall budget. Eliminated this request without hearing any criticisms about this request from the other members.

Identifies how much money Public Relations will have for a sporting event when taking into account that they were 30% overbudget and staying within a 40% increase. (Also Problem Analysis).

#### SENSITIVITY

Acknowledges that compromises will have to be made by all departments.

Acknowledges that he must work with the other group members.

Acknowledges that compromises will have to be made by all departments. (Also Problem Analysis).

Acknowledges the opinions of others by withdrawing his proposal of a \$300,000 increase and switching to a 40% increase.

Asks if everyone is agreeable to the proposal of a 40% increase.

Sees if everyone is agreeable to the decision to eliminate his personnel request.

Appendix J  
Training Script for Individual Training



### Script for Individual Training

In this training session, we will review the tasks involved in a consensus meeting. Understanding these tasks and skills will help you be more effective in the consensus meeting.

First, let me provide a little background on the consensus meeting and its purpose. In a consensus meetings, three to six individuals get together, exchange information about an assessee, generate ratings on dimensions, and an overall assessment rating (OAR). Consensus meetings are used in assessment centers, because assessors view the assessees in different exercises and must share information to generate overall ratings. Each assessor presents a report to the other assessors in order to form overall ratings and developmental feedback for the assessee. Consensus meetings are characterized by generating information from multiple exercises obtained by multiple assessors. The ratings generated from consensus meetings can be very stable and accurate, because they are based on multiple sources of information.

Consider the present situation to be an assessment center. You are three assessors who viewed the same assessees in three different exercises. So, we have multiple raters and information from different exercises.

The first stage of a consensus meeting is the reading

of narrative reports. The assessor who viewed the in-basket will read aloud the in-basket report. You do not need to make a presentation, just read it. When reading your report, please be complete; read everything that you have written in your report and do not omit any information. Try to follow the same order as the guideline questions. Read your response to question 1 first, then questions 2, 3, and 4.

While the in-basket report is being read, the other assessors should be taking notes on the information being presented. When taking notes, be sure to record all relevant behaviors; those that correspond with Problem Analysis, Problem Solution, or Sensitivity. Also, record any additional information that you think will have an influence on overall dimension ratings or an OAR.

Your first priority when taking notes is to record the behavior the assessee displayed in the in-basket. Recording behavior is what note taking is all about. Your second priority is to record some contextual information to clarify the behavior. Recording contextual information is not the most important part of note taking (recording behavior is), but noting contextual information is important and should be done whenever possible. By recording behavior with context, you will have sufficient detail on the assessee's behavior.

When taking notes try to provide as much detail as possible. It is fine to write brief summaries of behavior, as long as you understand it. Don't worry about grammar and spelling when taking notes, as long as you can understand them.

In sum, the objectives are to record all the behaviors you believe are relevant and provide some clarifying context for the behaviors.

When the assessor has completed reading the in-basket report, the other assessors may ask questions about the information just presented. If you have any questions about the information presented in the report, ask the assessor who read the report to clarify the information.

Next, the assessor who observed the role-play reads the role-play report. The other assessors take notes. After reading the role-play report, the assessors may ask questions about the information that was presented. For the assessor reading the role-play report, the same rules that were mentioned earlier apply for reading the report. That is, read the report, be complete, do not omit information, and follow the order of the guideline questions. The same rules also apply for those taking notes. That is, record all relevant behavior and record any information that you think is important for forming ratings. Finally, ask questions to clarify the information

presented.

Next, the assessor who observed the assessee in the leaderless group discussion reads the leaderless group discussion report, while the other two assessors take notes. After this report is read, clarifying questions about the assessee's performance may be asked.

In summary, the first stage of the consensus meeting follows a report reading, note taking, questioning sequence for each of the three exercises. One thing you must not do in this stage is begin to make overall ratings. Ratings are not made until all reports are read and questions answered. Rating before all the information is presented may distort your ratings and make you miss behaviors being reported. When not presenting your report, you should only be taking notes and asking questions. Overall ratings are made during the second stage of the consensus meeting.

#### QUESTIONS

The second stage of the consensus meeting is the generation of ratings for each of the three dimensions: Problem Analysis, Problem Solution, and Sensitivity. The ratings are independently generated by each of the three assessors. The information you use to form these ratings are your narrative reports and the notes taken from the other narrative reports. Only behaviors relevant to the dimension being evaluated should impact on your rating for

that dimension. Remember, impressions must not play any part in the formation of your ratings; only behaviors should be used. Furthermore, only behaviors relevant to a dimension being rated should be used. For example, only those behaviors classified as Problem Solution should be used to formulate the Problem Solution rating.

In order to generate dimension ratings, you must understand how to use the rating instrument. The rating instrument that you will use is called a behaviorally anchored rating scale (BARS). It is considered behavioral because different levels of effectiveness are illustrated by behaviors. This particular BARS is on a 5-point scale. On the scale, 5 represents the most effective level of performance and 1 represents the most ineffective level, with 4, 3, and 2 representing effective, average, and ineffective behavior, respectively.

The statements listed next to each scale point reflect behaviors that illustrate that level of performance. As you can see, the most effective behavior is listed next to the 5 point with progressively less effective behaviors going from 4 to 1.

These behaviors are listed on the scale to serve as concrete examples of the continuum of performance. They serve as a frame-of-reference (F-O-R) for each dimension. You must remember that the behaviors on the BARS are only

some of the behaviors that illustrate performance. Many other behaviors, not listed on the BARS, also correspond to these 5 levels of performance. So, what you must not do is focus on the behaviors that are on the BARS when generating a rating. The purpose for listing behaviors on the BARS is to provide information about where different types of behaviors are rated. Do not focus on single behaviors to look for a match on the BARS.

How should you use the scale? You should first examine all the behaviors in your notes relevant to a dimension and assess the relative effectiveness of these behaviors using the 5 points and example behaviors on the BARS as a guide. At this point, you ask yourself, "based on the behaviors recorded and evaluated, which of the 5 behavioral levels on the scale best describes how the assessee performed consistently?" Your rating should not be for an episode of performance, but for how the assessee performed consistently.

In order to better use the BARS, I will review the rationale for each frame-of-reference.

For Problem Analysis, the most effective behaviors involve finding relationships between two or more separate pieces of information. These behaviors are considered most effective, because identifying common themes between separate pieces of information shows greater use of

information than identifying one bit of information or obtaining additional information about a single problem. In addition, a relationship can have a greater impact on a decision than identifying additional information.

The next most effective behaviors consist of specific inquiries for more information and taking the needed information into account when analyzing a problem. Specific questioning is effective, because more useful information can be obtained when specific questions about specific issues and problems are asked than with general questions. In addition, when the assessee is taking into account the needed information when analyzing a problem, a better understanding of the problem and more effective solutions may be formed as compared to when information is omitted. For example, when an assessee identifies the impact of a decision on other problems, the assessee is exhibiting this level of behavior.

The next lowest level of Problem Analysis behaviors consist of asking for general input about a specific issue; asking for opinions, but not information; and identifying an aspect of a problem or issue. Behaviors like these are considered average. They are considered average, because the behaviors are basically neutral in terms of effectiveness. More information is gained and a better understanding of the problem would be obtained with

specific questions or identifying relationships. However, these behaviors do not lead to inappropriate or inaccurate information. In summary, these behaviors are not as probing as the more effective behaviors mentioned earlier, but this line of questioning is more effective than inaccurate or no probing.

The next level of Problem Analysis behaviors get into ineffective behaviors. These behaviors consist of identifying information that has already been provided, asking for clarification about some information, and asking general questions that cut across issues or problems (e.g., are you having any problems). As can be seen, these behaviors, in general, do not add to the investigation for additional information. Although they do not detract from the investigation of problems, they do not add to it either. Identifying information that has been provided and asking for clarification slow the investigative process, because this information has already been brought up. General questions that cut across issues or problems are also likely not to add useful information that can address a specific problem.

The lowest level of Problem Analysis behaviors are those that detract from the investigation for information or provide inaccurate information. General examples include: Not identifying information, problems, issues, or



requests that have been provided to them; Inquiries about information that has already been provided; and Forming inaccurate relationships. As you can see these behaviors either 1) add no new information to solve the problems or 2) lead to the generation and use of inaccurate information.

In summary, the F-O-R for Problem Analysis goes as follows: Forming accurate relationships are the most effective behaviors. Specific questions also form a hierarchy of effectiveness; specific questions about specific issues are more effective than general questions about specific issues, or general questions that cut across issues. Remember, the more specific the question, the more effective the behavior. In addition, the information considered to analyze a problem, the better. Finally, not recognizing needed information and inaccurate information are the least effective behaviors.

The next F-O-R we will discuss is Problem Solution. For Problem Solution, three hierarchies were identified that can be used to judge behavioral effectiveness. The first hierarchy is specific solutions to nonspecific solutions. This means that the more specific the solution, the more effective the behavior. The second hierarchy concerns the amount of information used to form solutions. More effective Problem Solution behaviors are generated

when the assessee has all needed information. The third hierarchy concerns solution complexity. More detailed solutions are superior to simpler solutions (e.g., a number of specific steps to solve multiple problems).

The most effective Problem Solution behaviors are those solutions that are complex and specific. For example, if a number of specific actions are proposed to solve a single problem, the solution is considered very effective. Another behavior is: Providing a detailed method for organizing a meeting or outlining a specific plan of action. These behaviors are considered most effective because 1) detailed plans are clearer and easier to carry out than general ones; 2) proposing multiple solutions provides the opportunity for others to choose an option; 3) multiple solutions show that greater thought went into forming the decision.

The next level of effective Problem Solution consists of providing specific solutions and making decisions after checking the needed information. These behaviors are considered effective because they 1) are specific solutions to specific issues and 2) take into account the information needed to generate an accurate solution. They are not as effective as the behaviors mentioned earlier, because the solutions are not as detailed or only one solution is proposed. With the most effective Problem Solution

behaviors, a number of solutions may be offered to address a single problem.

The next level of Problem Solution reflects average behaviors. Average Problem Solution behaviors involve general solutions, suggestions, and proposals of general action. General solutions or action plans are not as effective as more specific solutions, because they possess greater ambiguity (i.e., the instructions for carrying out the solution are not as clear cut). However, they are solutions and are appropriate.

The next lowest level begins to get into the ineffective behaviors. Problem Solution behaviors at this level are the very general and obvious solutions. A very general solution may be the setting of a goal without specifying how to obtain it. These solutions are ineffective because they provide little or no suggestions as to how to carry them out. Obvious solutions also add little because they may have already been tried and are most likely already known.

The most ineffective Problem Solution behaviors are those behaviors that involve a) not checking the needed information, b) delegation without instructions, c) inappropriate or inaccurate solutions, d) providing no solution for a problem, and e) stating that a problem can be solved without saying how. These behaviors are the most

ineffective, because one of two things can result from these solutions. First, the problem is incorrectly solved, or second, the problem is not solved and the problem remains. Not addressing a problem or not attempting to solve a problem constitutes a poor Problem Solution behavior.

The F-O-R for Problem Solution follows three hierarchies that should be examined concurrently when judging behavioral effectiveness; no one hierarchy is superior to any of the others. The first pertains to specific solutions. The more specific the solution, the more effective the behavior. The second hierarchy is the amount of information used to generate the solution. The more information incorporated into the solution, the more effective the behavior. The third hierarchy pertains to complex solutions. Complex solutions involve multiple steps and can be applied to multiple problems.

The final F-O-R to be discussed concerns Sensitivity. The F-O-R for Sensitivity goes from sensitive to insensitive behaviors. Differentiating between behaviors that are sensitive goes as follows. The most effective behaviors exhibit sensitive action or show sensitivity towards the individual being addressed. These sensitivity behaviors pertain to the individual him or herself, not aspects of the individual. Other behaviors at this level

are those that exhibit action rather than just words. The adage "action speaks louder than words" applies here.

The next level of effective Sensitivity behaviors are compliments or support of some aspect of individuals. What is meant by aspects is the work the individual has done, and other department's requests. Also at this level are those behaviors that show awareness or concern for some aspect of another individual. These behaviors are effective, but not as effective as those mentioned above, because they are statements, not actions, and they are less "central" to the individual. The behaviors do not show concern for others as individuals, rather they show concern for some product or aspect of the individual. In other words, behaviors here don't strike as close to home as those mentioned earlier.

The next level of behaviors represent average Sensitivity. These behaviors reflect general consideration, attempts to put other people at ease, or support for other people not being directly addressed. With general consideration, we are talking about thanking people for providing information, reinforcing people for providing suggestions, and acknowledging that one must work with others. These behaviors still fall on the sensitive side of the sensitive - insensitive hierarchy, but they are not considered as effective as those mentioned above

because these behaviors represent general consideration and one does not have to extend him or herself to exhibit these behaviors. In addition, a higher degree of Sensitivity is displayed when you are exhibiting these behaviors directly toward someone than indirectly.

The next level of Sensitivity gets into the insensitive behaviors. These behaviors show a lack of support for others' and being unaware of the concerns of others. For behaviors that exhibit a lack of support, the behaviors must be accompanied by justification or a reason for such behavior. With justification, the behaviors are not as insensitive when compared with criticisms without justification. In addition, the criticisms here pertain only to those criticisms of aspects of individuals, not the individual him or herself.

The lowest level of Sensitivity are those behaviors that exhibit any type of insensitivity without justification. The key in distinguishing between these behaviors and those just mentioned is justification. Without justification, the behavior represents an attack on an individual. In addition, any criticism directed at an individual, with or without justification, reflects ineffectiveness. Most ineffective behaviors are beyond showing no awareness of others' concerns. With these behaviors, the assessee is aware, but downplays or

criticizes the concerns.

In summary, the F-O-R for Sensitivity is as follows. Actions depicting sensitive behaviors are the most effective behaviors along with sensitivity directed at the individual. The next most effective behaviors are complimenting and acknowledging some aspect or product of the individual (e.g., their work, their requests). Behaviors such as putting others at ease, general consideration, and supporting other individuals not present make up the average Sensitivity behaviors. The last two levels of Sensitivity are ineffective behaviors that reflect a lack of sensitivity or insensitivity. The fourth level consists of criticisms directed at aspects or products of individuals with justification. The lowest level of sensitivity involves behaviors which criticize without justification or criticisms directed at individuals with or without justification.

After the individual ratings have been generated, the third stage of the consensus meeting occurs. In this stage, ratings are communicated by all assessors. The ratings are communicated one dimension at a time. All Sensitivity ratings will be communicated first. If an adequate level of agreement is not present, the Sensitivity ratings are discussed until consensus is obtained. When consensus for Sensitivity has been obtained, the Problem

Solution ratings are communicated and, if needed, discussed. Finally, the Problem Analysis ratings are communicated and discussed.

Now I will clarify the meaning of consensus and discussion. One purpose of the consensus meeting is to form overall or agreed upon ratings for each dimension. From the individual ratings, the overall ratings will be generated. However, in order for overall ratings to be final, a specified level of consensus must be reached. If, for example, the three assessor ratings were 1, 3, and 5, an overall rating could not be formed; there is too much disagreement among the assessor's ratings. In this example, one assessor saw the assessee as highly effective (5), another saw the assessee as average (3), and a third assessor saw the assessee as highly ineffective (1). From these ratings, we do not have a very accurate or stable picture of the assessee's performance. A final overall dimension rating can only be formed when there is an adequate level of consensus.

The consensus level that must be obtained is as follows: Two assessors must agree on one rating (say a rating of 3) and the third assessor may be one scale point away (either a rating of 2 or 4). So, any combination of ratings like this, or better still, if all three assessors agree on a single rating, an overall rating can be formed.



In the combination (3, 3, 2) the final rating would be a 3. Other examples of adequate consensus include (2, 2, 1) and (4, 4, 5).

If the ratings are more divergent than one scale point, an overall rating cannot be formed until the ratings are discussed and revised. Examples of rating combinations that do not have adequate consensus include: (1, 2, 3), (2, 2, 4), and (3, 4, 5).

When the specified level of consensus is not reached for a dimension rating, the next step in the consensus meeting is for the assessors to discuss the behavioral rationale behind the ratings. Only behaviors should be used as evidence for a rating. The purpose for this discussion is to influence other assessors to change their ratings so consensus can be reached. Discussion should continue until consensus is reached. The only evidence that should influence a change in rating is behavioral rationale. Through the discussion of behaviors, assessors are provided with new insights and eventually change their ratings to achieve consensus.

The structure of the discussion goes as follows. The assessor with the highest rating provides a rationale for the rating. At this point, other assessors may not question the rationale. Next, the assessor with the lowest rating provides a rationale without interruption. Then,

the third assessor provides a rationale. Once all the rationales have been presented, assessors can begin to question each other. Discussion and questioning then continues without any specific structure; any assessor can speak at any time.

Once overall consensus ratings have been generated for the three dimensions, a final rating of the assessee's overall performance is generated independently by each assessor. This overall assessment rating (OAR) asks the assessors to evaluate the assessee's entire performance across all exercises and dimensions. On the rating sheet the introduction reads, "taking into account the assessee's behavior across all exercises and dimensions, the managerial performance of the assessee is considered:." What is being addressed here is how well did the assessee perform as a manager. This rating reflects the assessee's performance in the three exercises on the three dimensions. The scale for the OAR is a 5-point scale with evaluative adjectives (Most Effective, Effective, Average, Ineffective, Most Ineffective) next to each point. What should be considered in this rating are all the relevant behaviors from the three exercises. In addition, you should consider the entire job of a first-level manager, or "how effective was this assessee's managerial performance?" When examining the scale points, compare your information

to your expectations for how a first-level manager would perform, then circle the adjective that best describes the overall performance. For example, if you are considering giving an average rating, compare your information to how you would expect an average first-level manager to perform.

After independent OARs have been generated by the assessors, these ratings are communicated to the group. At this point, if adequate consensus is not obtained, the ratings are discussed in the same fashion used for the dimension ratings.

Once this stage is completed, all the final ratings for this assessee have been formed. After this, the next assessee is evaluated using the same stages mentioned above. This process continues until all the assessees have been evaluated.

Now I will answer any questions you may have about the stages involved in the consensus meeting procedure.

PAUSE

Now I would like to give you a chance to practice a consensus meeting. In this practice session, you will be generating three overall dimension ratings and one OAR for one assessee. The assessee you will evaluate is the same individual that you observed and wrote a report on in the previous training session. The reports you wrote on this assessee will serve as the information to be used to

generate consensus ratings. At the conclusion of this meeting, I will tell you the ratings that experts gave this assessee and their rationale behind their ratings. If you have any questions about your task in the consensus meeting please ask them before beginning the practice consensus meeting.

PAUSE

For the Problem Analysis rating across the three exercises, the experts gave the assessee a mean rating of 2.6, with the majority of experts agreeing on a rating of 3.

The assessee did recognize relationships in all three exercises. In addition, the future consequences of a decision were identified in the LGD and in-basket. However, general questions seemed to dominate the Problem Analysis behaviors, especially in the role play and LGD. The assessee on numerous occasions asked for general input and opinions that were not probing. In addition, the information obtained from these questions was not used for later investigation or for solving problems. For some memos in the in-basket, the assessee lacked investigative questions needed to better understand the problem.

For the Problem Solution rating across the three exercises, the experts gave the assessee a mean rating of 2.8, with the majority of experts agreeing on a rating of

3.

The experts agreed that the assessee did exhibit all five levels of Problem Solution behaviors. However, the most frequent level of behaviors exhibited across the three exercises were general solutions with little or no action plans for carrying them out. One could most likely expect the assessee to consistently exhibit general solutions across the three exercises.

For the Sensitivity rating across the three exercises, the experts gave the assessee a mean rating of 3.8, with the majority of experts agreeing on a rating of 4.

The assessee was given this rating, primarily because of his multiple sensitive behaviors and sensitive action in the role play. The assessee showed numerous acknowledgments of the employee and supported the him. In the other two exercises, the assessee exhibited basic Sensitivity. He did show sensitivity and support towards Cindy in the in-basket. The assessee was not insensitive in any of the three exercises and no insensitive behaviors were observed.

For the OAR, the experts gave the assessee a mean rating of 2.8, with the majority of experts agreeing on a rating of 3.

What helped boost the assessee to this "fair" rating was his sensitivity which was seen as effective by the

experts. Problem Analysis and Solution was, in general, ineffective, but he did show potential for effective Problem Analysis (i.e., identifying relationships in all exercises) and Problem Solution (i.e., exhibited some specific solutions and actions). Based on the Sensitivity behaviors exhibited and the potential for effective Problem Analysis and Solution, in addition to not exhibiting any behaviors that would lead to big problems in his department, the assessee's overall performance as a manager was seen as fair.

Now, we will begin the consensus meeting to form overall ratings for the four experimental assessees.

Appendix K  
Training Materials Used During Team Training

### Team Training - Questioning Narrative Report Behaviors

The purpose of this exercise is to find out how well you understand the questions that can be asked about an assessor's narrative report. For the following behaviors, generate questions that you would ask if these behaviors were presented to you in an assessor's narrative report.

1. Role-Play: Assessee conveyed the impression that the employee was guilty until proven innocent.
2. In-Basket: Assessee delays action on managerial recommendations until his return.
3. Grp. Disc: The assessee seemed aggravated when making budget cuts in her departmental budget.
4. Role-Play: Assessee wanted to hear the employee's side of the story for some problems.
5. In-Basket: Assessee did not want to let Pat (store manager) know about some of the problems in his department since he directed no memos at Pat.
6. Grp. Disc: Assessee proposed a way to organize the meeting that was efficient.
7. Role-Play: Assessee suggested that the employee communicate more with his subordinates.
8. In-Basket: Assessee scheduled five meetings for Monday, June 8th (the day she gets back).
9. Grp. Disc: Assessee had an impact on the meeting. Although the assessee was not influential in his justifications for his budget or against others' requests and was not looked to for needed information; he was actively involved in the meeting and kept track of the budget totals.



## Behavioral Frameworks

### Problem Analysis

- Input from all exercises given equal weight.
- Different exercises provide information about different characteristics of Problem Analysis.
- Questioning for additional information is seen most often and most clearly in the role play.
- The most effective relationships were seen in the LGD.
- For identifying information, the LGD was given slightly more weight than the other exercises, however, all three exercises did contribute to this characteristic of Problem Analysis.

### Problem Solution

- The in-basket was given the greatest weight, because for each memo, a Problem Solution behavior can be exhibited.
- In the role play and LGD the solutions are not as clearly observable as they are in the in-basket.
- However, the LGD and role-play do have solutions that are considered.
- Solutions are most evident in the LGD during the assessee's presentation and the questioning of budget requests.
- For the role play, solutions are expected after a problem has been brought up by the assessee and discussed.

### Sensitivity

- In-basket behaviors given the least weight, because only a few memos exhibit Sensitivity behaviors.
- Many Sensitivity behaviors can be displayed in the LGD and role play.
- However, the range of sensitive behaviors (most effective to most ineffective) in the LGD may be restricted.
- In the role play, not only can many behaviors be expected, but a wide range as well.
- Thus, the role play was given a little more weight than the behaviors from the LGD.

### Overall Assessment Rating

- Ineffective behaviors weighted more heavily than effective behaviors.
- This bias was stronger for the OAR than for the overall dimension ratings.

- All three dimensions did contribute to the OAR, however Sensitivity was weighted slightly more heavily than the other dimensions.
- All three exercises contributed equally.

## Interactive and Inhibitory Behavior Observation List

### Interactive Behaviors

- Checking - Recognizing errors in another assessor's report or behavioral rationale. Recognizing the use of impressions or improper behavioral interpretations.
- Filtering - As a team, determining what information is relevant or irrelevant for consideration for a rating during discussion or narrative report clarification.
- Communicating - Providing the needed information to others when questioned about a narrative report. Giving clear and complete justification for a rating.
- Gathering - Asking other assessors for more information to clarify the information provided. Asking for specifics about an assessor's behavioral rationale and details concerning the narrative report.

### Inhibitory Behaviors

- Member Dominance - One or two members dominate the discussion at a point when all the members' inputs are needed. There is not equal participation among the three assessors during the discussion of ratings.
- Conformity - Ratings are changed without hearing the rationale behind the ratings. An assessor(s) changes a rating before the behavioral rationales have been communicated to the team. Assessor(s) attempts to convince an assessor with a discrepant rating to change it without the use of rationale.
- Lack of Information Exchange - Information is introduced into the discussion that was not mentioned in any narrative report and used as behavioral rationale. This excludes exercise-specific information.

## Guidelines for Team Participation in Consensus Meetings

### GOAL OF THE MEETING

To generate accurate overall ratings using all the relevant information from the three exercises and the interaction of the three assessors.

### RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE ASSESSOR

Interact with other assessors; check information for its correctness and appropriateness; determine what information is relevant to a rating (filtering); provide exercise-specific information on the exercise you observed.

### READING REPORTS

Read the entire report; provide contextual information with behaviors; follow the order of the Guidelines; avoid lack of information exchange.

### ASKING QUESTIONS

Ask questions about any bit of information in a report that 1) was unclear, 2) you want more detail on, 3) you think may be an impression or inappropriate, or 4) you want to determine its relevancy (filtering).

### ANSWERING QUESTIONS

Be clear and specific in your responses; make sure you answer the question being addressed; provide exercise-specific detail if needed.

### GENERATING RATINGS

Use behaviors only, no impressions; use all the information that is relevant to the rating. Select the level of performance based on "how you would expect the assessee to consistently perform on that dimension".

### DISCUSSING RATINGS

Avoid member dominance, conformity, and lack of information exchange. Changing your rating should only be based on behavioral evidence and rationale. You should provide your explanation for your rating and question other assessors' evidence. Check information for its appropriateness and determine what information is relevant to a rating (filtering).

Appendix L  
Training Script for Team Training

### Script for Team Training

In this training session, we will review the tasks involved in a consensus meeting. In addition, you will learn the interactive skills needed to perform effectively in consensus meetings.

First, let me provide a little background on the consensus meeting and its purpose. In a consensus meeting, three to six individuals get together, exchange information about an assessee, generate overall dimension ratings, and an overall assessment rating (OAR). Consensus meetings are used in assessment centers, because assessors view the assesseees in different exercises and must share information to generate overall ratings. Each assessor presents a report to the other assessors in order to form overall ratings and developmental feedback for the assessee. Consensus meetings are characterized by generating information from multiple exercises obtained by multiple assessors. The ratings generated from consensus meetings can be very stable and accurate, because they are based on multiple sources of information. However, the key to accurate ratings remains the responsibility of the assessors. Assessors must provide clear information, check information for its appropriateness, make sure the proper information is used for a particular rating, and question other assessors' ratings and interpretations of

information. When assessors meet these responsibilities, the benefits of multiple information can be realized. Thus, your responsibilities include more than just rating; interaction with the other assessors is also needed.

Consider the present situation to be an assessment center. You are three assessors who viewed the same assessees in three different exercises. So, we have multiple raters and information from different exercises.

One assessor viewed the assessees' in-basket performances, another assessor the role-play, and the third assessor the leaderless group discussion. So, each assessor has information that the other two assessors do not have. In order to generate accurate final ratings, all information must be learned by all assessors. Accurate ratings cannot be made without complete information. The need to communicate information makes the three assessors a team. You must interact and depend upon one another in order to accomplish the objective of the meeting. This means that the information in the narrative reports must be communicated clearly, completely, and accurately. In addition to communicating information, information from one assessor must be checked by other assessors to determine if it is appropriate; that no impressions are being used, and the behavior is classified to the appropriate dimension. In addition, information must be gathered by the team, and

the information must be filtered to determine if it is relevant to a particular dimension rating. In order for the needed information to be communicated, checked, gathered, and filtered, interaction among the assessors must occur. Interaction is the only way to get the needed information and insure that it is appropriate.

Furthermore, since you are a team with each assessor having a equal say in the meeting's outcome, other types of behavior need to be avoided. One member shouldn't dominate the others. One assessor shouldn't try to take charge of the meeting or try to "bully" others. Also, you shouldn't conform to others without hearing the rationales behind the ratings. You may be correct in your opinions. These and other inhibitory behaviors will be discussed again at the point in the meeting where they are most likely to occur.

The first stage of a consensus meeting is the reading of narrative reports. The assessor who viewed the in-basket will read aloud the in-basket report. You do not need to make a presentation, just read it. When reading your report, please be complete; read everything that you have written in your report and do not omit any information. Remember that you want to maximize information exchange. In order for accurate ratings to be generated, complete information is a must. Try to follow the same order as the guideline questions. Read your



response to question 1 first, then questions 2, 3, and 4.

When reading your report, you must remember that you are the expert for that exercise. The other assessors have never viewed that exercise. You are more knowledgeable of the behaviors exhibited in the exercise: You know what behaviors are classified with what dimensions; and you know the effectiveness of the behaviors. Being an expert on one of the exercises gives you some added responsibility in the consensus meeting. You are responsible for communicating exercise-related information to the other assessors and clarifying behaviors using this information. When reading your reports, you should provide the context in which the behaviors occurred in a way that clarifies the behaviors for the other assessors. Remember, these assessors know nothing about the exercise you observed. Presenting the context for the behaviors, along with the behaviors, will help the other assessors better understand the behaviors and the exercise.

While the in-basket report is being read, the other assessors should be taking notes on the information being presented. When taking notes, be sure to record all relevant behaviors; those that correspond with Problem Analysis, Problem Solution, or Sensitivity. Also, record any additional information that you think will have an influence on overall dimension ratings or an OAR.

Your first priority when taking notes is to record the behavior the assessee displayed in the in-basket. Recording behavior is what note taking is all about. Your second priority is to record some contextual information to clarify the behavior. Recording contextual information is not the most important part of note taking (recording behavior is), but noting contextual information is important and should be done whenever possible. By recording behavior with context, you will have sufficient detail on the assessee's behavior.

When taking notes try to provide as much detail as possible. It is fine to write brief summaries of behavior, as long as you understand it. Don't worry about grammar and spelling when taking notes, as long as you can understand them.

In sum, the objectives are to record all the behaviors you believe are relevant and provide some clarifying context for the behaviors.

When the assessor has completed reading the in-basket report, the other assessors may ask questions about the information just presented. In order to use the information presented to form accurate ratings, the information must be understandable, clear, and accurate. If any of the information is unclear, or if you feel it reflects impressions, you must question the assessor who

presented the information. If you do not, the information will either be of no use or used inappropriately in the formation of ratings. For information to be used correctly, it must be clear. The only way to clarify ambiguous information is to question the assessor who presented it. Asking questions applies to any information that was unclear, missed in your note taking, or that you are uncertain about in any way.

In addition to questions intended to clarify information, other types of questions can be asked at this stage. Some behaviors, may be clear, but, you may need more detail to interpret the behavior accurately. These type of questions also include questions intended to determine the rationale behind an assessor's response on the narrative report. The assessor that read the report knows the exercise and can provide the needed detail. So, if you need additional detail, ask the assessor who read the report at the conclusion of the presentation.

Another type of question that should be asked are "checking type" questions. Recall that one of your responsibilities in the consensus meeting is to check the information presented by other assessors for its appropriateness. The purpose of these questions is to insure that impressions are not incorporated into the ratings, and that the behaviors are classified and

evaluated correctly. It is the responsibility of the team to identify impressions and any other inappropriate information and eliminate them from consideration. If the assessor mentions what you believe to be an impression, you must question the assessor about this information to determine whether it is an impression or behavior.

Finally, questions that determine whether a behavior is important for a particular rating should also be asked. These questions are classified as "filtering type" questions. The purpose of these questions is to determine what behaviors are relevant for a particular rating. If you believe that a behavior is not relevant to any of the ratings, you should question the assessor about that behavior.

It should also be remembered that if the response from the assessor is not clear to you, ask the question again. Keep questioning the assessor until your question is answered and you understand the response. To lessen the occurrence of unclear responses, I will now provide some advice for those answering the questions.

For the assessor that answers the questions about the report, there are a few things to consider. First, you should maximize information exchange by answering the questions clearly and completely and make sure that the assessors understand the response. You may want to ask the

assessor if your response was understood. If the response you give is unclear, try answering the question differently. Try to use examples. Another thing that may clarify your response is your knowledge of the exercise. Providing context with a behavior helps clarify the behavior. The assessors do not know the exercise you observed. You may have to give a more detailed description of the exercise than you did in the report. Be specific and tell how the behavior relates to other parts of the exercise.

Next, the assessor who observed the role-play reads the role-play report. The other assessors take notes. After reading the role-play report, the assessors may ask questions about the information that was presented. For the assessor reading the role-play report, the same rules that were mentioned earlier apply for reading the report. That is, read the report, be complete, do not omit information, and follow the order of the guideline questions. The same rules also apply for those taking notes. That is, record all relevant behavior, and record any information that you think is important for forming ratings. Finally, ask questions to clarify the information presented.

Next, the assessor who observed the assessee in the leaderless group discussion reads the leaderless group

discussion report, while the other assessors take notes. After this report is read, clarifying questions about the assessee's performance may be asked.

In summary, the first stage of the consensus meeting follows a report reading, note taking, questioning sequence for each of the three exercises. One thing you must not do in this stage is begin to make overall ratings. Ratings are not made until all reports are read and questions answered. Rating before all the information is presented may distort your ratings and make you miss behaviors being reported. When not presenting your report, you should only be taking notes and asking questions. Overall ratings are made during the second session of the consensus meeting.

#### QUESTIONS

Next, I am going to read written excerpts from narrative reports that need to be questioned in order to better understand them. Three behaviors are described for each exercise. What I would like you to do now is read each of the behaviors. Then I want you to ask me questions about the behaviors. After your questions, I will provide you with feedback.

#### PAUSE

#### FEEDBACK AND RESPONSES ARE PRESENTED LIVE

The second stage of the consensus meeting is the generation of ratings for each of the three dimensions:

Problem Analysis, Problem Solution, and Sensitivity. The ratings are independently generated by each of the three assessors. The information you use to form these ratings are your narrative reports and the notes taken from the other narrative reports. Only behaviors relevant to the dimension being evaluated should impact on your rating for that dimension. Remember, impressions must not play any part in the formation of your ratings; only behaviors should be used. Furthermore, only behaviors relevant to a dimensions being rated should be used. For example, only those behaviors classified as Problem Solution should be used to formulate the Problem Solution rating.

In order to generate dimension ratings, you must understand how to use the rating instrument. The rating instrument that you will use is called a behaviorally anchored rating scale (BARS). It is considered behavioral because different levels of effectiveness are illustrated by behaviors. This particular BARS is on a 5-point scale. On the scale, 5 represents the most effective level of performance and 1 represents the most ineffective level, with 4, 3, and 2 representing effective, average, and ineffective behavior, respectively.

The statements listed next to each scale point reflect behaviors that illustrate that level of performance. As you can see, the most effective behavior is listed next to

the 5 point with progressively less effective behaviors going from 4 to 1.

These behaviors are listed on the scale to serve as concrete examples of the continuum of performance. They serve as a frame-of-reference (F-O-R) for each dimension. You must remember that the behaviors on the BARS are only some of the behaviors that illustrate performance. Many other behaviors, not listed on the BARS, also correspond to these 5 levels of performance. So, what you must not do is focus on the behaviors that are on the BARS when generating a rating. The purpose for listing behaviors on the BARS is to provide information about where different types of behaviors are rated. Do not focus on single behaviors to look for a match on the BARS.

How should you use the scale? You should first examine all the behaviors in your notes relevant to a dimension and assess the relative effectiveness of these behaviors using the 5 points and example behaviors on the BARS as a guide. At this point, you ask yourself, "based on the behaviors recorded and evaluated, which of the 5 behavioral levels on the scale best describes how the assessee performed consistently?" Your rating should not be for an episode of performance, but for how the assessee performed consistently.

In order to better use the BARS, I will review the



rationale for each frame-of-reference.

For Problem Analysis, the most effective behaviors involve finding relationships between two or more separate pieces of information. These behaviors are considered most effective, because identifying common themes between separate pieces of information shows greater use of information than identifying one bit of information or obtaining additional information about a single problem. In addition, a relationship can have a greater impact on a decision than identifying additional information.

The next most effective behaviors consist of specific inquiries for more information and taking the needed information into account when analyzing a problem. Specific questioning is effective, because more useful information can be obtained when specific questions about specific issues and problems are asked than with general questions. In addition, when the assessee is taking into account the needed information when analyzing a problem, a better understanding of the problem and more effective solutions may be formed as compared to when information is omitted. For example, when an assessee identifies the impact of a decision on other problems, the assessee is exhibiting this level of behavior.

The next lowest level of Problem Analysis behaviors consist of asking for general input about a specific issue;

asking for opinions, but not information; and identifying an aspect of a problem or issue. Behaviors like these are considered average. They are considered average, because the behaviors are basically neutral in terms of effectiveness. More information is gained and a better understanding of the problem would be obtained with specific questions or identifying relationships. However, these behaviors do not lead to inappropriate or inaccurate information. In summary, these behaviors are not as probing as the more effective behaviors mentioned earlier, but this line of questioning is more effective than inaccurate or no probing.

The next level of Problem Analysis behaviors get into ineffective behaviors. These behaviors consist of identifying information that has already been provided, asking for clarification about some information, and asking general questions that cut across issues or problems (e.g., are you having any problems). As can be seen, these behaviors, in general, do not add to the investigation for additional information. Although they do not detract from the investigation of problems, they do not add to it either. Identifying information that has been provided and asking for clarification slow the investigative process, because this information has already been brought up. General questions that cut across issues or problems are

also likely not to add useful information that can address a specific problem.

The lowest level of Problem Analysis behaviors are those that detract from the investigation for information or provide inaccurate information. General examples include: Not identifying information, problems, issues, or requests that have been provided to them; Inquiries about information that has already been provided; and Forming inaccurate relationships. As you can see these behaviors either 1) add no new information to solve the problems or 2) lead to the generation and use of inaccurate information.

In summary, the F-O-R for Problem Analysis goes as follows: Forming accurate relationships are the most effective behaviors. Specific questions also form a hierarchy of effectiveness; specific questions about specific issues are more effective than general questions about specific issues, or general questions that cut across issues. Remember, the more specific the question, the more effective the behavior. In addition, the information considered to analyze a problem, the better. Finally, not recognizing needed information and inaccurate information are the least effective behaviors.

The next F-O-R we will discuss is Problem Solution. For Problem Solution, three hierarchies were identified

that can be used to judge behavioral effectiveness. The first hierarchy is specific solutions to nonspecific solutions. This means that the more specific the solution, the more effective the behavior. The second hierarchy concerns the amount of information used to form solutions. More effective Problem Solution behaviors are generated when the assessee has all needed information. The third hierarchy concerns solution complexity. More detailed solutions are superior to simpler solutions (e.g., a number of specific steps to solve multiple problems).

The most effective Problem Solution behaviors are those solutions that are complex and specific. For example, if a number of specific actions are proposed to solve a single problem, the solution is considered very effective. Another behavior is: Providing a detailed method for organizing a meeting or outlining a specific plan of action. These behaviors are considered most effective because 1) detailed plans are clearer and easier to carry out than general ones; 2) proposing multiple solutions provides the opportunity for others to choose an option; 3) multiple solutions show that greater thought went into forming the decision.

The next level of effective Problem Solution consists of providing specific solutions and making decisions after checking the needed information. These behaviors are

considered effective because they 1) are specific solutions to specific issues and 2) take into account the information needed to generate an accurate solution. They are not as effective as the behaviors mentioned earlier, because the solutions are not as detailed or only one solution is proposed. With the most effective Problem Solution behaviors, a number of solutions may be offered to address a single problem.

The next level of Problem Solution reflects average behaviors. Average Problem Solution behaviors involve general solutions, suggestions, and proposals of general action. General solutions or action plans are not as effective as more specific solutions, because they possess greater ambiguity (i.e., the instructions for carrying out the solution are not as clear cut). However, they are solutions and are appropriate.

The next lowest level begins to get into the ineffective behaviors. Problem Solution behaviors at this level are the very general and obvious solutions. A very general solution may be the setting of a goal without specifying how to obtain it. These solutions are ineffective because they provide little or no suggestions as to how to carry them out. Obvious solutions also add little because they may have already been tried and are most likely already known.

The most ineffective Problem Solution behaviors are those behaviors that involve a) not checking the needed information, b) delegation without instructions, c) inappropriate or inaccurate solutions, d) providing no solution for a problem, and e) stating that a problem can be solved without saying how. These behaviors are the most ineffective, because one of two things can result from these solutions. First, the problem is incorrectly solved, or second, the problem is not solved and the problem remains. Not addressing a problem or not attempting to solve a problem constitutes a poor Problem Solution behavior.

The F-O-R for Problem Solution follows three hierarchies that should be examined concurrently when judging behavioral effectiveness; no one hierarchy is superior to any of the others. The first pertains to specific solutions. The more specific the solution, the more effective the behavior. The second hierarchy is the amount of information used to generate the solution. The more information incorporated into the solution, the more effective the behavior. The third hierarchy pertains to complex solutions. Complex solutions involve multiple steps and can be applied to multiple problems.

The final F-O-R to be discussed concerns Sensitivity. The F-O-R for Sensitivity goes from sensitive to

insensitive behaviors. Differentiating between behaviors that are sensitive goes as follows. The most effective behaviors exhibit sensitive action or show sensitivity towards the individual being addressed. These sensitivity behaviors pertain to the individual him or herself, not aspects of the individual. Other behaviors at this level are those that exhibit action rather than just words. The adage "action speaks louder than words" applies here.

The next level of effective Sensitivity behaviors are compliments or support of some aspect of individuals. What is meant by aspects is the work the individual has done, and other department's requests. Also at this level are those behaviors that show awareness or concern for some aspect of another individual. These behaviors are effective, but not as effective as those mentioned above, because they are statements, not actions, and they are less "central" to the individual. The behaviors do not show concern for others as individuals, rather they show concern for some product or aspect of the individual. In other words, behaviors here don't strike as close to home as those mentioned earlier.

The next level of behaviors represent average Sensitivity. These behaviors reflect general consideration, attempts to put other people at ease, or support for other people not being directly addressed.

With general consideration, we are talking about thanking people for providing information, reinforcing people for providing suggestions, and acknowledging that one must work with others. These behaviors still fall on the sensitive side of the sensitive - insensitive hierarchy, but they are not considered as effective as those mentioned above because these behaviors represent general consideration and one does not have to extend him or herself to exhibit these behaviors. In addition, a higher degree of Sensitivity is displayed when you are exhibiting these behaviors directly toward someone than indirectly.

The next level of Sensitivity gets into the insensitive behaviors. These behaviors show a lack of support for others' and being unaware of the concerns of others. For behaviors that exhibit a lack of support, the behaviors must be accompanied by justification or a reason for such behavior. With justification, the behaviors are not as insensitive when compared with criticisms without justification. In addition, the criticisms here pertain only to those criticisms of aspects of individuals, not the individual him or herself.

The lowest level of Sensitivity are those behaviors that exhibit any type of insensitivity without justification. The key in distinguishing between these behaviors and those just mentioned is justification.



Without justification, the behavior represents an attack on an individual. In addition, any criticism directed at an individual, with or without justification, reflects ineffectiveness. Most ineffective behaviors are beyond showing no awareness of others' concerns. With these behaviors, the assessee is aware, but downplays or criticizes the concerns.

In summary, the F-O-R for Sensitivity is as follows. Actions depicting sensitive behaviors are the most effective behaviors along with sensitivity directed at the individual. The next most effective behaviors are complimenting and acknowledging some aspect or product of the individual (e.g., their work, their requests). Behaviors such as putting others at ease, general consideration, and supporting other individuals not present make up the average Sensitivity behaviors. The last two levels of Sensitivity are ineffective behaviors that reflect a lack of sensitivity or insensitivity. The fourth level consists of criticisms directed at aspects or products of individuals with justification. The lowest level of Sensitivity involves behaviors which criticize without justification or criticisms directed at individuals with or without justification.

In addition to the F-O-Rs, a behavioral framework can be used to rate assessee behavior across the three

exercises. The behavioral framework will help you integrate behaviors across the three exercises into one overall dimension rating. I will now present a behavioral framework, formed by expert assessors, for each dimension.

For generating overall Problem Analysis ratings, input from all three exercises was given equal weight. However, different exercises provided information about different characteristics of Problem Analysis (e.g., identifying relationships, questioning for information, and identifying information).

Questioning for additional information is seen most often in the role play. In the role play, it is clear whether the assessee had a sequence of questions, probed with the questions, and used the information from responses. In the other two exercises, sequencing of questions is not as easily observed because of other members in the LGD and no responses in the in-basket. Thus, for questioning behaviors the role play was weighted most heavily.

However, the relationships identified in the role play were considered rather obvious and were not weighted as heavily as relationships in the in-basket and LGD. For the in-basket, there are certain memos where relationships should have been seen. These memos help focus attention on relationships and make them clear to the assessors, thus

these relationships, or not identifying relationships, are weighted heavily. The relationships identified in the LGD were also weighted heavily, because to identify relationships in this exercise, some creativity is needed. Relationships in the LGD are not as obvious as the relationships in the role play and in-basket, thus relationships in the LGD were weighted most heavily. Within the LGD, the experts saw the most effective relationships in response to another member's budget request rather than identifying relationships in his or her department's budget. Although both were seen as effective and weighted heavily, response-type relationships were formed with less preparation and required greater analysis of information.

Finally, for identifying needed information, the LGD was given slightly more weight than the other exercises, because of the greater amount of information to be identified. However, it should be remembered that all three exercises did contribute to the identifying needed information characteristic of Problem Analysis.

For Problem Solution overall ratings, the in-basket was given the greatest weight. It was weighted most heavily, because for each memo in the in-basket, a Problem Solution behavior can be exhibited. By expecting some solution for each memo, Problem Solution behaviors occur at

specific points in the in-basket. The other exercises do not have these specific points where Problem Solution is expected. So, with the in-basket, the solutions are clear to the assessor and there are multiple opportunities to exhibit a Problem Solution behavior. In the role play and LGD the solutions are not as clearly observable as they are in the in-basket.

However, the LGD and role play do bring out solutions (they are just harder to identify) and they should be considered in the overall rating. Solutions are most evident in the LGD during the assessee's presentation of departmental requests and the questioning of budget requests that occur after a departmental presentation. For the role play, one can expect solutions after a problem has been brought up by the assessee and discussed with the employee.

For generating overall Sensitivity ratings, the behaviors from the in-basket were given less weight than the behaviors from the other exercises. In the in-basket only a few memos (e.g., sexual harassment, customer complaint, employee theft), were expected to exhibit Sensitivity behaviors. Thus, the in-basket did not generate many Sensitivity behaviors.

For the other two exercises, more Sensitivity behaviors could be displayed. Many Sensitivity behaviors

can be displayed in the LGD and role play. For the role play, the assessors are more aware of sensitive behaviors, because of the one-on-one setting and the assessee has to deal directly with the employee. Although both exercises can display a number of behaviors, the range of behaviors varies between the exercises. Because of the nature of the exercise, the assessee may have to be insensitive in the LGD and may not have a chance to display a great deal of effective behaviors. Thus the range of sensitive behaviors (most effective to most ineffective) in the LGD may be restricted. However, in the role play, not only can many behaviors be expected, but a wide range as well. The assessee has the opportunity to display most effective or most ineffective behaviors at different times in the role play. Thus, the role play was given a little more weight when rating overall Sensitivity than the behaviors from the LGD.

After the individual ratings have been generated, the third stage of the consensus meeting occurs. In this stage, ratings are communicated by all assessors. The ratings are communicated one dimension at a time. All Sensitivity ratings will be communicated first. If an adequate level of agreement is not present, the Sensitivity ratings are discussed until consensus is obtained. When consensus for Sensitivity has been obtained, the Problem

Solution ratings are communicated and, if needed, discussed. Finally, the Problem Analysis ratings are communicated and discussed.

Now I will clarify the meaning of consensus and discussion. One purpose of the consensus meeting is to form overall or agreed upon ratings for each dimension. From the individual ratings, the overall ratings will be generated. However, in order for overall ratings to be final, a specified level of consensus must be reached. If, for example, the three assessor ratings were 1, 3, and 5, an overall rating could not be formed; there is too much disagreement among the assessor's ratings. In this example, one assessor saw the assessee as highly effective (5), another saw the assessee as average (3), and a third assessor saw the assessee as highly ineffective (1). From these ratings, we do not have a very accurate or stable picture of the assessee's performance. A final overall dimension rating can only be formed when there is an adequate level of consensus.

The consensus level that must be obtained is as follows: Two assessors must agree on one rating (say a rating of 3) and the third assessor may be one scale point away (either a rating of 2 or 4). So, any combination of ratings like this, or better still, if all three assessors agree on a single rating, an overall rating can be formed.

In the combination (3, 3, 2) the final rating would be a 3. Other examples of adequate consensus include (2, 2, 1) and (4, 4, 5).

If the ratings are more divergent than one scale point, an overall rating cannot be formed until the ratings are discussed and revised. Examples of rating combinations that do not have adequate consensus include: (1, 2, 3), (2, 2, 4), and (3, 4, 5).

When the specified level of consensus is not reached for a dimension rating, the next step in the consensus meeting is for the assessors to discuss the behavioral rationale behind the ratings. Only behaviors should be used as evidence for a rating. The purpose for this discussion is to influence other assessors to change their ratings so consensus can be reached. Discussion should continue until consensus is reached. The only evidence that should influence a rating change is behavioral rationale. Through the discussion of behaviors, assessors are provided with new insights and eventually change their ratings to achieve consensus.

The structure of the discussion goes as follows. The assessor with the highest rating provides a rationale for the rating. At this point, other assessors may not question the rationale. Next, the assessor with the lowest rating provides a rationale without interruption. Then,

the third assessor provides a rationale. Once all the rationales have been presented, assessors can question each other. Discussion and questioning then continues without any specific structure; any assessor can speak at any time.

Obviously, this discussion stage requires assessor interaction. However, the content of discussion and interactions can influence the accuracy of subsequent ratings. The three inhibitory behaviors mentioned earlier can all occur during discussion. I will now review these types of behaviors and provide examples.

One type of inhibitory behavior is member dominance. This occurs when one assessor dominates the discussion when input from all assessors is needed. If one assessor is doing all the talking and other assessors' information is not being heard, then only the dominant member's information is communicated and the behavioral rationales from all assessors remain unknown. During discussion, all assessors must explain why they gave the rating they did. Member dominance also applies to questioning others' behavioral rationales. All three assessors should feel free to question another's behavioral rationale. Remember, the assessors all have an equal say in the outcome and, in order for you to have your views and opinions heard, you must present an explanation for your ratings and question others. If you suspect that another member is dominating



the discussion, or is exhibiting any of the three inhibitory behaviors, you should bring the behavior to the attention of the team. Identifying the behavior and making the other members aware of it may eliminate the inhibitory behaviors. Here's an example of member dominance:

After hearing the individual ratings, an assessor presents his behavioral rationale, hypothesizes about the other members' rationales, questions the accuracy of their rationales, and suggests what assessors should change their ratings.

Another inhibitory behavior is conformity. Conformity represents the changing of a rating before hearing the behavioral rationales from the other assessors or changing a rating due to pressure from other assessors. Changing your ratings for the sake of consensus is not the purpose of consensus meetings. True, consensus must be reached, but, not through the indiscriminate changing of ratings. The only information that should influence rating changes is behavioral rationale and behavioral evidence. An assessor must hear all three behavioral rationales before changing a rating. In addition, an assessor should not suggest that another assessor change a rating so consensus can be reached, or that the discrepant assessor is slowing down the meeting. Such pressure from other assessors, without behavioral evidence, constitutes conformity.

Examples of conformity include:

After hearing the individual ratings, an assessee says "the ratings are 3, 2, and 1. I think the person with the 1 is

incorrect and should change their rating."

After hearing the behavioral rationales, an assessor states (to the assessor with the discrepant rating), "now that you have heard our position, you must be ready to change your rating."

The third inhibitory behavior that may be present during discussion is a lack of information exchange. This occurs when an assessor introduces new information that wasn't in any of the narrative reports. Recall that all information in the narrative reports must be communicated. If it isn't, then the assessors do not have complete information for generating ratings. The assessors must have complete information in order to make accurate ratings. Individual ratings will differ if the assessors have different information. However, they will differ because of differences in available information, not because of differences in evaluation. When the independent ratings are made, each assessor should have the same information; no new behaviors should enter into the discussion. An example of this is:

An assessor states that, "the assessee failed to recognize a number of relationships in the in-basket" as justification for her rating. However, there was no mention of this in any of the narrative reports.

However, there is one type of information that may be introduced for the first time during discussion. This type of information is exercise-related information. For example, if your rationale for a behavior being ineffective

is tied to an exercise, then you can mention how it relates to the exercise. Also, an assessor may be interpreting a behavior incorrectly because of an incomplete understanding of the exercise. Here, the expert for the exercise can provide knowledge to clarify the behavior. In sum, if exercise-specific information needs to be brought up to support a rating or question a rating it is fine, even if the information wasn't brought up previously. An example behavior of this is:

An assessor explains that a particular in-basket memo was not an urgent one and it does not require immediate action, in response to the assessee's action of delay until return.

Okay, we just reviewed the behaviors that should be avoided in the discussion of ratings. Now, let me tell you what should occur in the discussion. What should be done is the communicating of explanations for the ratings (e.g., behavioral rationale, behavioral evidence), checking information for appropriateness, and filtering it to determine what is important.

What is meant by checking is the questioning of the other assessors' behavioral rationale and evidence. Specifically, what is being checked are: were any impressions used as evidence, did the assessor interpret the behavior correctly, did the assessor classify behaviors to dimensions and evaluate the behaviors correctly. If an assessor used any information as evidence for a rating that

you believe may be inappropriate or incorrect, you should question the assessor to determine if the information is appropriate. In order for accurate ratings to be made, the information must be used properly. An advantage of consensus meetings is that multiple assessors are present to identify and correct any errors in another assessor's behavioral rationale or evidence. In order for this consensus meeting to be effective, this type of checking must be done. Here are some examples of checking:

An assessor questions another assessor as to why she thought a particular solution made by the assessee was effective.

An assessor questions another assessor why he believes the assessee will do better in the future and his use of this as behavioral evidence.

Filtering information pertains to deciding what information is important for consideration when forming ratings. As you know, not all behaviors in the exercises are relevant to the three dimensions and most behaviors are relevant to one dimension. If the assessors disagree on what behaviors are important for a particular rating or in the classification of behavior, then discussion of this is needed. The assessors must agree on what information is relevant and what behaviors go with what dimensions. In the discussion, the assessors may have to decide and come to agreement on what information is relevant for a particular rating. Examples of filtering include:

An assessor questions whether common courtesy behaviors (saying thank you, apologizing) is important enough to raise a rating one scale point.

An assessor questions whether the behavior, "asking others for their views regarding an issue", should be classified as Problem Analysis or Sensitivity.

In addition to checking and filtering, there are other requirements of the discussion that must be followed to insure accurate ratings. The most important requirement is that individual ratings should be changed only when there is enough behavioral evidence to influence a rating. Behavioral evidence should be the only determining factor in changing ratings. In addition, the evidence should not only change your rating, but also make you feel comfortable with your revised rating. Never generate a rating, either independently or during discussion, that you feel does not most accurately represent the assessee's performance. If changing your rating makes you less comfortable, don't change your rating; ask to hear more behavioral evidence and proceed with further discussion. Only when you think that another rating is more appropriate than your original rating should you change it.

Although the only appropriate factor for changing ratings is behavioral evidence, other, inappropriate, methods may also be present. The first of these methods is changing your rating for the sole purpose of achieving consensus. As mentioned earlier, consensus is needed,

however, consensus should be achieved only through behavioral evidence, not for the sake of consensus. Never change your rating for the sole purpose of obtaining consensus; remember you must be comfortable with your rating.

Another inappropriate method is changing your rating before all the behavioral evidence and rationales have been presented. You should gather all the needed information before making a rating change. Better decisions will be made when complete information is used. Furthermore, who is to say that your rating is the one that should be changed, even if it is the discrepant one. You may have strong evidence and rationale behind your rating. What I am getting at here are two things. First, hear all the behavioral rationales and present your own before making rating changes. Second, don't be under the impression that your rating is the "incorrect" one, even if it is discrepant. Let the behavioral evidence influence your rating, not the ratings of the other assessors.

Finally, "pressure tactics" should not be used by assessors to force other assessors to change their ratings. Sometimes, the assessors with the discrepant rating may be pushed to conformity by the other assessors. They may say "you need to change your rating to reach consensus" or "you are slowing down the meeting". Such attempts at achieving

consensus should not be used to influence ratings. If you believe that another assessor's rating needs to be changed, persuade that assessor with behavioral evidence, not pressure tactics.

Once overall consensus ratings have been generated for the three dimensions, a final rating of the assessee's overall performance is generated independently by each assessor. This overall assessment rating (OAR) asks the assessors to evaluate the assessee's entire performance across all exercises and dimensions. On the rating sheet the introduction reads, "taking into account the assessee's behavior across all exercises and dimensions, the managerial performance of the assessee is considered:." What is being addressed here is how well did the assessee perform as a manager. This rating reflects the assessee's performance in the three exercises on the three dimensions. The scale for the OAR is a 5-point scale with evaluative adjectives (Most Effective, Effective, Average, Ineffective, Most Ineffective) next to each point. What should be considered in this rating are all the relevant behaviors from the three exercises. In addition, you should consider the entire job of a first-level manager, or "how effective was this assessee's managerial performance?" When examining the scale points, compare your information to your expectations for how a first-level manager would

perform, then circle the adjective that best describes the overall performance. For example, if you are considering giving an average rating, compare your information to how you would expect an average first-level manager to perform.

Similar to the overall dimension ratings, expert assessors also generated a behavioral framework for the OAR. The experts stated that, for the OAR, they weighted ineffective behaviors more heavily than effective behaviors. They felt that this negative bias was stronger for the OAR than for the overall dimension ratings. This bias was present probably because the OAR determines overall managerial effectiveness. For a manager to be effective, he or she must be effective at all aspects of the job. Thus, if an assessee is ineffective on a dimension, he or she may be ineffective on the job, since these dimensions make up a large part of a managerial position. In terms of the three dimensions, all three dimensions did contribute to the OAR, however Sensitivity was weighted most heavily.

After independent OARs have been generated by the assessors, these ratings are communicated to the group. At this point, if adequate consensus is not obtained, these ratings are discussed in the same fashion used for the dimension ratings.

Once this stage is completed, all the final ratings



for this assessee have been formed. After this, the next assessee is evaluated using the same stages mentioned above. This process continues until all the assesseees have been evaluated.

Within the stages of the consensus meeting, it is evident that interaction is vital to rating accuracy. Although the needed information is communicated via the reading of narrative reports, further questioning of the information is needed. In addition to communicating the information, the information needs to be clarified, checked for its appropriateness, filtered to determine its importance, and exercise-specific information may be needed to better explain the information. The only way that this can occur is through assessor interaction. Through assessor interaction, the advantages of using multiple assessors can be realized, as well as the generation of accurate ratings using clear, complete, and accurate information.

Now I will answer any questions you may have about the stages involved in the consensus meeting procedure and the interactive behaviors.

PAUSE

Now I would like to give you a chance to practice a consensus meeting. In this practice session, you will be generating three overall dimension ratings and one OAR for

one assessee. The assessee you will evaluate is the same individual that you observed and wrote a report on in the previous training session. The reports you wrote on this assessee will serve as the information to be used to generate ratings. During the meeting, I will be providing feedback on your use of the interactive behaviors discussed earlier. At the the conclusion of this meeting, I will tell you the ratings that experts gave this assessee and their rationale behind their ratings and provide summary feedback on your use of the interactive behaviors. If you have any questions about your task in the consensus meeting please ask them before beginning the practice consensus meeting.

PAUSE

For the Problem Analysis rating across the three exercises, the experts gave the assessee a mean rating of 2.6, with the majority of experts agreeing on a rating of 3.

The assessee did recognize relationships in all three exercises. In addition, the future consequences of a decision were identified in the LGD and in-basket. However, general questions seemed to dominate the Problem Analysis behaviors, especially in the role play and LGD. The assessee on numerous occasions asked for general input and opinions that were not probing. In addition, the

information obtained from these questions was not used for later investigation or for solving problems. For some memos in the in-basket, the assessee lacked investigative questions needed to better understand the problem.

For the Problem Solution rating across the three exercises, the experts gave the assessee a mean rating of 2.8, with the majority of experts agreeing on a rating of 3.

The experts agreed that the assessee did exhibit all five levels of Problem Solution behaviors. However, the most frequent level of behaviors exhibited across the three exercises were general solutions with little or no action plans for carrying them out. One could most likely expect the assessee to consistently exhibit general solutions across the three exercises.

For the Sensitivity rating across the three exercises, the experts gave the assessee a mean rating of 3.8, with the majority of experts agreeing on a rating of 4.

The assessee was given this rating, primarily because of his multiple sensitive behaviors and sensitive action in the role play. The assessee showed numerous acknowledgments of the employee and supported the him. In the other two exercises, the assessee exhibited basic Sensitivity. He did show sensitivity and support towards Cindy in the in-basket. The assessee was not insensitive

in any of the three exercises and no insensitive behaviors were observed.

For the OAR, the experts gave the assessee a mean rating of 2.8, with the majority of experts agreeing on a rating of 3.

What helped boost the assessee to this "fair" rating was his sensitivity which was seen as effective by the experts. Problem Analysis and Solution was, in general, ineffective, but he did show potential for effective Problem Analysis (i.e., identifying relationships in all exercises) and Problem Solution (i.e., exhibited some specific solutions and actions). Based on the Sensitivity behaviors exhibited and the potential for effective Problem Analysis and Solution, in addition to not exhibiting any behaviors that would lead to big problems in his department, the assessee's overall performance as a manager was seen as fair.

Now, we will begin the consensus meeting to form overall ratings for the four experimental assessees.

Appendix M  
Training Materials Common to Team and Individual Training

## Summary Frame-of-References

Problem Analysis

Definition. Breaking up a problem into parts such that the parts can be examined for their importance, interrelationships, or need for additional information.

Key Words. Recognizes, Asks, Relates, Inquires, Checks, Investigates.

|                       |   |  |
|-----------------------|---|--|
| Most Effective (ME)   | - | Relationships of information.<br>Integration of separate pieces of information.  |
| Effective (E)         | - | Specific questions about specific issues.<br>Taking the needed information into account.   |
| Average (A)           | - | General questions about specific issues.<br>Identifying some piece of information about an issue.                                    |
| Ineffective (I)       | - | General questions that cut across different issues.<br>Identifying information that has been provided.                               |
| Most Ineffective (MI) | - | Not identifying information or problems.<br>Inquiring about information that has been provided.<br>Forming inaccurate relationships. |

---

CRITERIA: Specificity of questioning - the more specific the questions, the more effective the behavior. Information incorporated into the analysis of a problem - the more information incorporated, the more effective the behavior.

Problem Solution

Definition. The assessee suggests, recommends, or outlines actions, methods, or strategies that help in the resolution of problems.

Key Words. Proposes, Suggests, Recommends, Delegates.

|                       |   |  |
|-----------------------|---|--|
| Most Effective (ME)   | - | Specific and detailed solutions to specific problems.<br>Multiple solutions to a single problem.                     |
| Effective (E)         | - | Specific solutions to specific problems.<br>Making decisions after checking the needed information.                  |
| Average (A)           | - | General solutions and general actions to a problem.<br>Solutions with general actions for carrying out the solution. |
| Ineffective (I)       | - | Obvious solutions.<br>Solutions with no action plans for carrying them out.  |
| Most Ineffective (MI) | - | Making decisions without checking the needed information.<br>Not forming solutions.<br>Inaccurate solutions.         |

---

CRITERIA: Specificity of solution - the more specific the solution, the more effective the behavior.  
Complexity of solution - the more detailed the solution (number of distinct steps), the more effective the behavior.  
Amount of information used to form a solution - the more information used, the more effective the behavior.

Sensitivity

Definition. Showing concern for the feelings, needs, and points of view of others. Letting people know you are aware of their individual situations.

Key Words. Apologizes, Acknowledges, Supports, Respects, Thanks.

|                       |   |
|-----------------------|---|
| Most Effective (ME)   | - Sensitive actions.<br>Sensitivity towards the person being addressed.   |
| Effective (E)         | - Sensitivity towards a product or aspect of the person being addressed.<br>Showing concern for the needs of others.            |
| Average (A)           | - General consideration and courtesy behaviors.<br>Supporting others who are not present.<br>Putting others at ease.            |
| Ineffective (I)       | - Criticisms of a product or aspect of a person with justification.<br>Being unaware of the concerns and/or opinions of others. |
| Most Ineffective (MI) | - Insensitive behavior without justification.<br>Criticisms directed at a person.   |

---

CRITERIA: Sensitive behaviors are more effective than behaviors which show a lack of sensitivity and these are more effective than insensitive behaviors.  
Sensitive actions are most effective; then comes sensitive words, then general consideration, then a lack of sensitivity, and finally insensitivity is least effective.



**Appendix N**  
**Guidelines for Writing Exercise Narrative Reports**

### Guidelines for Writing the In-Basket Narrative Report

1. Did the assessee respond to all memos and items? If not, which memos and items were omitted?
2. Did the assessee use a particular response (e.g., delegate to the assistant manager) on multiple occasions? If yes, please specify these behaviors.
3. Did the assessee recognize any relationships between memos or pieces of information? If yes, please list the examples observed.
4. For each item, please summarize the assessee's response by matching the assessee's behaviors to dimensions (Problem Analysis, Problem Solution, Sensitivity).

Example: Sexual harassment:  
 Problem Solution - Assessee delegated the matter to Frank (assistant) with no instructions.  
 Sensitivity - Assessee tells Frank (assistant) to apologize to Cindy.

Please include the following items (with responses) in your report.

Sexual Harassment  
 Val-U-Track Lights  
 Quality Inspection Report  
 Employee Theft  
 Customer Complaint  
 Summer Sale  
 Manager's Meeting  
 Dress Code Violations  
 Employee Time Off  
 Performance Rating Complaint  
 Staff Training  
 Promotion Recommendation

### Guidelines for Writing the Role-Play Narrative Report

1. Did the assessee address all the problems? If not, which problems were omitted?, which problems did the assessee resolve?
2. Did the assessee exhibit any relevant behaviors on multiple occasions? If yes, please specify what these behaviors were.
3. Did the assessee recognize any relationships between problems or other pieces of information? If yes, please list the examples observed.
- 4a. What behaviors did you observe that were relevant to Problem Analysis? Please list them and provide the context in which they occurred.  
  
Example: Assessee asks specific questions to get at the heart of the overordering problem.
- 4b. What behaviors did you observe that were relevant to Problem Solution? Please list them and provide the context in which they occurred.
- 4c. What behaviors did you observe that were relevant to Sensitivity? Please list them and provide the context in which they occurred.

Guidelines for Writing the Leaderless  
Group Discussion Narrative Report

1. Did the assessee have an impact on the meeting? Please provide behavioral examples to support your answer. Example questions to consider for this question. Was the assessee actively involved in the meeting? Was he/she able to persuade other members? Did the assessee lead the meeting?, keep the meeting moving? Did the other members look to the assessee for information or solutions?
  
2. Did the assessee exhibit any relevant behaviors on multiple occasions? If yes, please specify what these behaviors were.
  
3. Did the assessee recognize any relationships between budget requests or other pieces of information? If yes, please list the examples observed.
  
- 4a. What behaviors did you observe that were relevant to Problem Analysis? Please list them and provide the context in which they occurred.  
  
Example: Assessee integrates his/her own departmental request when forming his/her department's budget.
  
- 4b. What behaviors did you observe that were relevant to Problem Solution? Please list them and provide the context in which they occurred.
  
- 4c. What behaviors did you observe that were relevant to Sensitivity? Please list them and provide the context in which they occurred.