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Chapter 1

Purpose and Background of Study / Limitations of Study

When you ask two or more HRD professionals to define the field of HRD you are likely to get different answers. A more concise and consistent definition of HRD has been the subject of much research in the field (Watkins, 1998). In 2001, another team of researchers attempted to define HRD but in slightly different way than past researchers. The team of Reid Bates, Hsinchih Chen, and Tim Hatcher attempted to define the field of HRD by identifying the value perceptions of HRD professionals as they related to the HRD process. Values based research and the underlying theory of values has become a more widely accepted and used method of research (e.g., Argyris & Schon, 1982; Kahle, 1996; Schwartz, 1996). Because values are shown to be more stable and consistent over time, using them may be a better way to form a core definition of what HRD is or should be. The 2001 study by Bates et al., involved surveying 84 members of the Academy of Human Resource Development (AHRD). The Academy is made up of professionals in the HRD field who are committed to furthering research in the field. An international group of participants made up the survey sample and represented many levels of HRD from scholars and academicians to HRD practitioners. This international study used a set of six HRD related value measures to identify the value perspectives held by the participants. The study was an attempt to create values based normative statement of HRD that could be used to define the field of HRD. In writing about the results of the internationals study, Bates et al., recommended that future values based research be conducted in order to better the HRD field.

This study acknowledges the recommendation of Bates et al., and attempts to repeat their study using the same survey instrument they designed and used in the 2001 international study.
Purpose of Study

This study attempts to determine if the HRD related values of HRD professionals in the greater Rochester, New York area are similar or dissimilar to the values of the HRD professionals who completed the 2001 international study. This study also attempts to create a description or definition of how the greater Rochester, New York area HRD professionals view the HRD process. A study should be conducted because it is important for the group, topic, or field that it addresses and because it can potentially add value to the body of knowledge for the field. The importance of this study is addressed in the next section.

Importance of Study

This study should be considered important to the field of HRD for several reasons. The study addresses a key question in the field that is being addressed by researchers today: the question of what the field of HRD is or should be. The results and information learned from this study can potentially add to our overall understanding of the HRD field.

Another important feature of this study relates to the HRD professionals in the greater Rochester, New York area. This study (to the author’s knowledge) is the first to attempt to identify the HRD related values held by the professionals in this area. Information gained from this study may prove valuable to better understand how HRD professionals in this area perceive the field.

This study also contributes to the field of research by continuing to build upon the work of other researchers to verify or raise new questions about their work. This study has the potential to add credibility to the use of values based measurements within a field where the use of this measurement tool is relatively new. Lastly, this study is important to the author as way to add to his experiences and learning within the field of HRD.
All studies have varying degrees of advantages and disadvantage. The advantages and disadvantages of this study are explained in the next section.

Advantages / Disadvantages

This study has three advantages worth noting. Utilizing a web-based survey takes advantage of a technology that allows the collection of data from individuals throughout the world. Internet use is becoming more prevalent in our society and the ability to use the technology is likely to become essential to professionals in the HRD field. Another advantage of web-based surveying is the ease of data collection. Data entered by participants in this study went directly into a statistical analysis package. The chance for data entry error is virtually eliminated. Data entry using other methods can often experience data entry error issues. A final advantage of this study is the use of a reliable and valid survey instrument. Reid Bates et al., designed the survey instrument used in this study and it has already demonstrated reliability and validity, although internal consistency was measured for this study.

This study does have some disadvantages. The study only obtained values form those professionals who participated. The small sample of 18 participants does not allow a generalization for all the greater Rochester, New York area HRD professionals. An additional disadvantage of the small sample size is the increased chance for type I statistical errors. A third disadvantage of this study concerned the mailing of participation letter and the use of the web as a collection tool. In both cases, the participants could not be verified as actual members of the target population of Rochester area HRD professionals. A final disadvantage worth noting concerns the technology involved with the study. Participants were required to have relatively new web browser software and access to the Internet. This requirement may have excluded
some participants. In the next section, an explanation of how the rest of this paper is organized is provided.

Organization of Paper

This paper is organized using the standard format for empirical studies describe in the 5th edition of the *Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association*. Chapter 2 is a literature review that provides the theoretical framework of this study with information on value theory, facet theory, and the six value outcomes used in this study. Chapter 3 details the methodology of this study and provides information on the logistics the design, and the analysis methods of the study. Chapter 4 details the results of this study. Results include information regarding the qualitative data collected, quantitative data collected, and the analysis results with some interpretation. Chapter 5, the final chapter, presents the findings of this study. Included in this chapter an interpretation of the results, possible explanations for the findings, answers to the survey objectives, a review of any implications, and recommendations for the future.

The foundation of this study rests on the concepts of value theory. It is important that the concepts and theories that support this study be defined and explained in order to better interpret and understand the results of the study. The next Chapter, the literature review will address the concepts and theories of this study.
Chapter 2

Literature Review

In 2001, Reid Bates et al., conducted an international study involving 84 HRD professionals from the Academy of Human Resource Development. The study used a set of 6 HRD value related measures to gauge the value perceptions of the 84 participants. This study used the same survey instrument of the international study to compare the value perceptions of 18 HRD professionals in the greater Rochester, New York area to the value perceptions of the 84 HRD professionals who completed the 2001 international study. The purpose of this study is to determine if the HRD related values of the professionals in the greater Rochester, New York area are similar or dissimilar to the values of the HRD professionals from the 2001 international study. An additional purpose of this study is determine if a description or definition of how the greater Rochester, New York area HRD professionals view the HRD process can be determined.

In order to better interpret and understand the results of this study, a review of the theoretical framework used in this study needs to be provided. Value theory and, to a lesser extent, facet theory are the two concepts that underlie the design of this study. The following sections of this chapter include an explanation of value theory, a description of the HRD value matrix used in this study, an explanation of facet theory, and information about each of the 6 value measurements used in the study.

Value Theory

According to Value theory (Rokeach & Ball-Rokeach, 1989; Schwartz & Bilsky, 1990) values are important because they tend to be structured and stable over time. In other words, individuals tend assign a priority order to their values and the values remain relatively constant over time. Value theory can be used to provide a more normative view of the HRD process by
measuring the underlying HRD related values of HRD professionals that are common across groups and consistently ranked as a higher priority. Bates et al. felt that "...to fully interpret the discourse surrounding competing definitions, practices, and beliefs about HRD we must first gain some understanding of the values that guide the HRD process" (2002, in press, p. 1). The basic rational for using values as measuring tool is sound but a question might be asked as to what make values based questions a more effective tool than attitudes or opinions?

*The importance of values and why to use them in this study.* According to Bates et al., "Values ... represent normative statements describing the ideal state of the HRD process. Discovering and understanding these values is important because they influence the beliefs and attitudes that HRD professionals have about the development of human resources and help form the basis for decision making about individual actions or activities within the HRD process." (in press p. 3) Values have been used as a basis of measurement in the many fields including based management, organizational development, psychology, and sociology. (e.g. Argyris & Schon, 1982; Hofstede, 1998, & Connell, 1996) It is believed that values may be a more powerful indicator of behaviors than the use of attitudes or opinion surveys. Examples of the use of values as indicators of behavior include the work of Hofstede, 1980; Munson & Posner, 1980; and Masznevska & Peterson, 1997. Using values as a measurement tool and the idea that values are consistent and stable over time is well founded based on the research mentioned. A question one might ask about this study is what are the 6 values used in this study and how were they identified?
The HRD Value Matrix

The 6 value measures used in this study can be seen in the HRD value matrix of exhibit 1. Bates et al., designed the matrix after conducting an extensive content analysis of the HRD research and literature to identify the values used in this study. The organizational structure for the matrix is based in facet theory.

Facet theory. According to Bates et al., "to analyze the HRD values domain systematically, an attempt was made to define its essential facets" (In press). In Facet theory, "the definition of the behavioral domain provides a rationale for hypothesizing structural relationships among variables employed in a study" (Guttman & Greenbaum, 1998). Through the content analysis, Bates et al., identified 3 HRD value domain philosophies: learning, performance, and spirituality of work or meaning. Within these value domains Bates et al., hypothesized two facets in which to contain the 6 value measurements or variables of the study. These facets were labeled HRD outcomes and locus of HRD influence. Before addressing the facets and values of this study, a closer look at the selected value domains is warranted. These three domain philosophies are the basis for the entire study but do they adequately represent the HRD field?

Meaning. Reviewing the literature for a meaning philosophy or spirituality of work philosophy reveals several articles addressing the subject. Some of the important works in the field of HRD address meaning in relation to HRD. The Adult Learner by Malcolm Knowles states that a core principle of andragogy is that it should meet an "intrinsic value" and provide "personal payoff" for those involved (1998, p. 5). Another important work used in the field of HRD is Productive Workplaces by Marvin Weisbord. One of the key themes of this book is that "...we hunger for community in the workplace and are a great deal more productive when we
find it. To feed this hunger in ways that preserve democratic values of individual dignity, opportunity for all, and mutual support is to harness energy and productivity beyond imagining” (p. xiv). A study conducted in 1999 by Mitroff and Denton revealed that spirituality was considered “...a highly appropriate subject for the workplace. Most believed strongly that organizations must harness the immense spiritual energy within each person in order to produce world-class products and services” (p. 83). Participants in the Mitroff and Denton study were asked what gives people meaning in their work? The top two responses were: the ability to realize my full potential as a person and being associated with a good organization or an ethical organization (p. 85). The first response is example of individual meaning while the second characterizes organizational meaning. Today more and more employers are encouraging spirituality in the workplace as a way to boost loyalty and enhance morale” (USA Today, May 14, 1998, p. 4b).

Additional literature relating to a meaning philosophy of work or spirituality philosophy of work can be found with Donde & Dunchon, 2000; Cash et al., 2000; Dirkx, 1997; Garavan, Heraty, & Barnicle, 1999. There seems to be a sound foundation for including the philosophy of spirituality of work or meaning in the study.

**Learning.** The HRD literature referencing learning is vast and presents a great deal of information. All HRD professionals would consider learning a key part of the HRD process to some degree. A few researchers on the subject of learning in HRD include: Rothwell, Sanders, & Soper, 1999; Burgoyne, 1997; Garvan, 1997; Jasapara, 1993. Since learning is recognized by a majority of professionals in the field as a fundamental concept of the HRD process, this researcher we will accept Bates et al., decision to include learning as a key philosophy or HRD domain.
**Performance.** Performance, like learning is another key concept of the HRD process and a great deal of literature exists to support this statement. The works of Galagan, 1994; Harless, 1995; Sorohan, 1996; Rothwell, Sanders, & Soper, 1999; and Mager, 1998 are just a few examples of the volume of literature related to performance in the HRD field. The inclusion of this domain in the study should be acceptable to a majority of HRD professionals. With the HRD philosophies identified, more explanation regarding the facets is required.

Bates et al. provide an explanation for the selection of the two facets used in this study. The HRD outcome facet, facet A on exhibit 1, reflects the 3 HRD philosophies.

"Meaning of work outcomes emphasizes processes that empower and enable individuals to create work that is personally meaningful and the fulfills important emotional and social needs. Learning outcomes emphasize increases in the long-term work-related capacity of individuals, groups, and organizations through the development and application of learning-based interventions for purposes of optimizing human and organizational growth and effectiveness. Outcomes in performance domain focus on those elements of work behavior that directly advance the mission of the work system in which those behaviors are embedded. Performance outcomes are work system specific" (In press, 2002).

The locus of influence facet, facet B on exhibit 1, addresses the area of influence within the HRD process.

"Locus of influence refers to the point in work systems that the HRD process is applied...individual influence refers to HRD processes directed a meeting the needs of individuals performing in a work system. Organizational influence refers to the HRD process directed at meeting the design, structure, management, and process needs of a work system" (In press, 2002).
There are 6 value outcome measures in this study and can be seen in exhibit 1. A brief description of each value is outlined in the next section of this chapter.

Exhibit 1: HRD Outcome Value Matrix With Sample Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facet B: Locus of Influence</th>
<th>Facet A: HRD Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Meanings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating Empowering Work (CEW)</td>
<td>• HRD should create workplaces that enable people to fulfill important inner needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Caring Organizations (BCO)</td>
<td>• A key goal for HRD should be to build a culture of trust and openness in organizations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Six Value Outcomes

The explanation of the 6 value measures includes information on how an HRD professional might be expected to interpret the value. In addition, an attempt was made to link each value to current literature to indicate how the selected value relates to HRD and the world outside this study.
Creating empowering work (CEW). CEW is a meaning related HRD outcome value with an individual locus of influence. This value represents the intrinsic need of the individual to have meaning in the work they perform. This value measures the perceived importance an HRD professional assigns to the fulfilling of intrinsic needs of individuals in relation to the HRD process. An example of the type of question asked for this value would be: 'HRD should create workplaces that enable people to fulfill important inner needs.' A great deal of literature has been written about empowering individuals and their organizations in the workforce (Rothwell & Sredl, 2000; Strozniak, 2000; Becker, 1996; Spence Lashinger, 2001; Papmehl, 2000; Guzda, 2000). The essence of creating empowering work is when an individual perceives that the work s/he does has valuable meaning. A study conducted in 1989 by Lois and Lawrence James concluded that there was a strong correlation between an employee’s feeling of personal well-being and his/her perception that the work they performed was meaningful. As individuals felt the work they performed had meaning, they felt better regarding their own well-being, in addition they felt better in regard to their organizations. According to Knowles’s, Holton, and Swanson (1998), a key factor in adult learning is the intrinsic factor that motivates adult’s to learn and grow. Adults must perceive a personal payoff or meaning in order to grow in their work life.

Building caring organizations (BCO). BCO is a meaning related HRD outcome value with an organizational locus of influence. This value represents meaning within an organization, an organization that promotes the welfare of its employee and the society. This value measures the perceived importance an HRD professional assigns to the need for a caring, responsible organization in relation to the HRD process. An example of the type of question that measures BCO is: ‘a key goal for HRD should be to build a culture of trust and openness in organizations.’
Organization that promote the social good and support the communities where they reside would be organizations that might rate high in BCO. These companies might also be known as employers of choice. These tenets are often associated with the employers of choice. According to Pam Withers (2001), "Today's workers yearn to be motivated by more than a company's bottom line. Firms that are good corporate citizens or that rewrite their mission statements to promote a sense of a deeper cause have an edge—though only a small percentage of companies have paid attention to this reality...surveys show that, faced with a choice of making more money or earning "enough" doing work that makes the world a better place, 86 percent of today's workers will choose the latter."

Building competence through learning (BCTL). BCTL is a learning related HRD outcome value with an individual locus of influence. This value measures the perceived importance an HRD professional assigns to increasing the learning and competency of individuals within organizations in relation to the HRD process. An example of a question that measures BCTL would be: "HRD's focus should be on building individual competence through learning." The idea of building competencies through learning is a key topic in training literature (Rothwell & Sredl, 2000; Nadler & Wiggs, 1986; Laird, 1985). A classic formula in HRD is the development of knowledge, skills, and abilities or KSA for people within the organization. In today's fast paced business environment building competency through learning takes on a more important role than ever before. According to Roshan (2002), "Continued growth and success demand that all levels of the staff have the ability to access information and learn it quickly and effectively by having the tools available for "just-in-time" and "just-enough" learning. Only with such support can employees react immediately to companies' changing business needs and demands."
Creating learning systems (CLS). CLS is a learning related HRD outcome value with an organizational locus of influence. This value measures the perceived importance an HRD professional assigns to creating/maintaining a system of learning within the organization in relation to the HRD process. An example of a CLS related value question would be “the creation of effective learning systems should be the most important goals for HRD.” The idea of creating a learning system within an organization is a relatively new concept; Rothwell and Sredl (2000) note the creation of learning organizations as a trend that is being adopted (and will be) by more organizations. Individual learning or training has often been viewed in the past as a singular event and not approached from a systemic view. The pressures of competition and reaching the market first have forced organizations to view learning as a system. According to (Bechtold, 2000, p. 2), “to transform in stride with the business changes, organizations need to think of development as organizational learning rather than training.” CLS is being viewed as a strategic movement that organizations should strive to obtain: Senge states “A learning organization is a strategic commitment to capturing and sharing learning in the organization for the benefit of individuals, teams, the organization, and society.” (1990, p. 3)

Improving job specific performance (IJSP). IJSP is a performance related HRD outcome value with an individual locus of influence. This value measures the perceived importance an HRD professional assigns to improving the work performance of individuals in relation to the HRD process. Improving individual performance is a classic tenet of HRD. An example of an IJSP value question would be “HRD activities should enable people to meet specific job-related performance requirements.” The importance of IJSP is well documented (Rothwell & Sredl, 2000; McArdle, 1999; Mager, 1997). An entire segment of the HRD community is dedicated to human performance improvement (HPI) with a systems view to improving the job performance
of individuals and organizations. Today, organizations are very focused on improving the job performance of individuals in order to meet increasing demands. According to Longnecker and Mitchell (2000), "Managers are also spending great amounts of time and energy devising more effective ways to enhance work force performance. Employment security, selective hiring, extensive use of teams, pay-for-performance systems, training investments, reduced status differences, and sharing performance information have been put forth as effective strategies to maximize competitive advantage through people."

*MUeeting organizational goals (MOG).* MOG is a performance related HRD outcome value with an organizational locus of influence. This value measures the perceived importance an HRD professional assigns to helping the organization reach its goals in relation to the HRD process. An example of a MOG value question would be "Helping the organization fulfill its mission should be the primary goal of HRD." The definition of Organizational development parallels MOG values in many ways. "Organizational development...increase(s) organizational effectiveness and health through planned interventions in the organization's processes, using behavioral knowledge." (Beckhard, 1969, p. 9) Organizational development essentially is a planned intervention to bring about some form of positive change and improve the organization as a whole. MOG values and IJSP values are not exclusive of each other. MOG could be considered a macro view while IJSP could be considered the micro view of improving effectiveness. Improving organizational effectiveness is an important factor for business in today's market. According to study conducted by Kristin Doucet in 2001, "a majority of Canadian business leaders indicate that knowledge management practices have created value by improving organizational effectiveness, delivering customer value, and improving product innovation and delivery."
With the validity of using value theory and facet theory established as the basis of measurement for this study and the value matrix explained, it would be appropriate at this point to review the methodology employed with this study.
Chapter 3

Methodology

In 2001, Bates et al., conducted an international study involving 84 HRD professionals. The study used a set of 6 HRD related value measures to gauge the value perceptions of the 84 participants. This study used the same survey instrument to compare the value perceptions of 18 HRD professionals in the greater Rochester, New York area to the value perceptions of the 84 HRD professionals who completed the 2001 international study. The purpose of this study is to determine if the HRD related values of the professionals in the greater Rochester, New York area are similar or dissimilar to the values of the HRD professionals from the 2001 international study. An additional purpose of this study is determine if a description or definition of how the greater Rochester, New York area HRD professionals view the HRD process can be determined.

The methodology of a study should follow accepted and proven techniques to ensure quality results. For this study, the majority of the techniques used in this study and explained in this chapter come from one source. The Survey Kit Series (1995) edited by Arlene Fink. In this chapter, the study target population is identified, information on the sample and sample technique is provided, and the survey instrument is described along with the details on survey administration. This chapter concludes with information on how the results were analyzed.

Target Population

The target population of this study is HRD professionals. Professionals are practitioners, scholars (students), and academicians (teachers and researchers) working in the field of HRD.
Sample

The sample consisted of local HRD professionals working or residing within a 50-mile radius from the center of the city of Rochester, NY. A sampling size of 200 for this survey was a randomly determined amount.

Sampling Procedure

Random sampling was used for this survey. Participants were randomly selected using a systematic sampling technique of selecting every other label from the sample frame. The sample frame consisted of a mailing list supplied by the St. John Fisher Graduate Human Resource Program. The frame was compiled using publicly available sources including member listings of the American Society for Training and Development (ASTD) and from member listings of the Society for Human Resource Management (SHRM). Participants received an invitation letter (see appendix A1) explaining the purpose of the survey, how the data would be used, acknowledgement of confidentiality, instructions for completing the survey online, and details on how to obtain results if s/he wishes.

Instrument

A web based survey instrument was utilized to access participant perspectives of HRD. The instrument was the same survey instrument used by Reid Bates et al., and is included in the appendices of this paper (see appendix A4). The survey consists of 140 quantitative and 10 qualitative questions. The survey layout is broken into four main categories: (a) HRD in organizations, (b) Cultural perspectives, (c) How people think about the environment in which they act, (d) Your own culture. Items on the survey were worded in a normative manner (e.g., HRD should support and accelerate individual learning) and designed specifically to tap values. Respondents were asked to rate the extent to which they believed the normative statements
should be used to guide practice. A seven point Likert-type scale was used with anchors ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). All data used in this research was collected through the online survey instrument.

**Survey Administration**

The survey instrument was self-administered via the Internet. The survey was posted as a web-based form that could be completed by respondents and submitted electronically. No other interface with the respondents occurred. All participants' responses were kept confidential. All possible identifying information was removed from the survey. Any information received from participants was kept confidential: not linked to any individual respondent, and reported only in aggregate to preserve anonymity of the participant. Three individuals had access to the data: the researcher, the researcher's advisor, and Professor Reid Bates who is providing the survey instrument.

**Dissemination**

The study results were used as course material for completion of a final project in the Graduate Human Resource Development Program at St. John Fisher College. A report of the findings has been produced and reported in public. The report has been made available to any of the participants who request it. The final document is a hardbound copy of the project report placed in the St. John Fisher College Library.

**Analysis**

The data collected in this study was subjected to several types of analyses. The statistically testing included comparing correlation coefficients, establishing scale reliabilities, identifying mean and standard deviation for each value outcome, two-sample t tests for gender
and job classification, and ranking of the highest value means. More explanation of each test follows.

Mean and standard deviation. Simple descriptive statistics were established for each value measure (CEW, BCO, BCTL, CLS, USP, and MOG), the mean and standard deviation (SD) were obtained. Means and SD were established again for each value but separated by gender and again by job classification.

Scale reliabilities. Scale reliabilities were established using Cronbach’s alpha to measure the internal consistency of the survey instrument.

Correlation measures. Pearson’s product-movement was used to establish a correlation coefficient for each value. A correlation table was created to view and analyze the relationships between the six HRD outcome values on this study and the outcome values of the international study. The correlation sizes or strengths were compared to the Size of Correlation table found on page 36 of the Survey Kit volume 8 (Fink, 1995).

Two-sample t tests. The t test was used to measure for variation between the results based on gender and on job classification. The assumption used for this test was that no difference existed between the results seen by gender or by job classification.

Mean ranking. A simple table that ranked participant’s highest mean scores per value was used to compare this study and the international study.

This chapter focused on the methods and techniques used in this study. This explanation is meant to provide information that will verify the soundness of the study, allow a better understanding of how the study worked, how to interpret the results, and finally this chapter provides a basis for anyone interested in repeating the study. In the next chapter information regarding the results of this study are detailed.
Chapter 4
Results

In this chapter, a comparison of two studies that used the same survey instrument is presented. The data collected from a study of HRD related values held by HRD professionals in the greater Rochester, NY area is compared to the data collected from an international study conducted by Bates et al., in 2001. A set of 6 HRD related value measures were used to assess the value perceptions of the 84 participants against the 18 participants in the Rochester study. The intended purpose of this study is to determine if the HRD related values of the professionals in the Rochester area are similar or dissimilar to the values of the HRD professionals from the international study. An additional purpose of this study is determine if a description or definition of how the greater Rochester, New York area HRD professionals view the HRD process can be determined.

This chapter presents the findings of the study. The first section will detail the results of the simple statistics, the results of the internal consistency test for reliability, and a comparison of the demographics of both studies. In the second section, the scale intercorrelations from both studies will be presented and compared. Section three will address the t tests results of this study, and the final section will compare the top value rankings both studies.

Before describing the means and standard deviations, some information about the exhibits in this section is needed. For purposes of space, each of the 6 value outcomes measured are presented in acronym form. For example, the performance domain outcome of improving job specific performance will be presented as IJSP. It may help to refer to the value matrix (exhibit 1) when reviewing the results.
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Scale Means and Standard Deviation

Scale means for the Rochester sample can be seen in exhibit 2. The scale means for the international study can be seen in appendix 5. The means of the Rochester study range from a high of 6.22 for improving job specific performance (IJSP) to a low of 4.48 for building caring organizations value (BCO). When viewed as an aggregate, the scale means appear to fall into three hierarchical value groupings. A high group consisted of the two performance outcome values, IJSP (\( \bar{X} = 6.22 \)) and MOG (\( \bar{X} = 6.11 \)); a second slightly lower range group was composed of the learning outcome values of BCTL (\( \bar{X} = 5.47 \)) and CLS (\( \bar{X} = 5.37 \)), and a third group comprised of the meaning outcome values of CEW (\( \bar{X} = 4.66 \)) and BCO (\( \bar{X} = 4.48 \)).

Exhibit 2: Scale Reliabilities, Means, and Standard Deviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>x</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>x</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>x</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>x</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IJSP</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6.22</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6.06</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6.17</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOG</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6.11</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5.83</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6.14</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCTL</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5.47</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5.27</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5.56</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5.44</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLS</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5.37</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5.11</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5.51</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5.35</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEW</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCO</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Performance Values = IJSP (Improving Job Specific Performance) & MOG (Meeting Organizational Goals)
Learning Values = BCTL (Building Competence Through Learning) & CLS (Creating Learning Systems)
Meaning Values = CEW (Creating Empowering Work) & BCO (Building Caring Organizations)

Reliability Test

The internal consistency test results can be seen in column 2 of exhibit 2. Cronbach's alpha was used to obtain the results shown. The reliability scores indicate that the survey instrument reliably measured the values it sought to measure. The one questionable result here is
the 0.67 obtained for BCL but according to Bates et al., this was acceptable. They considered a .67 score to be “in the acceptable range for early scale development” (In press. 2002, p. 4).

Demographic Comparison.

Exhibit 5 shows the demographic comparison between the Rochester study and the international study.

Exhibit 3: Comparison of Rochester and International Survey Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Rochester</th>
<th>International</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responses</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>6 (33%)</td>
<td>30 (36%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>12 (67%)</td>
<td>54 (64%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 years or younger</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 to 55 years</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56 years and older</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average years of formal Education</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Classifications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRD Scholars±</td>
<td>2 (12%)</td>
<td>39 (47%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRD Practitioners*</td>
<td>14 (77%)</td>
<td>45 (53%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

± Instructors, professors, researchers, and students in HRD programs in colleges or universities
* 2 respondents not reporting

A review of the demographics reveals several important points. The obvious difference in sample sizes is apparent. This is not as different as it first appears since the international study return rate was approximately 17% compared to the 11% for this study. The gender mix was the
same for both studies near a 65% female and 35% male split. The international study had a slightly larger group of participants in the midrange age group of 36 to 55 years while this study had a slight lead in the 56 years and older group. Average years of education showed a significant difference. The international study showed an average number of years of education that was equivalent to the PhD level while the Rochester study showed an average number of years of educations equivalent to the Masters level. Lastly, the job classification make up of the two groups was also significantly different. The Rochester study showed 77% of the participants as HRD practitioners while the international study was made up of 53% practitioners. The remaining 12% of the Rochester study reported as scholars of HRD while 47% of the international study reported as scholars of HRD. The scholar category in both studies was a combination of HRD students and academicians due to low numbers of each of either students or academicians.

Scale Intercorrelations

The most striking differences between the two studies can be seen in the scale intercorrelations (see exhibit 4). The scale intercorrelations of both studies were generally ranged in the low to moderate levels of correlation indicating that both instruments reliably measured the values they sought. Some very different results can be seen between the correlations of the two studies especially in the performance and meaning domains of the value outcomes. It is important to note that the scale intercorrelations comparison only presents a cursory comparison. Since the scales are based on r-values they cannot be directly compared to each other. An r to z transformation of the correlation results was not done with this data and therefore cannot reveal if the perceived differences are statistically significant.
Assessing Value Perspectives 32

Exhibit 4: Comparison of Survey Scale Intercorrelations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Meaning Outcomes</th>
<th>Learning Outcomes</th>
<th>Performance Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CEW</td>
<td>BCO</td>
<td>BCTL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEW</td>
<td>-- --</td>
<td>-- --</td>
<td>-- --</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCO</td>
<td>0.55 .65 -- --</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCTL</td>
<td>0.59 .53 0.45 .42</td>
<td>-- --</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLS</td>
<td>0.72 .37 0.46 .28</td>
<td>0.39 .63 -- --</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IJSP</td>
<td>0.10 -.28 -.04 -.28</td>
<td>0.59 .03 0.06 .26</td>
<td>-- --</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOG</td>
<td>0.36 -.13 0.08 -.24</td>
<td>0.34 .12 0.74 .39</td>
<td>-.03 .58 -- --</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

P = .05

Comparing performance to meaning. For the international study, the performance to meaning correlation was negative. A closer look at this correlation shows performance values of IJSP ($r = -.28$ & $r = -.28$) and MOG ($r = -.13$ and $r = -.24$) versus the meaning values of BCO and CEW. This suggests that individuals from the international study who considered performance outcome values to be a high priority in the HRD process generally considered the meaning outcome values to be a lower priority value.

The Rochester study showed no correlation between performance and meaning values. Comparing the values of IJSP ($r = .10$ & $r = -.04$) and MOG ($r = .36$ & $r = .08$) to the meaning values of BCO and CEW revealed a slight correlation at the $r = .36$ level but with the sample size of 18 this could be considered not statistically significant. This view is supported by Fink who explained the problems that can be experienced when using a small sample size in data analysis. She noted, "sampling variability decreases as the sample size increases." (1995, Vol. 6, p. 34).

Comparing performance to learning. Another area of difference between the international study and the Rochester study can be seen in the comparison between the performance values and the learning values. For the international study the performance to
learning correlation indicated that no correlation was present. Comparing the values of IJSP ($r = .03$ & $r = .26$) and MOG ($r = .12$ & $r = .39$) to the learning values of BCTL and CLS suggests no relationship exists. There is an exception in the performance to learning correlation for the international study and that is seen with the $r$-value of ($r = .39$) between MOG and CLS. This can be considered a fair degree of relationship and suggests some correlation between the organizational performance and organizational learning facet. This can be considered a locus of influence correlation since the locus of influence facet is concerned with values that are organizational or individual.

The Rochester study revealed this same tendency to correlate along the locus of influence when comparing performance values to learning values. The Rochester study revealed stronger correlations along this facet than the international study. Comparing the values of IJSP ($r = .59$ & $r = .06$) and MOG ($r = .34$ & $r = .74$) to the learning values of BCTL and CLS suggests that a fair to good correlation exists between the performance value and learning values of the same locus of influence. For example, the individual performance value of improving job specific performance (IJSP) showed a good degree of correlation ($r = .59$) with the individual learning value of building competency through learning (BCTL). This correlation is even stronger ($r = .74$) between the organizational performance value of meeting organizational goals (MOG) and the organizational learning value of creating learning systems (CLS) The international study hinted at this type of correlation with the $r = .39$ between MOG and CLS. This correlation was intriguing to find. It suggests that Rochester area HRD professionals who consider individual performance a high priority in the HRD process also consider individual learning a high priority. This also seems to hold true when considering organizational performance to organizational learning.
Comparing learning to meaning. An area of similarity between the international study and the Rochester study is found in the comparison of Learning values to meaning values. For the international study, comparing the learning values of BCTL ($r = .53 \& r = .42$) and CLS ($r = .37 \& r = .28$) to the meaning values of CEW and BCO shows a fair to good correlation overall. This suggests that individuals in the international study who consider the values of learning a priority also consider the values of meaning a priority.

For the Rochester study, comparing the learning values of BCTL ($r = .59 \& r = .45$) and CLS ($r = .72 \& r = .46$) to the meaning values of CEW and BCO shows a slightly stronger correlation than seen in the international study. This suggests that individuals in the Rochester study who consider the values of learning a priority also consider the values of meaning a priority just as the participants in the international study.

Results of the t tests. The results of the two-sample t tests showed no variation in mean scores of the value outcomes based on Job classification but did present one difference when comparing the mean scores of value outcomes by gender. The meaning value of building caring organizations (BCO) revealed a statistically significant difference (t value of 2.29, p = .04) indicating that Rochester area HRD professionals who are female generally score the BCO value higher than Rochester area HRD professionals who are male.

Comparing the value rankings. Comparing the value rankings (see exhibit 5) results of the two studies shows a great deal of difference in what the two samples perceived to be the most important outcome values. Reviewing the individual rankings, the international study placed the learning outcomes BCTL (34%) and CLS (30%) as the highest ranking compared to individuals in the Rochester study who placed the performance outcomes of IJSP (40%) and MOG (40%) the highest.
Exhibit 5: Comparison To International Study of Top Ranked Values By Individuals, Gender, and Job Classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>By Individuals</th>
<th>By Gender</th>
<th>By Job Classification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value</td>
<td>N* %</td>
<td>N* %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IJSP</td>
<td>2 40</td>
<td>5 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOG</td>
<td>2 40</td>
<td>4 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEW</td>
<td>1 20</td>
<td>8 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCO</td>
<td>-- --</td>
<td>2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLS</td>
<td>-- --</td>
<td>21 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCTL</td>
<td>-- --</td>
<td>24 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total**</td>
<td>5 64</td>
<td>3 26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N* = number of individuals who rated a specific value the highest of all values rated
Total** = Individuals with two or more values with equal top ratings are not included in this table

A review of the ranks by gender revealed that the international study females placed the learning values of BCTL (33%) and CLS (28%) as the highest ranking compared to the Rochester study females who placed the performance values of MOG (75%) as the highest ranking. Males from the international study placed the learning values of BCTL (37%) and CLS (33%) as the highest ranking compared to males in the Rochester study who placed the performance value of IJSP (100%) as the highest ranking.

A review of the ranks by job classification revealed that international study scholars placed the learning values of BCTL (40%) and CLS (37%) as the highest ranking compared to the Rochester study where the scholars (2 respondents) did not rank one value higher than any other value. Practitioners in the international study placed the learning values of BCTL (29%)
and CLS (29%) as the highest ranking compared to the Rochester study where the practitioners placed the performance values of MOG (50%) and IJSP (34%) as the highest ranking.

The results section revealed some interesting information. The demographics of the two groups are generally the same except for a difference in years of education and job classifications. The survey instrument appears to be reliable. Correlation results indicate that the international study group showed a negative correlation between performance and meaning while the Rochester study showed no correlation of performance and meaning. The international study showed a slight correlation in values of the same locus of influence when comparing performance and learning values while the Rochester study showed a much stronger correlation in values of the same locus of influence with the performance and learning values. Both studies showed that individuals who consider the values of learning a priority also consider the values of meaning a priority. The Rochester study revealed that women generally rate the meaning value of building caring organizations higher than men. Lastly, the Rochester area HRD professionals give the performance values of IJSP and MOG the highest ranking of all the values regardless of gender and job classification. The international study HRD professionals give the learning values of building competence through learning and creating learning systems the highest ranking of all the values regardless of gender or job classification.

What do these results mean and what do they imply for the HRD field? Potential answers to the questions that arise from this study will be presented in finding and analysis chapter, the next chapter of this paper.
Chapter 5

Finding Analysis/Recommendations/Future Implications/Results

In this chapter, the results of a comparison between 2 studies will be analyzed. A study of 18 HRD professionals in the greater Rochester, NY area sought to identify the underlying value perspectives held by the participants based on 6 HRD related value measures. The Rochester study was a replication of a previous international study conducted in 2001 by Bates et al., with 84 members of the Academy of Human Resource Development. The Rochester study used the same survey instrument used in the international study. Results from both studies have been compiled and compared.

This chapter consists of an analysis of the results obtained for both studies. The first section addresses the results based on the main objectives of this study. The second section reviews the implications of this research and offers recommendations for the future.

Study Objectives

This study had two purposes. (1) to determine if the HRD related values of HRD professionals in the greater Rochester, New York area are similar or dissimilar to the HRD related values of HRD professionals who completed the 2001 international study; and (2) the study also attempted to create a description or definition of how the greater Rochester, New York area HRD professionals view the HRD process. This section will address each question by providing an analysis of the results and offering possible reasons as to why the particular results were obtained.

Differences in rankings. It appears that a central difference of value priorities exists between the two groups. Rochester area HRD professionals focus on performance related values: improving job specific performance (IJSP) and meeting organizational goals (MOG).
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The international group of HRD professionals focus on learning related values: building competency through learning (BCTL) and creating learning systems (CLS). This can be seen in the mean score assigned to each value and in the highest ranked values for each study.

A possible explanation for this difference may be found in the education and job classifications demographics of both groups. The international study sample contains many PhD level participants (based on average years of education) as well as a higher percentage of scholars (47% compared to 12%). This may explain the high priority placed on the learning values. The Rochester study sample contains a higher percentage of practitioners (77% compared to 53%). Another possible explanation is that the sample size of the Rochester study is skewing the data. A third explanation may lie with the make up of the international study. Data on who made up the study (other than basic demographics) was not available. Perhaps a large portion of the sample came from a country whose culture highly values learning. This may be influencing the results from the international study. Another possible explanation is that practitioners take a more narrow view of the HRD process and scholars take a broader view of the process (the rankings for the international study are more diverse than the Rochester study).

This researcher tends to believe that this last explanation may be the best for this difference since there is research to support this. According to Garvan, Gunnigle, & Morley: “The performance focus is usually advanced by practitioners of HRD, whereas the learning focus is more often advanced by academics who claim HRD as an area of research” (2000, p. 2).

Differences in scale correlations. There appears to be a difference in how the two groups view the relationships between the three HRD domains of meaning, performance, and learning. Rochester area HRD professionals show no correlation between the performance and meaning values while the international HRD professionals correlate the values negatively.
A possible explanation for this difference most likely lies in the sample size. The correlations for the Rochester group were near zero to slightly negative. It is possible that given a larger sample this correlation would match the international study. Why meaning values would negatively correlate to performance values is a question that warrants more research.

The performance and learning correlations indicate that Rochester area HRD professionals strongly correlate these values in terms of their locus of influence. The international professionals showed this same correlation in the performance and learning values but to a lesser degree of strength. This correlation suggests that HRD professionals perceive a relationship between the performance of individuals and the learning of individuals as well as the performance of organizations and the learning systems of organizations.

This may be another example of sample size influencing the Rochester results but this researcher believes that the correlations are more valid. The correlation demonstrated between learning and performance seems to affirm other research. A number of "...researchers contend that ... developing learning organization practices result in increased organizational performance" (Greiego, Geroy, & Wright, 2000, p. 2).

Similarities in correlations. The learning and meaning correlations for both studies showed that individuals who consider learning an important value also considered meaning an important value.

One possible explanation for this similarity pertains to the relationship between learning and meaning can be found in adult learning. In adult education, learning and meaning values are related. According to Ault learning theory, adults learn because it provides some form of meaning to them in their lives. This may take the form of some practical knowledge or it may be fulfill an intrinsic need of the learner. (Knowles, 1998). Senge (1990) offers another view of the
learning/meaning relationship he refers to learning organizations as organizations where people continually expand their capacity to create the results they truly desire, where new expansive patterns of thinking are nurtured, where collective aspiration is set free, and where people are continually learning how to learn together.

*Differences in the t tests.* The t test results indicated that women in the Rochester study score the meaning value of building caring organizations higher than men in the Rochester study. A t test was not performed in the international study. A possible explanation for this result might be due to the sample size of the study. Repeating the study with a larger sample would help determine if this result is an anomaly. A valid question concerning this result would be to ask if there is any research that might support this difference in scores. There is a great deal of research concerning the nurturing or caring view held by women in the workplace. (Therese Clase. 1999). Perhaps this is a societal or cultural difference we are seeing in the result.

*A possible definition of HRD for the Rochester area.* Generalizing a definition based on the results of such a small study would be difficult. If any one aspect is apparent in this study, it would be the heavy emphasis on performance. Any definition of HRD concerning HRD professionals in the greater Rochester, NY area (based on assumptions from this study) would have to focus on performance as a key part of the definition. Research on HRD reveals an interesting difference between the United States and European views of HRD.

academics (Kilcourse, 1996; Lee and Flatau, 1996; Lee, 1996a,b, 1997, 1999) focus on learning as the primary purpose of HRD” (Garavan, Gunnigle, & Morley, 2000, p. 66).

The Rochester study seems to support this view of performance over learning.

Implications and Recommendations.

Research on values held by HRD professionals can be used to better understand the entire field of HRD, better understand the behaviors that drive persons in the profession, better understand the attitudes and opinions expressed by HRD professionals. The use of value theory and facet theory seems to hold promise as a viable method for learning more about the HRD process. More work in this area of research may prove worthwhile for enhancing the HRD field for all.

More values related research in the HRD field should be conducted. The difference seen in this study in comparison to the international study, at the very least, raises questions that warrant more research. The differences in demographics and the research suggest that there is a significant difference in the values that motivate practitioners compared to the values that motivate researchers in the HRD field. Do these groups hold significantly different views of the HRD process? This is a good question for future research.
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Appendix

A 1: Participant Invitation Letter

May 1, 2002

Dear HRD professional, practitioner, student, or academician:

The Graduate Human Resource Development (GHRD) Program at St. John Fisher College in Rochester, New York is sponsoring a research study designed to learn more about the philosophy and values guiding Human Resource Development practitioners, students, academicians, and how these values are related to various individual difference factors. This study replicates a previous study conducted inter2001ly by the research team of Reid Bates and Hsin Chih Chen from Louisiana State University and Tim Hatcher of the University of Louisville.

The Fisher study will be conducted on the local level and will be compared to the results of the inter2001 study. The research is focused strictly on HRD practitioners and scholars (students, academicians and researchers) in the Rochester area. The main objectives of the research is to: (1) Create a quantifiable description of how HRD practitioners, students, and academicians believe the process of human resource development should be viewed; (2) Investigate how individual differences in cultural orientation, gender, age and other factors influence HRD values, and (3) determine how the local HRD population survey results compare to the results of the inter2001 survey.

The study is being conducted as an applied research course requirement of the GHRD program. Upon completion, a report of the findings will be produced and will be made available to all participants who wish to review the results.

As an HRD practitioner, student, or academician in the Rochester area, you are asked to complete an online survey. The survey takes approximately 30 minutes to complete and can reached using either Internet Explorer or Netscape Navigator. Directions on how to complete the survey can be found on the site. Please note that access to the online survey will be closed after April 7th, 2002. The URL address of the survey is:

http://www.sjfc.edu/survey.htm

Your identity will be kept completely confidential. All information collected in this study will be grouped ensuring individual response anonymity. Your participation in this study authorizes your consent. This study has been reviewed and approved by the St. John Fisher College’s Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects. If you have any questions or concerns about this study, please contact Michael Postilli at (716) 392-1808 or by email at Postilli@rochester.rr.com

Thank you in advance for your participation in this important study.

Sincerely,

Michael J Postilli
Graduate Student of GHRD 590: Applied Research
St. John Fisher College, Rochester, New York
A 1: Web Page Directions

People in the field of Human Resource Development (HRD) have different philosophies and values about how they fulfill their role in working with people and organizations. All of the perspectives are valuable and have the potential to improve organizations and their human resources. This survey was developed to learn more about the philosophy and values guiding Human Resource Development professionals, and how these values are related to an individual's cultural orientation. Your thoughtful responses to the items in this survey will be very helpful in our efforts to understand these issues.

Participation in this research is voluntary and the responses you submit are totally anonymous. Because this survey is on the World Wide Web, we are providing potential respondents with an entry code. The purpose of the entry code is to allow some control over who completes the survey. Only those individuals who know the code will be able to respond to the survey items. This code will not compromise your anonymity in any way because every participant shares the same entry code. Please enter the code in the space provided as you begin Section 1: Human Resource Development (HRD) in organizations.

Completing and submitting the survey will take about 30 minutes of your time. Since we cannot store a partially completed survey for you to return to and complete at another time, please try to respond to all the items in the survey before submitting your responses.

If you have any questions about this research, please contact Dr. Reid Bates, School of Human Resource Education & Workforce Development, Louisiana State University (rabates@hrdvalues.org)

Thank you very much for your contribution.

CLICK HERE TO ENTER

Copyright 2001 Reid Bates & Hsin chih Chen all right reserved.

Email us: contactus@hrdvalues.org

Contact webmaster/designer. Hsin chih Chen
A 2: Web Page Introduction to Survey

HRD Values Survey

This survey is designed to learn more about the philosophy and values guiding Human Resource Development practitioners, students, academicians, and how these values are related to various individual difference factors.

The survey replicates a previous study conducted inter2001ly by the research team of Reid Bates and Hsin Chih Chen from Louisiana State University and Tim Hatcher of the University of Louisville.

People in the field of Human Resource Development (HRD) have different philosophies and values about how they fulfill their role in working with people and organizations. All of the perspectives are valuable and have the potential to improve organizations and their human resources. This survey was developed to learn more about the philosophy and values guiding Human Resource Development professionals, and how these values are related to an individual's cultural orientation. Your thoughtful responses to the items in this survey will be very helpful in our efforts to understand these issues.

Participation in this research is voluntary and the responses you submit are totally anonymous. Because this survey is on the World Wide Web, we are providing potential respondents with an entry code. The purpose of the entry code is to allow some control over who completes the survey. Only those individuals who know the code will be able to respond to the survey items. This code will not compromise your anonymity in any way because every participant shares the same entry code. Please enter the code in the space provided as you begin Section 1: Human Resource Development (HRD) in organizations.

Completing and submitting the survey will take about 30 minutes of your time. Since we cannot store a partially completed survey for you to return to and complete at another time, please try to respond to all the items in the survey before submitting your responses. If you have any questions about this research, please contact Michael J Postilli via email at Postilli@rochester.rr.com

Thank you very much for your contribution.

Copyright 2001 Reid Bates & Hsin Chih Chen all right reserved.
A 4: Web Survey

The web survey can be found at: http://www.hrdvalues.org/
A 5: 2001 Study - Scale Reliabilities, Means and Standard Deviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th></th>
<th>Female</th>
<th></th>
<th>Scholar</th>
<th></th>
<th>Practitioner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCTL</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>4.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLS</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>3.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEW</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>3.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IJSP</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>3.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOG</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>3.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCO</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>3.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MG</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>3.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BCTL = Building Competence Through Learning
CLS = Creating Learning Systems
CEW = Creating Empowering Work
IJSP = Improving Job-Specific Performance
MOG = Meeting Organizational Goals
BIO = Building Caring Organizations
MG = Macro HRD Goal

From (Bates, Chen, & Hatcher, 2001, p. 4.)

A 6: 2001 Study - Scale Intercorrelations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CEW</th>
<th>BCO</th>
<th>BCTL</th>
<th>CLS</th>
<th>IJSP</th>
<th>MOG</th>
<th>MG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CEW</td>
<td></td>
<td>.65*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCO</td>
<td>.55*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCTL</td>
<td>.37*</td>
<td>.42*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLS</td>
<td>.28*</td>
<td>.28*</td>
<td>.65*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IJSP</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.24*</td>
<td>.31*</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.29*</td>
<td>.23*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOG</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.55*</td>
<td>.31*</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.29*</td>
<td>.23*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05

From (Bates, Chen, & Hatcher, 2001, p. 4.)

A 7: 2001 Study - Top Ranked Values by Individuals, Gender, and Job Classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>By Individuals</th>
<th>By Gender</th>
<th>By Job Classification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N*</td>
<td>%*</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCTL</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLS</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEW</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MG</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IJSP</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOG</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCO</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total**</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N* = number of individuals who rated a specific value the highest of all values rated
Total** = Individuals with two or more values with equal top ratings are not included in this table

From (Bates, Chen, & Hatcher, 2001, p. 4.)