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ABSTRACT

The following study evaluates the effectiveness of a leadership training program conducted at IRMC Toronto by Fulcrum Consulting, Inc. In order to determine the effectiveness of the leadership training program, the evaluation used Kirkpatrick’s four levels of evaluation. Specifically, the evaluation examined commitment surveys, yes/no questionnaires, and turnover data. Furthermore, the study evaluated responses for the supervisors and managers who participated in the leadership training, as well as responses from their direct reports. Qualities of effective leaders are outlined and incorporated into the evaluation. Overall, the results indicate that there has been positive behavioral changes in the supervisors and managers. In addition, the results specifically showed improvement at level four of the Kirkpatrick model: work results. The attitudes of the supervisors and managers changed, the direct reports took notice, and it appears that as a result turnover has slightly decreased for IMRC Toronto. As indicated, it is beneficial for organizations to evaluate beyond Kirkpatrick’s first two levels to see what type of impact the training has had on the organization. In the case of IRMC Toronto the leadership training program had some positive impacts on the organization.
CHAPTER 1

Overview

Introduction

Ineffective leadership in organizations is a problem faced by many organizations today. When leaders are ineffective at their positions, there tends to be low morale, high turnover, and an overall general dissatisfaction with their jobs among the employees (Randolph, 1995). In fact, Randolph states that employees report that the greatest stressor of their jobs is not the actual work, but instead problems with leaders within their organization. Thus, when organizations fail to place effective people in leadership roles, the organization as a whole suffers.

Employees want to be able to control the environments around them (Randolph, 1995). When ineffective people are placed in leadership roles, employees often feel as though they do not have control over their environments. The futile leaders may not be able to effectively delegate tasks to their employees and may behave as micro-managers. Employees do not want to be micro-managed; they want to be able to control the environment around them. It is time for organizations to solve the problem of ineffective leadership.

Problem Statement

As a result, organizations are now investing a great deal of time and money into developing the skills of the leaders; training them on how to empower their employees. Gauld and Miller (2004) revealed that companies spend between $60 and $70 billion a year on training programs. However, the question of whether or not these leadership training programs are successful in the end remains to be answered. This study evaluates one leadership training program. The evaluation is based on work by Kirkpatrick (1998).
Background

Kirkpatrick (1998) recommended using four levels of evaluation to determine the effectiveness of training:

1. Reaction
2. Learning
3. Behavior
4. Work Results

Unfortunately, it is uncommon for organizations to evaluate training beyond Kirkpatrick's first one or two stages of evaluation. This is because the first two levels are by far the easiest ones to evaluate (Plant & Ryan, 1994), and it is far less time consuming to rely on Kirkpatrick's first two stages of evaluation (Geber, 1995).

However, companies that do go beyond the first two stages of the Kirkpatrick model may be able to better determine if the training that was conducted was, in fact, effective (Kirkpatrick, 1998). The third and the fourth stages take into account whether or not the training program was a success. It is in these two stages where changes are actually seen if the training program was successful.

Given the enormous sums of money that are invested into training, it is remarkable that many companies have not evaluated beyond the first two stages of the training model to determine whether the training program was successful. There is the need to continue to use case organizations to demonstrate to others how to properly measure the impact of training beyond only the first or second levels of evaluation. After all that is invested into training the organizations need to look at change.
IntelliRisk Management Corporation (IRMC) in Toronto plans to become part of the small percentage of organizations which measures the effectiveness of training beyond Kirkpatrick’s first two levels of evaluation. The company is currently investing considerable time and money into leadership development. In the end, IRMC Toronto wants to determine if the investment was successful beyond the reactions and learning stages of the Kirkpatrick model of evaluation.

Who is IRMC?

IRMC Toronto is a section of a family of companies that specializes in financial collections (Anonymous, n.d.). IRMC Toronto is only a small portion of the larger company that currently employs over 6,000 employees globally. The large company hopes to continue to eventually expand into North America, Asia, and Europe.

Today, IRMC is the largest provider of accounts receivable management and other services in Canada (Anonymous, 2000). The Toronto based company concentrates on consumer and collection services. This company provides employment for nearly 600 people in and around the Toronto area.

Based on multiple conversations with the Human Resource Director at IRMC it was determined that the supervisors and managers need training to further develop their leadership skills. The chief executive of IRMC, Vikas Kapoor states, “We are a work in progress. I am on a crusade to get really talented people into that company at every function and level” (Anonymous, n.d., paragraph 5). To improve the way the company functions and the morale within IRMC, training programs are going to be implemented to improve leadership.
Purpose of Study

In order for supervisors and managers to become more effective leaders at IRMC Toronto, the organization has invested in a training program through a third party – Fulcrum Consulting Inc. Recently, a new Vice President was hired at IRMC Toronto and he realized the need to train his supervisors and managers in becoming more effective leaders. He felt that it would be more beneficial for him to bring in Fulcrum Consulting Inc. to assist with the training.

This project examines whether the training program at IRMC was actually effective. IRMC's goal was to determine if, in the end, the upper level management training that was offered was actually successful. The direct reports had the opportunity to discuss any issues that they had with upper management at the time. IRMC hopes that many of the issues the direct reports had are no longer present because of the training sessions conducted by Fulcrum Consulting Inc.

Research Questions

The following study will look at the following three questions:

1. What was the impact of training on participating supervisors and managers in a company sponsored training program?

2. How did the training program affect the direct reports?

3. How did the overall training program change the company?

Significance

There are two reasons that determine the necessity for this study. The first is that organizations will be able to determine the return of investment in regard to the training programs. Specifically, it will assist IRMC to determine if the training that they have invested in
has made a real difference to the company and the way that leaders lead. It will go beyond the first two levels of the Kirkpatrick model to determine if training was actually successful.

The second is that this study is significant for the Human Resource Development field. It will provide methodology for the evaluation of the Kirkpatrick model of training. It will offer suggestions to future leadership and development as to how to evaluate training programs.

*Research design and overview*

The following study concentrates on both quantitative, as well as qualitative research. Surveys, turnover, and absenteeism are used for the main quantitative research. Focus groups and interviews are utilized for the purpose of qualitative research. The purpose of such analysis is to determine if the overall training program, offered to the supervisors and managers, was successful.

Surveys are given to all of the executives, managers, and supervisors at the end of all of the training sessions. These surveys will be used to determine if the trainees felt the training is important and useful. They surveys will also be utilized to offer assistance to the facilitators to let them know of any changes need to be made.

In order to determine if the direct reports of the supervisors and managers are more committed a commitment survey was distributed. The survey was distributed in September, prior to the beginning of the training and at the end of the training in March, as well. The participants of the survey were determined through stratified random sampling based on hire date and department.

Turnover was viewed at the beginning and at the end of the training. The measures once again, look specifically at the individuals who work under the supervisors, managers, and
executives. The overall hope is that turnover can be reduced to make IRMC as productive an agency as possible.

For qualitative measures three focus groups with eight credit card collectors are formed. The focus groups met prior to the training programs to discuss some issues or concerns that they have with upper management. At the end of the training the focus groups met again to see if there have been any changes in any of the issues previously discussed in the focus groups.

Face to face interviews are conducted with three individuals from upper management who have not had any experience with the initial training process. These results assist in determining if upper level management feels that the training was effective at increasing their leadership and soft skills. Whenever it is possible face to face interviews are conducted.

All of the above mentioned analyses assist IRMC Toronto in determining if the time and money invested into the supervisors and manager training programs has been effective. The analyses also assist Fulcrum Consulting Inc in determining if there are changes that need to be made with future leadership training programs, in order for them to be more effective at obtaining the desired results.
CHAPTER 2

Literature Review

Introduction

The following chapter will outline leadership and the nine characteristics of effective leaders. It will also explore Kirkpatrick’s four levels of evaluation in order to analyze a leadership training program conducted IRMC Toronto. Leadership training will be analyzed utilizing each of Kirkpatrick’s four levels of evaluation.

Effective leadership

Many organizations do not fully understand the effects that a positive or negative leader may have on the success of the organization (Kotter, 1999). Effective leadership, as defined by Hogan, Curphy, and Hogan (1994), as persuading other people to set aside for a period of time their individual concerns and to pursue a common goal that is important for the responsibilities and welfare of a group (pg. 493), may be a key factor in assisting an organization in reaching its ultimate goals. It is such a simple concept, but many organizations clearly do not see the benefits of having leaders who are effective at leading their employees. Effective leaders are able to gain employees who are willing to work with leaders for the better good of the organization (Weisbord, 2004).

Leaders of organizations, by the very essence of their title are provided with the great opportunity to lead those around them (Smircich & Morgan, 1982). Employees are going to look to their leaders to offer guidance and meaning to difficult situations. It is important for organizations to place effective people in leadership roles who can act as role models for their employees. The following sections reveal why effective leadership is important and how to go
about achieving effective leadership in order to increase the general satisfaction from the employees and decrease overall turnover.

Leaders in Organizations

Often employees are more stressed out by their leaders than by their actual job (Hogan, et al., 1994). In fact, Hogan and colleagues revealed that regardless of the type of organization, 60-75% report the worst or most stressful aspect of their job is their immediate supervisor – the one who leads them. Leaders who are not effective at leading may have high turnover, insubordination, and overall low morale among the employees. This raises the question as to why people who are not qualified to be leaders are being promoted to the leadership roles.

Frequently, organizations promote people based on their technical skills, not on their leadership skills (Hogan et al., 1994). Many organizations promote based on past performance at accomplishing the targeted goals successfully without giving much thought into what skills are required to be an effective leader. Organizations need to recognize that a dysfunctional leader is not assisting in the further advancement of the organization (Abbasi, & Hollman, 2000).

Change in Organizations

Leaders in organizations are the ones who are charged with the goal to produce change (Kotter, 1990). Setting the direction is a fundamental concept to being an effective leader. When the leader is not effective then the change that allows the organization to grow most likely will not be achieved. Ineffective leaders themselves need to go through a change process before they are able to effectively lead others. Before they are able to help change the culture of the organization, they need to go about changing themselves. Change can be accomplished through a three step process designed by Lewin (Weisbord, 2004, p. 99):
1. Unfreezing – Decreasing the negative factors by providing information on how to improve in such areas.

2. Moving – Changing the attitude, values, structure, feelings, and behaviors.

3. Refreezing – Establishing new behaviors based on information learned and maintaining that behavior.

Once this three step process is completed the hope is that leaders are equipped with skills that allow them to be more effective at leading employees in the organization. Effective leaders should be persistent and patient, but also be ready to change as the culture changes (Schein, 1992). For many organizations, developing effective leaders requires a complete culture change that helps the organization in becoming more successful. The old model where managers are in control and the employees are controlled does not work in organizations anymore (Randolph, 1995). People want to feel like they are in control of their own environments.

**Empowerment**

This section examines empowerment and why it is so important for leaders within organizations to empower their followers. Empowerment is explored further by detailing why having employees who are internally committed is so important in organizations.

Employees who are empowered feel as though they are in control of their work environments. According to Thomas and Hafer (1995), performance and morale increases among employees when they feel empowered. Empowerment is defined as a feeling of job ownership and commitment brought about through the ability to make decisions (Silver, 2000). Many managers may feel as though they are empowering their employees, when in reality they are still controlling them. The control model of dealing with employees is well known by many leaders and easy to rely on when issues arise.
True empowerment is when a leader is able to rely on his/her employees to get the job done with little direction or support (Randolph, 1995). The leaders need to see and realize that the employees are key contributors to the organizations success (Abbasi & Hollman, 2000). The sooner this is realized, the sooner true empowerment will be achieved.

Turnover. According to Abbasi and Hollman (2000), high turnover is a natural and inevitable result of organizations with leaders who do not empower employees. Employees who leave are often the most talented ones who are very marketable and who are able to be quite successful elsewhere. Unfortunately, these employees take with them valuable experience and knowledge that then has to be passed onto new employees.

In order for employees to remain at organizations they want to feel as though they are seen as individuals (Will, 2001). Employees need to feel personal attention from their leaders to feel as though they are needed within the organization. Leaders need to take the time to understand their employees and get to know their core beliefs and what they hope for in the long-term (Abbasi & Hollman, 2000).

When employees feel as though their leaders see them as an individual who is a great contributor to the organization they are more likely to feel as though they are a member to that organization (Thomas & Hafer, 1995). Leaders who take their employees’ voices into consideration are more likely to gain committed employees. Committed employees have more of a sense of control over their environments and are more likely to feel a sense of empowerment.

Internal versus External. In order for employees to take on more responsibility, in order to feel empowered, internal commitment needs to be stressed within the organization (Argyris, 1998). According to Argyris (1998), internal commitment is closely tied to empowerment
because those employees who are internally committed are taking part in setting objectives and determining how to go about achieving these objectives. When employees have little or no say in setting these objectives it results in having employees who are externally committed to the organization. Employees who are externally committed do not feel empowered within the organization and are not engaging in their work to assist in the organization being successful.

Employees who do not feel empowered within the organization will not feel as committed to helping the organization succeed (Argyris, 1998). Weisbord (2004) quotes Lewin, saying that “We are likely to modify our own behavior when we participate in problem analysis and solution and likely to carry out decisions we have helped make” (pg. 94). Lewin further reveals that when people have a direct influence on the results they are more motivated to complete the tasks.

According to McGregor effective leaders have faith in the potential of humans (Weisbord, 2004). Leaders need to be able to work through others and delegate tasks in order to be successful (Hogan, et al., 1994). When the faith in the employees is not present, leaders will not be able to sufficiently delegate different tasks. The employees also do not feel empowered when the leaders do not have faith in their abilities to complete the steps necessary to assist the organization in reaching its goals. The question remains as to what are the qualities of an effective leader.

*Nine qualities of an effective leader*

The next few sections will concentrate on the qualities of an effective leader. Nine qualities will be outlined on being a successful leader. The final section will discuss why it is so important to develop these nine qualities in the leaders.
According to Daly (2003), an effective leader should possess nine qualities. It is beneficial for organizations to have set guidelines as to what is expected from leaders (Conger & Ready, 2004). When organizations have distinct qualities or guidelines that they wish all leaders to follow, nobody is able to question what is expected of them. According to Daly (2003), there are nine specific characteristics that need to be present in the criteria in order for leaders to be effective. The characteristics are as follows: 1. trust, 2. respect, 3. vision, 4. self-confidence, 5. communication skills, 6. enthusiasm, 7. feedback, 8. ability to fulfill commitments, 9. developing future leaders. Each of the nine traits will be explored as to why effective leaders should possess such qualities.

Trust. Daly (2003) defines trust as acting with integrity, being businesslike, honest, and respectful. The term trust has the ability to be looked at in two different ways, depending on the perspective that it is taken from. Trust in regard to leaders being able to trust their employees and trust in regard to employees being able to trust their leader. When both of the forms of trust are present a positive work environment is created.

First, leaders need to put their trust into the hands of their employees, before the employees are fully able to trust their leaders (Daly, 2003). When leaders place their trust on their employees, employees are more likely to place confidence in the hands of their leaders. Leaders are not present in organizations to make decisions for their employees (Follett, 1949). The leaders of organizations are there to help guide employees and teach them how to handle themselves. When more autonomy is present for the employees, greater commitment to an organization is a direct result (Martin & Hafer, 1995).

Organizations that have employees who trust their leaders can experience greater effectiveness within it. The employees are not always second guessing their leaders motives if
the trust factor is present. When the trust factor is not present the employees may be wondering if what they are doing is for the actual good of the organization or solely to improve the position of the leader.

*Respect.* Respect, as defined by Daly (2003), results when leaders are respected for their expertise, but the leaders also respect those around them, as well. In one study, employees reported that having a caring boss who respected them was more important than the money that was made or the fringe benefits that go along with the position (Wellins & Byham, 2001). Many leaders feel that in order to gain respect from their employees they need to act in an aggressive manner, rather than in a sincere, caring manner.

Respect does not necessarily mean being aggressive to gain power over employees (Follett, 1949). Follett, who was ahead of her time in 1949, realized the importance of a leader being sincere to gain the respect of employees. She understood that aggressive leaders do not necessarily gain the respect of their employees through the use of fear. According to her, respect is gained when the leaders act in a manner that reveals they care for the well-being of their employees.

When employees feel respected by their leaders they are likely to feel more secure in their positions. If a problem ever arises the employee will also be more comfortable to approach their leaders with it because the respect factor is there. Ultimately, this will lead to a more effective workplace.

*Vision.* Abbasi and Hollman (2000) state that “management is about tomorrow, not yesterday,” (pg. 336). It is the responsibility of the leader to see future trends of the world and find ways to unite them in the organization (Follett, 1949). According to McGregor (Weisbord, 2004), “successful leaders tend to have a clear sense of direction and a flexible repertoire of
behavior. They are able both to listen, delegate, involve and to decide and direct,” (pg. 141). Vision results when leaders are able to look forward and see the big picture of where the organization is headed (Daly, 2003). This requires the leader to look at both the internal and external factors allowing the organization to be a success.

The internal factors taken into consideration are the employees. The leaders have to take into consideration the differences among employees and place them in roles that will allow for the organization to reach its vision (Buckingham, 2005). Leaders who are able to see the link between employees and performance are likely to see more results and this will ultimately lead to the success of the organization (LaBarre, 2001).

It is responsibility of the leaders to share pertinent information about the vision of the organization to the employees (Hafer, 1995). When information is shared with employees, the employees feel more of a sense of commitment to achieving that goal because they are privy to the organizations vision. They are motivated to succeed all the while keeping the organizations’ vision in mind (Wheeler, 2005).

Self-confidence. Self-confidence is one of the most important things that leaders are able to bring to an organization (Daly, 2003). Leaders who are self-confident know their strengths and weaknesses, as well as the strengths and the weaknesses of the organization. Self-confident leaders are not afraid to interact with others and are able to share knowledge openly with employees.

Leaders who are not self-confident in themselves generally rely on the model that leadership is about being in control and the employees are there to be controlled (Randolph, 1995). This model does not help the organization in reaching its goals because, as mentioned, employees do not feel empowered. Self-assured leaders are more likely to place trust in their
employees because they do not feel that their employees are a threat to them (Daly, 2003). Kantor (1999) reveals that the most important thing leaders can deliver to their employees is confidence in others. Only when the leader has confidence in their own abilities are they able to place confidence in others. When leaders are able to place confidence in their employees, the employees feel empowered leading to a more productive workplace.

*Communication skills.* Communication is important in the organization at all levels, but especially for leaders (Daly, 2003). Strong communication skills cover both the speaking and the listening style of the leader. Leaders who have strong communication skills show that they respect the employees who work for them.

Strong leaders need to be able to adjust to the needs of the situation, such as whether or not the conversation should head in a more professional or a more personal manner (Daly, 2003; Wheeler, 2005). Trust and respect are directly linked to communication skills. Leaders with strong communication skills reveal they are able to be trusted and that they respect their employees based on the manner in which they communicate with their employees. Those leaders who communicate in a sincere manner are more likely to gain the trust and respect from their employees, whereas leaders who are aggressive in their communication style are more likely to create employees who fear and disrespect them (Follett, 1949).

Self-confidence has also been directly related to the communication skills of leaders. When a controversy arises between employees, one of the best ways to go about solving the issue is to communicate with the employees (Field, 1988). Leaders who are confident feel comfortable communicating with employees and dealing with the situation head on (Daly, 2003). Leaders who are less self-confident are less likely to deal with the issue directly, resulting in delayed action, causing the situation to spiral and increase in severity (Field, 1988).
On the other hand, leaders who have strong communication skills are probably most comfortable in their leadership positions (Daly, 2003). They understand that their employees need to feel empowered, so leaders hold a two-way conversation with their employees (Woodward & Hendry, 2004). This reveals to the employees that the leader is not trying to control the conversation, but rather the conversation is about give and take, allowing employees to voice their own opinions. Problems are more likely to result in an organization when the leaders do not have the skills necessary to communicate with their employees.

*Enthusiasm.* Enthusiastic leaders are motivating leaders (Daly, 2003). Leaders who show passion for the job they are doing and a strong belief about the mission and the vision of the organization are more likely to gain employees who are also motivated. When leaders are enthusiastic about the work, they are able to excel under almost any circumstances.

Kotter (1990) agrees, saying that leaders know how to motivate people. Leaders know that in order for people to feel motivated the vision needs to be shared. If the leader is enthusiastic about this vision, the employee is more likely to be motivated to reach the vision. This enthusiasm can only assist the organization in becoming more successful.

*Feedback.* Feedback is very important for both the leaders and the employees in order for an organization to be completely successful (Daly, 2003). Employees want to be able to voice their opinions with their leaders and feel as though this feedback is actually taken into consideration (Will, 2001). Leaders who are able to receive constructive feedback from their employees will gain their trust and respect while exhibiting self-confidence (Daly, 2003). It is just as important for leaders to be able to communicate with their employees, offering them positive and negative feedback for the work they do.
Leaders who offer positive feedback to their employees are more likely to gain employees who are committed to the organization (Thomas & Hafer, 1995). For employees who are not offered positive feedback, they see themselves as being unsuccessful at the organization and feel they have no reason to remain because they are not benefiting it in any way (Abbasi & Hollman, 2000). The positive feedback is a motivator to them and needs to be provided.

Constructive feedback to the employees is also necessary from the leaders (Thomas & Hafer, 1995). The feedback needs to be offered in a helpful manner though, in order for the employee to want to remain in the organization. The feedback should be framed in such a way that reveals to the employees the steps necessary to improve and remain successful in the organization (Abbasi & Hoffman, 2000).

The leaders need to be consistent when delivering feedback (Schein, 1992). When there is inconsistency, e.g. one day an action is correct, the next day an action in incorrect, the employees face confusion. Distrust for their leaders is a direct result of inconsistent feedback. Regardless of the type of feedback, positive or constructive, it needs to be delivered with consistency.

Constructive feedback allows the employees to make appropriate adjustments to make the organization more successful. Positive feedback reveals to the employees that they are a valued member of the team. Both types of feedback enable employee to grow within the organization resulting in a more effective environment.

*Ability to fulfill commitments.* Leaders need to be able to fulfill the commitments that are placed on them through the organization (Daly, 2003). These commitments are not able to be completed by one person, so the leaders need to be able to rely on their employees for support. Leaders who are able to pass commitments onto employees and trust them to complete the task
successfully will in turn get employees who want to be more involved in their positions (Thomas & Hafer, 1995).

In order to delegate tasks to be completed, leaders need to see the relation of all parts and organize the experience of the group (Follett, 1949). Once leaders have seen the relation of how to fulfill the commitments they are able to decide which employees are needed to best complete the task. The ability of leaders to fulfill commitments is directly related back to seeing the vision of the organization. As noted, leaders need to see the differences among employees and place them in the most appropriate role to complete the required tasks (Buckingham, 2005). By placing employees in distinct positions the organization is creating a more effective environment.

*Developing future leaders.* One of the most important things that an organization can do is to develop future leaders (Daly, 2003). It has been a long standing controversy as to whether leaders are born or leaders are made (Gregory, 2004). According to Follett (1949), leadership has the potential to be learned. Daly (2003) further supports Follett’s belief by saying that great leaders need to continually improve upon their leadership skills.

It is beneficial for organizations to develop future leaders for many reasons. One reason in particular is because so many leaders will be retiring in the next few years (Glen, 2005). The baby boomers generation is at that point of their lives where they will be leaving their organizations. Glen (2005) questions whether or not organizations have done enough to develop future leaders within an organization. It is more cost effective to develop leaders internally than having to do an external search for future leaders (Gander, 1998).

Another reason to develop employees into leaders is because that is one of the best ways to establish commitment and enthusiasm from employees (Manz & Sims, 1989). When leaders invest time and energy into teaching employees how to be self-leaders the organization will reap
the benefits. The leaders of organizations need to take it upon themselves to hone in on each employees individual skill set and further develop them for future leadership positions (Buckingham, 2005). Current leaders who nurture future leaders understand the benefits that will be gained from developing their employees (Daly, 2003).

One way to ensure that future leaders are developed is for the organization to place the training of future leaders in the hands of the individuals currently in leadership positions (Goldwasser, 2001). Leaders are no longer only required to supervise the employees, but to help further develop them, as well. Great leaders are able to see what unique qualities each employee possesses and from there are able to coordinate a plan of how to go about developing the future leader (Guttman, 2005). By developing future leaders the organization is ensuring future successes.

*Developing leaders*

Effective leadership is essential within an organization because the leaders act as the change agents (Weisbord, 2004). It is the leaders of an organization who are responsible for shaping the culture so that the organization acts in accordance with it. Culture is defined by Schein (1992) as, “a pattern of shared basic assumptions that the group learned as it solved its problems of external adaptation and internal integration, that has worked well enough to be considered valid and, therefore, to be taught to new members as the correct way to perceive, think and feel in relation to those problems” (pg. 12). It is the responsibility of the leaders to teach and guide their employees how to become immersed into the culture of the organization. When employees are immersed into the culture they are more likely to feel committed to that organization because they feel a sense of connection to it.
How are leaders developed?

By continuing to develop future leaders and further developing the current leaders, organizations will be better prepared for future obstacles that may arise (Daly, 2003). Many organizations are investing a great deal of time and money into training their leaders on how to become better leaders (Tubbs & Schult, 2006). IRMC Toronto is one of the many organizations who are investing a lot of time and money on leadership training for supervisors and managers.

In order for this change to take place, it is often necessary for organizations to bring in outsiders to assist with the development (Wheeler, 2005). Many leaders have been in an organization for a considerable length of time and continue to lead their followers in a traditional, controlling fashion. As a result of their long tenure they do not believe that they need leadership training. However, an outsider may in fact be able to offer that leader considerably more insight into why he or she was not always successful. This is because the outsider has not been entrenched in the culture of the organization and is able to offer new perspectives in a non-threatening manner. Thus leadership advice like this from an unbiased outsider may often be worth a considerable investment in training to improve subsequent leadership behaviors.

Kirkpatrick's Four Levels of Training Evaluation

Once organizations invest in leadership training programs it is in their best interest to determine the effectiveness of the program. This way, they can make changes to improve certain components of the program or discontinue it and replace it with another if it is not working well. In order to determine the effectiveness of the leadership training programs, organizations rely on different methods of evaluation. Kirkpatrick offers four levels of evaluation in order to determine if training programs are successful.
Kirkpatrick (1998), one of the foremost scholars on training evaluation, recommends using four levels of evaluation to determine the effectiveness of training. They include:

1. Reactions
2. Learning
3. Behavior
4. Work Results

Reaction. Reaction, the first stage of the Kirkpatrick model, is typically tested through the use of surveys at the end of the training sessions. This stage is designed to measure how satisfied the employees were with the overall training program. According to Kirkpatrick (1996) the goal of the reaction surveys is to receive honest feedback from the participants. In order to receive honest answers, it may be necessary to keep the survey anonymous. People are more likely to give honest responses when the surveys are anonymous because they do not fear the repercussions of what could occur.

Learning. The second stage of the Kirkpatrick (1998) model is learning. Many employers automatically assume that if the evaluations of the program are positive, then learning must have taken place (Hale, 2003). According to Kirkpatrick, learning occurs when one of the following three has occurred:

1. A change in attitude
2. An increased knowledge base
3. An increase in skills.

When none of these have occurred, then learning has not occurred, even if the evaluations were positive. It has often been a myth that good course evaluations mean that learning is taking place (Hale, 2003). It has long been believed that good course evaluations indicate learning is taking
place, but positive reactions do not automatically mean that learning has occurred. Instead as Plant and Ryan (1994), indicate that the surveys concentrate solely on aspects of enjoyment rather than on aspects of actually benefit or learning.

Behavior. When there is a noticeable difference in an employee’s behavior after the training, then the training program can be seen as a success. Level three of the Kirkpatrick model is one of the most difficult to measure because it looks directly at human behavior (Geber, 1996). It is difficult to determine exactly how to measure a change in human behavior.

Work results. The final stage of Kirkpatrick’s levels of evaluation is work results. The Webster’s Dictionary (1990) defines result as “to come about as a consequence or to end in a particular way”. Reducing turnover or increasing productivity are two results that may occur because a training program was effective. The results of a training program assist a company in improving its overall organizational function (Birnbrauer, 1987).

*Evaluating the IRMC Training Using Kirkpatrick’s Four Levels*

IRMC Toronto tested the effectiveness of the leadership training program specifically looking at all four levels of Kirkpatrick’s evaluation stages. The organization is spending a great deal of time and money on the leadership training program and it is important for them to determine whether the actual training was effective, and if so, what components were most effective. As Tubbs and Schult (2006) point out, organizations on average are spending roughly $60 million a year on leadership development programs. It is well worth IRMC Toronto to determine the effectiveness of leadership training programs if that much money is being spent on them.
CHAPTER 3

Analysis

Introduction

When the new Vice President began at IRMC Toronto he recognized a need to increase the leadership skills among the supervisors and the managers. He enlisted an outside consulting agency, Fulcrum Consulting, Inc., to conduct in-depth training sessions designed to help supervisors and managers become more effective leaders. Throughout the approximately 7-month period, 4 one-day training sessions were implemented for the managers and the supervisors. These sessions began in September 2005 and concluded in February 2006. In order to increase the leadership skills among supervisors and managers, change needed to occur; Fulcrum Consulting, Inc. utilized Lewin’s three step process of unfreezing, moving, and refreezing to help make these changes. Thus, IRMC Toronto, along with Fulcrum Consulting, Inc. hoped to further develop the leadership skills of the supervisors and managers through unfreezing, moving, and refreezing to improve leadership skills.

To determine the effectiveness of the leadership training sessions, IRMC Toronto requested an analysis of the overall effectiveness of the program. The following chapter outlines how data for this evaluation were collected in order to determine if the leadership training program has been successful at increasing the knowledge among the supervisors and managers. It outlines how the quantitative, archival, and qualitative research methods that were utilized. I have collected data from the supervisors and managers, as well as their direct reports for this study.
Direct reports

Focus groups. Qualitative data was collected from the direct reports through the use of focus groups. I conducted three focus groups with eight credit card collectors each (see Appendix A for questions). The collectors were randomly selected from the list of employees provided to me by IRMC Toronto. All direct reports participating in the focus groups were assigned a specific random number that was used for the sole purpose of allowing me compare data.

The focus groups met prior to the training programs to discuss some of the issues or concerns that they have with their supervisors and managers. The groups then met after two leaderships programs were conducted for the supervisors and the managers. At the end of the training the focus groups met again to see if there had been changes in the leadership abilities of the supervisors and the managers.

The questions that were asked during the focus group sessions were specifically designed to look at internal and external commitment, as well as trust, respect, and communication skills of the supervisors and managers towards their employees. The question, how satisfied are you with working at IRMC, is taking into consideration internal versus external commitment. When the employees are not feeling satisfied with the way they are being managed, they are not likely to feel internally committed to the organization. Questions such as, have you seen any improvements in communication over the past few months, and do you feel that you are able to address any problems or concerns with upper management when they arise have been designed to specifically look at communication and trust.

The focus groups will reveal if there have been any changes in the supervisors or managers since the start of the leadership training sessions. By the focus groups meeting on
three different occasions it gives the focus groups respondents an opportunity to see any changes from the supervisors and managers, if there are any. Kirkpatrick’s third level of evaluation, behavior, is being analyzed here because the focus group participants are divulging if there are any noticeable behavior changes.

Commitment survey. An organizational commitment survey (taken from Allen & Meyer, 1990; see Appendix B) was distributed to 120 direct reports in order to determine how committed they were before and after the supervisor and manager training programs. The surveys were distributed in September, prior to the beginning of the training and at the end of the training in March, as well. The participants for the survey were determined through stratified random sampling based on hire date and department. The individuals participating in the focus groups were excluded from answering the questions on the survey. Each participant was given a randomly assigned identification number that was used solely for the purpose of comparison research.

The commitment survey was distributed to the direct reports because it allowed me to determine how attached each employee was to IRMC Toronto before leadership training and after leadership training. Many of the questions were designed to determine if employees stay because there is a feeling of the sense of attachment to the organization or if they remain because they do not have any other alternatives than to remain. High turnover may be a direct result of employees who do not feel committed to IRMC Toronto.

The questions on the commitment survey can be broken down into two separate sections. Questions 1-8 specifically are looking at affective commitment. Affective commitment is a result of employees feeling emotionally attached and being able to identify with their organization (Meyer, Irving, & Allen, 1998). Questions 9-16 look specifically at normative
commitment. Normative commitment reflects how obligated an employee feels to remain committed to the organization.

The questions on the commitment survey look further into external and internal commitment. Once again, when people are internally committed they have a sense of empowerment. The leaders in the organization are granting the direct reports the leniency that is desired to feel internally committed and ultimately leading to a true feeling of empowerment.

The commitment survey responses from the direct reports will also be looked at to determine if there has been a change in behavior since the beginning of the leadership training sessions. The surveys evaluate Kirkpatrick's third level of evaluation: behavior. By distributing the survey both before and after the training sessions, allows for comparison data of behavior of the supervisors and managers before and after the training.

Yes/No questionnaire. Additional questions were designed (see appendix C) and added onto the commitment survey. These additional questions were only handed out at the end of the leadership training programs to the same 120 direct reports who received the original commitment survey. The additional yes/no questions were designed to determine if the behaviors of the supervisors and the managers has changed since the beginning of the leadership training.

Many of the additional questions looked again at Daly's (2003) nine characteristics that effective leaders possess. The question, in the past 6 months do you feel that you are more informed about your position, determines if the leaders are sharing the vision of the organization with the direct reports and also if the leader is helping to grow future leaders at IRMC Toronto. Some of the items measured feedback and if the supervisors or managers were asking for feedback. Other items measured the way communication is handled within the organization.
The underlying piece throughout the questions, asks the question of whether or not the leaders are empowering the employees.

The responses to the yes/no questionnaire will reveal if the knowledge gained was applied to the everyday work of the supervisors and managers. The direct reports will have the opportunity to reveal if they have actually seen any differences from the supervisors and managers since the leadership training program was conducted. That will determine if there was an actual change in behavior, testing work results, Kirkpatrick’s forth level of evaluation.

**Turnover.** Turnover data were provided by IRMC monthly. The turnover data collection began one month prior to the start of the leadership training and collected until the conclusion of the leadership training. The measures specifically looked at, once again, direct reports of the supervisors and the managers. IRMC Toronto hopes that the turnover has decreased at the conclusion of the leadership training programs.

As Abassi and Hollman (2000) pointed out, turnover is a direct result of organizations that do not empower their employees. Leaders who possess the nine characteristics may be able to retain employees at IRMC Toronto longer. All of the nine qualities of effective leaders encompass empowerment; this will ultimately lead to a decrease in turnover.

Turnover will also be looked at for the purpose of analyzing Kirkpatrick’s level four of evaluation. By looking at turnover prior to the training program, as well as throughout the training program, will assist in determining if the leadership training program has had a positive impact on turnover. A reduction in turnover will indicate that the leadership training program has, in fact, been effective at improving the leadership skills among the supervisor and managers.
Supervisors and Managers

Reaction surveys. At the end of all of the training sessions conducted by Fulcrum Consulting Inc. a survey was distributed to all of the supervisors and managers (see appendix D for a copy of the survey used by Fulcrum Consulting) to gather quantitative data. These surveys are used to determine if the trainees felt the leadership training was important and useful. The surveys were also utilized to offer assistance to the facilitators to let them know of any changes that needed to be made throughout the training programs.

The quantitative data gathered from the reaction surveys distributed to the supervisors and the managers at the end of each training program tests Kirkpatrick’s first level of his four levels of evaluation. The “happy surveys,” as they are often called, will reveal the supervisors and managers initial reaction to the leadership training sessions. As previously stated, the surveys were distributed on four different occasions at the conclusion of all of the training sessions.

Interviews. Face to face interviews were conducted with three individuals from management prior to the actual training, during the actual training, and again at the end of the training in March (see appendix E for the interview questions). The results are used to assist in determining if upper level management felt that the training program was successful at meeting the three outlined goals:

1. Being more effective at a personal and professional level
2. Being more effective with the staff
3. Becoming better acquainted with the departments within IRMC Toronto.

Phone interviews may be needed if there are conflicts with time or weather issues but if possible face to face interviews were conducted.
Interviews look at the second level of Kirkpatrick’s model: learning. By asking the same questions on three different occasions, I was able to determine if the supervisors or managers learned any applicable knowledge from the leadership training programs. It allowed me to determine if an actual change in knowledge occurred.

The interviews that were done prior to the training, during the actual training, and at again at the end of the training determine if there has been an actual change in behavior: Kirkpatrick’s third level of evaluation. The responses to the questions each time will indicate if any knowledge has been gained and behavior has changed among the supervisors and managers.

**Test.** Fulcrum Consulting, Inc. designed a test to be given at the end of all training sessions (see appendix F). It is an 80 question test that was designed to see if the supervisors and managers were increasing their knowledge on how to become an effective leader.

The tests distributed by Fulcrum Consulting Inc. also assesses Kirkpatrick’s second level of evaluation. Based on the answers to the 80 question test that was distributed, I am able to determine how much leadership knowledge each supervisor and manager retained. The test determines if there was an increase in knowledge and an increase in skill which must be apparent in order for learning to have taken place. A score of 65% has been determined as the minimum score that each supervisor and manager must receive. This score was used because it is the score that high schools often use a grade to be considered the minimum score that is considered satisfactory as a passing grade.

**Yes/No questionnaire.** At the end of the training sessions yes/no questions were distributed among the managers and supervisors, similar to the questions that were distributed to the direct reports (see Appendix G). The questions were designed to provide insight as to
whether or not the supervisors and managers have put to use the knowledge that was presented throughout the training programs.

The yes/no questions that were distributed to the supervisors and managers were designed to test whether there have been any changes since the start of the leadership training sessions. The supervisor and managers had the opportunity to reveal if they have gained any knowledge from the training programs that has encouraged them to change their behavior, testing Kirkpatrick’s forth level of evaluation, work results. The responses were then used to indicate if they have made the effort to change behavior ultimately leading to a change in work results.

Analyses

For the purposes of this paper, only specific analyses were utilized in the results section. The following tests were used to test all four levels of Kirkpatrick’s four levels of evaluation:

1. Reaction: Evaluation surveys that were distributed to the supervisors and managers at the conclusion of the four training sessions – only questions 1-6 will specifically be looked at for quantitative data analysis. The supervisors and managers were able to answer on a scale from 1-5, with 1 = poor and 5 = excellent. For the purpose of this study 1 and 2 were coded as poor, 3 as neutral, and 4 and 5 represented excellent.

2. Learning: The final 80 question test that was distributed to the supervisors and managers at the conclusion of all of the training sessions. The final scores were examined and compared to a typical passing score of 65%.

3. Behavior: The commitment survey distributed to the direct reports prior to the beginning of the leadership training and at the end of the of the leadership training.

4. Work Results: Turnover data collected from August to February. The yes/no questions distributed to the supervisors and managers, as well as the direct reports.
The data collected from each analysis assisted in determining if the overall leadership training program was successful.
Chapter 4

Results

Introduction

Chapter 4 summarizes the quantitative data gathered before and after the supervisor and manager leadership training sessions. The results were analyzed using Kirkpatrick’s four levels of evaluation: reaction, learning, behavior, and work results. The results were examined from two different perspectives: from the perspective of the supervisors and managers, as well as from the perspective of the direct reports. This allowed a comparison of the responses of the supervisors and managers to those of their direct reports.

Research findings

Reaction. The training evaluation questionnaires distributed to the supervisors and managers at the conclusion of each session revealed that, overall, participants were typically satisfied with the way the training sessions were being conducted (see Table 1). The supervisors and managers felt the material presented was relevant to their current leadership roles. The responses from the supervisors and managers remained relatively similar throughout all of the training sessions. “Excellent” was a common reaction from the supervisors and managers from all of the sessions. There were very few supervisors or managers who rated the training programs as “Poor.”

Learning. In order to determine if learning occurred, an 80 question test was distributed at the end of the training sessions. A score of 65% was used as a baseline score when testing the passing rates for the scores. The results from the test indicated that, on average, supervisors and managers (n = 45) did not receive a score of 65% or better on the test (M = 51.9, SD = 14.74),
one sample \( t = -5.96, p = 2.20 \) (see Table 2). As can be seen in the table large number of the supervisors and managers received a score well below the set score of 65%.

*Behavior.* To assess changes in leadership behavior among the subordinates, based on the leadership training sessions for the supervisors and managers, the commitment survey was distributed to direct reports. The findings indicate that there is no significant difference in affective commitment before or after the supervisor and manager leadership training sessions (see Table 3). The results also reveal that there is no significant difference in normative commitment before or after the leadership training. As the results indicate, regardless of the type of commitment, employees are no more likely to stay at IRMC Toronto after the leadership training programs were conducted for their supervisors and managers.

*Work results.* Turnover from August to February reveals that there was a decrease in turnover (see Figure 1). By comparing turnover from September, when the actual leadership training began, to the other months of training it is revealed that there has been a significant decrease in turnover between September and October \( \chi^2 = 4.29, p < .05 \). When comparing turnover on a month-to-month bases, there was a significant decrease in turnover in September as compared to turnover in December \( \chi^2 = 12.96, p < .05 \). However, the differences in turnover between September to November and September to February were not statistically significant \( \chi^2 = 1.48, p > .05 \) and \( \chi^2 = 0.82, p > .05 \), respectively. Overall, as stated, there has been at least some decrease in turnover since the start of the leadership training sessions.

Another analysis used to test work results are the similar questions that were asked to the direct reports, as well as the supervisors and managers. The results reveal the direct reports and the supervisors and managers agree in some areas and disagree in others (see Table 4 and Table
5). Specifically, a large number of direct reports answered “yes” to their supervisors and managers addressing them by name more often since the leadership training sessions. The supervisors and managers also indicated in their answers that they had started addressing their direct reports more by their name since the start of the leadership training sessions. Another question that both the direct reports and the supervisors and managers agreed that there had been some significant change was in recognizing the employees for their accomplishments. A majority of direct reports said that “yes,” since the training they have been recognized more for the work that they do with the supervisors and managers responding “yes,” as well.

There were some areas where the responses from the direct reports did not show a significant difference, but the responses from the supervisors and managers reveal that they feel they are behaving differently. The direct reports responded “no” more often to the question about whether or not the supervisors and managers were summarizing the important points at the conclusion of meetings, whereas the supervisors and managers felt that they were and responded “yes” more often. Another question where the responses differed greatly was on the question about offering more feedback. Once again, the direct reports felt that the supervisors and managers were not offering more feedback, whereas the supervisors and managers felt that they were offering more feedback since the leadership training sessions.

With some questions, both the direct reports, as well as the supervisors and managers answered “no” more often. Specifically, with the creation of a team covenant. Many of the supervisors and managers indicated that they had not taken the time to create the covenant and the direct reports are in agreement with that response. In regard to the question about utilizing a detailed agenda at meetings, it was revealed that there was a significant difference. More direct reports, as well as supervisors and managers responded “no” to utilizing an agenda.
In response to the question, please describe three noticeable differences in your manager/supervisor in the last 6 months or please describe three noticeable differences in your management/supervisory skills in the last 6 months, there were some common themes among the direct reports and the supervisors and managers (see Appendix G and Appendix I). Many of the direct reports said that they were receiving more praise from the supervisor or manager. One stated of the supervisors and managers, “started praising for a job well done.” Another direct report said, “starting to show more effort in recognition.” Praise was a common theme among supervisor and manager responses, as well. One supervisor/manager states, “more conscious of recognizing and praising work by staff.” The supervisors and managers have been making an effort to praise their staff more often in the past 6 months and the direct reports are taking notice.

When questioned about where there needs to be improvement, there were some commonalities among the direct reports and the supervisors and managers, as well. Time management was a theme that both parties felt could be improved upon. Holding more meetings to keep people up to date on what is going on in the organization was another area that both the direct reports and the supervisors and managers felt that there was room for improvement.
Chapter 5
Discussion

Introduction

Using Kirkpatrick’s four levels of evaluation, reveals that there have been changes in some areas with the leaders and some areas there is still room for improvement. The following chapter will detail why some analyses revealed significant results while others did not.

Summary of Results

Evaluations. Evaluation sheets were distributed at the end of each of the four training sessions. A majority of supervisors and managers positively evaluated the training programs. There were very few negative responses throughout all four leadership training sessions.

The supervisors and managers did not mind attending the leadership training sessions. One possible reason for such positive results may be because of the presenters. The presenters from Fulcrum Consulting, Inc. may have been able to captivate the attention of their audience to keep them interested in the material that was being presented.

Another reason the evaluations may have so positive is because the supervisors and managers felt that the leadership training was important. Some of the supervisors and managers may want to gather further information on how to improve their skills as a leader.

Tests. Although the evaluations were positive about the training program, the tests given at the conclusion of the training were not nearly as positive. Unfortunately, many of the supervisors and managers received a score below the required minimum score of 65%. Such low scores on the test may be direct result of the actual training program. The information may have been presented by Fulcrum Consulting, Inc. that made the classes enjoyable, but learning of certain concepts may not have taken place as expected.
A second reason for this is that the supervisors and managers may not have taken the training as seriously as they should have. Some may have seen it as a day off the floor never realizing that they really needed to fully learn and implement such information.

*Commitment survey.* When looking at affective and normative commitment before and after the training sessions, reveals that there was no significant change. The direct reports commitment level remained stable, regardless of the leadership training sessions.

Such commitment levels may be a direct result of the nature of the business. Many of the employees at IRMC Toronto are young individuals who are trying to make money after graduating from high school. Regardless of the leadership training, the direct reports who are recent high school graduates are not going to be as committed because there is constant competition between the collections agencies. The recent graduates are willing to go where ever the money is and the organizations know that. There were a small number of direct reports who were more committed after the leadership training, but they were vastly outnumbered by those who are only there to make the money and move on with their lives. Unfortunately, I did not collect demographic information on these surveys and cannot test this proposition.

Another reason commitment levels may have been equal before and after the leadership training sessions is because of the time frame. It was only about a 6 month time span between the distribution of the surveys to the direct reports. Six months may be too short of a time for there to be a difference in commitment from the direct reports.

*Turnover.* Turnover from August to September was analyzed and revealed that there had been at least some decrease in turnover since the beginning of the leadership training programs. When comparing September to other months, there was some significant difference between some months and then no significant difference between others. The large decrease when
comparing September to December may be interpreted in two ways. One way to look it is that the leadership training was producing some results causing fewer employees to leave. Another interpretation of that may be that it is around the holidays and very few people want to leave a job around the holidays. Overall, the results did reveal a decrease in turnover after the leadership training sessions.

*Yes/No questionnaire.* The similar yes/no questions that were asked to the direct reports, as well as the supervisors and managers revealed significant differences in a positive manner and then there were some significant differences in a negative manner. The results also revealed that the supervisors and managers had different opinions of their work than the direct reports. The direct reports, as well as the supervisors and managers need to realize that not all changes can occur at once. Many of supervisors and managers have taken the necessary steps to begin to work on the nine characters of effective leaders and ultimately empowering their employees.

Overall, the leadership training program produced some significant changes. There are various strengths, as well as various weaknesses to the evaluation of the leadership training program conducted at IMRC, Toronto. The following section will outline the various strengths, as well as the various weaknesses of the study. It will also discuss implications and make some future recommendations for further study at IMRC Toronto.

*Strengths*

One of the key strengths of this study was the analysis of leadership training program utilizing Kirkpatrick’s four levels of evaluation. As mentioned, it is not common for organizations to test all four levels of evaluation. It is more common for organizations to stop at the first or second level of evaluation because of time or money constraints. As the results
revealed though, just because the evaluations from the first level are positive does not mean that change is actually occurring.

By analyzing a leadership training program beyond the first and second levels of Kirkpatrick's evaluation, allows IRMC Toronto to see exactly where the training may have been effective and what areas still need to be worked on. Specifically, at Kirkpatrick's fourth level of evaluation in regard to the yes/no questions, it was revealed that there were some areas that need improving. The leadership training was actually producing change within IRMC Toronto.

Another strength of the study is that the responses and reactions of supervisors and managers as well as those from direct reports were considered. Often, level one and two of the Kirkpatrick model rely solely on responses from training program participants. Unfortunately, results from participants may not be as reflective of what is actually occurring in the organization because participants want to always put themselves in the best possible light. By taking into account the reactions of direct reports as well, this evaluation revealed that both agree that at least some improvement in leadership behavior is taking place.

Limitations

As with any study there were several limitations to this study. The first limitation is the low response rate; there were many commitment surveys distributed, but only a small number returned the commitment survey. Had a larger number of direct reports returned the surveys, the final results may have been slightly different.

Another limitation with the study is that it is an organization in Toronto, Canada. It was not as accessible as an organization may have been if it had been in Rochester, NY. There were some instances where maintaining a close contact with the organization proved to be difficult.
A final limitation to the analysis of the results is that many supervisors and managers did not take the training seriously. The supervisors and managers may not have been honest with the responses because they took the training lightly.

Implications/Recommendations

IRMC Toronto and Fulcrum Consulting, Inc. If IRMC Toronto relies on only the reactions evaluations to determine the effectiveness of the training program, the training was a success. Upon further inspection though, by analyzing the training beyond the first and second levels, the evaluation reveals that there are many areas of the leadership training which were successful while there were other areas that provide opportunities for further development.

If IRMC is to invest into more leadership training programs, the organization needs to emphasize the importance of the program. The seriousness of the training sessions needs to be emphasized because it is likely that many supervisors and managers did not take the current leadership training program as seriously as they could have. Rewards were offered to supervisors and managers with the highest test scores at the end of all of the training sessions, but there appeared to be little awareness among participants that such a reward was going to be offered. In order to stress the importance of such training programs, IRMC needs to state up front that rewards, such as money again, will be provided. This may encourage the supervisors and managers to take responsibility for their own learning.

In addition, the leadership training sessions need to be announced to all people at IRMC Toronto. In most cases, when I first met with the direct report participants in the focus groups, they had no idea that the leadership training was actually taking place. Many of the direct reports walked tentatively into the office, wondering if they were going to be fired. Once I
explained to them what the purpose of the focus groups were, many of them relaxed and freely answered my questions, but many still did not take the focus group sessions seriously.

Finally, the importance of such leadership training sessions needs to be stressed to the direct reports, as well. Had the direct reports been debriefed on leadership training sessions and direct impact it could have on them, they may have taken it more seriously. Instead, I believe that many direct reports who received the commitment surveys, saw it as something that would just take up their time on the phone and unfortunately, because of the nature of their work, many were unwilling to give up that time. The same behavior was evident during the focus group sessions, as well.

In order to determine if the training was truly successful in the long-term, I also recommend evaluating the effectiveness program a year after the actual sessions. This will benefit IRMC Toronto, as well Fulcrum Consulting, Inc. By analyzing the training after a year, data collected will reveal if what was learned in the training sessions is still being applied to the supervisors and managers everyday work.

Turnover should also continue to be tracked and analyzed for at least one year after the end of the leadership training programs. These results will assist in revealing if there have been a continual decrease in turnover since the supervisors and managers gained more knowledge on how to be more effective leaders.

As stated previously, change takes time. By evaluating the training program again after one year, IRMC Toronto and Fulcrum Consulting, Inc. will be able to determine if what has been learned is still being applied. It will help to determine if the results in the present study were only significant because the training had just taken place.
Prior to the beginning of the training it may be necessary to set up strict guidelines of what is required from IRMC Toronto. A set time schedule needs to be set-up beforehand as to when surveys are to be returned by and a set schedule of when interviews and focus groups will be conducted. Many of the direct reports did not attend the focus group sessions because they were not informed of the meeting until 20 minutes before hand.

*HRD Community.* The following study reveals to the HRD community that testing beyond Kirkpatrick’s first two levels of evaluation is possible and necessary to fully understand the benefits and limitations of any training program. These evaluations may be more time consuming, but the overall conclusion reveals a great deal of information that can further benefit the organization. In this study, I was able to compare the responses of the direct reports with the responses from the supervisors and managers and see if the leadership training actually produced significant results and in what areas there are opportunities for further leadership development.

Many of the nine qualities of effective leaders are examined through the data that was collected. The results reveal that it is possible for leadership skills to be learned. Such a concept reinforces Mary Parker Follett ideas that leaders are not necessarily born; it was her belief that leadership skills could be learned.

Mary Parker Follett also believed that aggressiveness and effective leadership do not necessarily go hand-in-hand. The skills presented by Fulcrum Consulting, Inc to the supervisors and managers at IRMC Toronto were skills that were not aggressive, but still effective at assisting them at becoming better leaders. The direct reports took notice when supervisors and managers addressed them by name; addressing someone by name is not considered an aggressive tendency, reinforcing Mary Parker Follett’s idea. The theorists of the past are still making an impact in the training world today.
Turnover has decreased since September and may be direct result of the supervisor and manager leadership training sessions. The leaders are gaining more knowledge and becoming more effective leaders. Thus, when employees feel empowered in other organizations, they also may realize the benefits in reduced turnover that IRMC benefited from. Fulcrum Consulting, Inc. assisted in further developing the nine characteristics of effective leaders of the supervisors and managers at IRMC Toronto, leading to the direct reports feeling empowered. As the results indicated, there was an overall decrease in the turnover.

Overall Conclusion

By testing beyond the first two levels of Kirkpatrick’s four levels of evaluation, organizations are able to determine a great deal more about training programs. Testing at levels three and four enable organizations to make distinctions between what is working from a specific leadership program and what areas remain to be improved upon. It is in the organizations best interest to test beyond the first two levels to see if the training program was successful. After large expenditures on leadership training, evaluating beyond the first two levels will assist other organizations in determining if the actual training changed behavior and was successful at accomplishing the desired work results.
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Table 1

Workshop Evaluation Survey Analyzed By Session

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>( x^2 )</th>
<th>( P )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1. Workshop Content</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2. Workshop Materials</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3. Learning Environment</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4. Application</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5. Workshop Instructors/Facilitators</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6. Overall Satisfaction</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1. Workshop Content</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2. Workshop Materials</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3. Learning Environment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4. Application</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5. Workshop Instructors/Facilitators</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6. Overall Satisfaction</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1. Workshop Content</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2. Workshop Materials</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3. Learning Environment</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4. Application</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5. Workshop Instructors/Facilitators</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6. Overall Satisfaction</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1. Workshop Content</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2. Workshop Materials</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3. Learning Environment</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4. Application</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5. Workshop Instructors/Facilitators</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6. Overall Satisfaction</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2

Breakdown of Test Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50 and under</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-60</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61-70</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71-80</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81-90</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91-100</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3

**Direct Report Commitment Survey**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre-test</th>
<th></th>
<th>Post-test</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective commitment</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>-1.37</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normative commitment</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Questions</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$\chi^2$</td>
<td>$p$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the past 6 months have you felt more informed?</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the past 6 months has your supervisor/manager:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addressed you by name more often?</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7.08</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Praised you for a job well done?</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognized you for your accomplishments?</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9.68</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acknowledged you more for the work you do?</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Created a team covenant?</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involved you more in the decision making?</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involved you in more in assisting w/problems?</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheduled structured meetings?</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>6.48</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointed a facilitator at meetings?</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>28.88</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilized a detailed agenda at each meeting?</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>10.01</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summarized meetings important points?</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointed a note taker at meetings?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>37.74</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asked for feedback on his/her behavior?</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>14.88</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicated what is expected of you?</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistently communicated with you?</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13.52</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taken time to address situations?</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offered you more feedback?</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before more of a mentor/coach?</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5

**Yes/No Supervisor and Manager Training Questions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th></th>
<th>No</th>
<th></th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In the past 6 months have you:</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kept your employees more informed?</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>96.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>27.13</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addressed your employees by name more often?</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>96.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>27.13</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Praised them for a job well done?</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>31.00</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognized employees for accomplishments?</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>96.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>27.13</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acknowledged employees for the work they do?</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>93.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>23.52</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Created a covenant with employees?</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>51.6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>48.4</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involved your team in decision making?</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>87.1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>17.07</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involved your team in problem solving?</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>83.9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>14.23</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheduled structured meetings?</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>71.0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>5.45</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointed a facilitator at each meeting?</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilized an agenda at meetings?</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>45.2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>54.8</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summarized important points at meetings?</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>74.2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>7.26</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointed an individual to take notes?</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>61.3</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asked for feedback on your employees?</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>77.4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>9.32</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicated w/employees what is expected?</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>31.00</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taken time to address/discuss situations?</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>96.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>27.13</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offered feedback on performance?</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>96.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>27.13</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Become more of a mentor/coach?</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>31.00</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 1

Monthly Turnover as a Percent of Headcount

\[ x^2 (6) = 18.84, \ p < .05 \]
Appendix A

Consent Form

Analysis of Training – 590 GHRD
St. John Fisher College

Study of the Effectiveness of the training program at CBCL

1. What is the aim of the study? The aim of the study is to determine if the training that being done by Fulcrum Consulting Inc. is effective at training upper level management in the three components outlined: 1. You as a Professional, 2. You and your team, and 3. You and the Organization.

2. How was I chosen? Your name was chosen through stratified random sampling based on number of years with the company and department that you work for.

3. What will be involved in participating? Two 45 minute focus groups with 8 participants. The focus group will meet prior to the start of the training programs and again at the end of the training programs in March.

4. Who will know what I say? Your name will be kept confidential, but your responses will be shared with other employees at CBCL, as well as the students and friends who attend colloquium at St. John Fisher College at the end of the Graduate Human Resource Development Program. The identification number at the top of the questionnaire will be solely utilized for comparison purposes.

5. What are my rights as a respondent? You have the right at any time to decline participating in the focus groups. It is also within your right to indicate to the facilitator any portion of the focus that you do not want to be shared with other people at CBCL or the students and friends who attend colloquium at St. John Fisher College.

6. If I want more information, whom can I contact about the study? For further information you may contact Sheila M. Coney at sconey@sjfc.edu.

_________________________________________________________

Sheila M. Coney – interviewer

_________________________________________________________

Respondent, date
Focus Group Responses

1. Tell the group one thing that they do not already know about you?

2. Do you feel that the work you do at IRMC is valued by your manager or supervisor? Why or why not? Please give specific examples.

3. On a scale of 1-10, how satisfied are you with working at IRMC? (1 = not at all and 10 = completely satisfied)

   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

   Rationale:

4. Do you feel that you, as an individual are valued by management? Please provide specific examples for either argument.

5. What are the some of main reasons that people leave IRMC? Have any of these reasons ever caused you to want to leave?
6. Have you seen any improvements in communication with management over the last few months? If yes, please provide specific examples.

7. Do you feel that you are able to address any problems or concerns with upper management when they arise? Please provide examples.

8. What are the three best characteristics about IRMC?

The three worst characteristics?

9. If you could tell me anything about IRMC, good or bad, what would it be?
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Appendix B (Items taken from Allen & Meyer, 1990)

Sheila M. Coney
3690 East Ave.
Rochester, NY 14618
September 10, 2005

IRMC
1210 Sheppard Avenue East
Suite 700
Toronto, Ontario, M2K 3C4

Dear Participant:

As you may already be aware, IntelliRisk Corporation (IRMC) has enlisted Fulcrum Consulting Inc. to assist in further developing the leadership skills of the supervisors, managers, and executives. The following survey has been designed to assist in determining if the training has been effective at improving leadership skills and increasing overall employee satisfaction.

You have been chosen at random to be a participant in the following study of addressing the training programs being offered at IRMC. You were asked to fill out this questionnaire in early September, and I am asking that you take the time to fill out the survey again, now that the training has been completed.

You may at any time decide not participate in this study. Please keep in mind that all of the responses to the surveys will be kept confidential. The identification number on the top of your survey will be used strictly for the purpose of comparing initial responses to the responses at the end of the training. The individual survey responses will never be revealed to anyone within IRMC. Your results will used for the sole purpose of determining if training has been effective for the supervisors, managers, and executives.

If you do decide to take part in this study, your responses are greatly appreciated and will be of great assistance in determining if the overall training program was successful. Please return it by September 23, 2005 in the attached envelope.

Thank you,

Sheila M. Coney
## Commitment Survey

*By completing this questionnaire you are implying that you consent to your responses being used as part of this study.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career with this organization.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I enjoy discussing my organization with people outside it.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I really feel as if this organization’s problems are my own.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I think that I could easily become as attached to another organization as I am to this one.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I do not feel ‘emotionally attached’ to this organization.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I do not feel like ‘part of the family’ at my organization.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. This organization has a great deal of personal meaning to me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I do not feel a strong sense of belonging to this organization.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I am not afraid of what might happen if I quit my job without having another one lined up.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. It would be very hard for me to leave my organization right now, even if I wanted to.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Too much in my life would be disrupted if I decided I wanted to leave my organization.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. It wouldn’t be too costly for me to leave my organization now.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Right now, staying with my organization is a matter of necessity as much as a desire.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. I feel that I have too few options to consider leaving this organization.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. One of the few serious consequences of leaving this organization would be the scarcity of available alternatives.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. One of the major reason I continue to work for this organization is that leaving would require considerable personal sacrifice – another organization may not match the overall benefits I have here.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C

Sheila M. Coney
3690 East Ave.
Rochester, NY 14618
March 6, 2006

IRMC
1210 Sheppard Avenue East
Suite 700
Toronto, Ontario, M2K 3C4

Dear Participant:

As you may already be aware, IntelliRisk Corporation (IRMC) has enlisted Fulcrum Consulting Inc. to assist in further developing the leadership skills of the supervisors, managers, and executives. The following survey has been designed to assist in determining if the training has been effective at improving leadership skills and increasing overall employee satisfaction.

You have been chosen at random to be a participant in the following study of addressing the training programs being offered at IRMC. You were asked to fill out this questionnaire in early September, and I am asking that you take the time to fill out the survey again, now that the training has been completed.

You may at any time decide not participate in this study. Please keep in mind that all of the responses to the surveys will be kept confidential. The identification number on the top of your survey will be used strictly for the purpose of comparing initial responses to the responses at the end of the training. The individual survey responses will never be revealed to anyone within IRMC. Your results will used for the sole purpose of determining if training has been effective for the supervisors, managers, and executives.

If you do decide to take part in this study, your responses are greatly appreciated and will be of great assistance in determining if the overall training program was successful. Please return it by March 17, 2006 in the attached envelope.

Thank you,

Sheila M. Coney
Commitment and Training Survey

By completing this questionnaire you are implying that you consent to your responses being used as part of this study. Please circle the response that best fits your opinion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career with this organization.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I enjoy discussing my organization with people outside it.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I really feel as if this organization’s problems are my own.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I think that I could easily become as attached to another organization as I am to this one.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I do not feel ‘emotionally attached’ to this organization.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I do not feel like ‘part of the family’ at my organization.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. This organization has a great deal of personal meaning to me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I do not feel a strong sense of belonging to this organization.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I am not afraid of what might happen if I quit my job without having another one lined up.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. It would be very hard for me to leave my organization right now, even if I wanted to.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Too much in my life would be disrupted if I decided I wanted to leave my organization.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. It wouldn’t be too costly for me to leave my organization now.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Right now, staying with my organization is a matter of necessity as much as a desire.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. I feel that I have too few options to consider leaving this organization.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. One of the few serious consequences of leaving this organization would be the scarcity of available alternatives.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. One of the major reason I continue to work for this organization is that leaving would require considerable personal sacrifice – another organization may not match the overall benefits I have here.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
17. In the past 6 months do you feel that you are more informed about your position?  

Yes  No  

**In the past 6 months has your manager/supervisor:**

18. Addressed you by name more often?  
   Yes  No  

19. Praised you for a job well done?  
   Yes  No  

20. Recognized you for your accomplishments?  
   Yes  No  

21. Acknowledge you more for the work you do?  
   Yes  No  

22. Gathered everyone together to create a team covenant?  
   Yes  No  

23. Involved you more in the decision making process?  
   Yes  No  

24. Involved you more in assisting with solving problems?  
   Yes  No  

25. Scheduled structured meetings?  
   Yes  No  

26. Appointed a facilitator at each meeting?  
   Yes  No  

27. Utilized a detailed agenda at each meeting?  
   Yes  No  

28. Summarized the important points of each meeting?  
   Yes  No  

29. Appointed an individual to take notes at the meeting?  
   Yes  No  

30. Asked for feedback about his/her behavior?  
   Yes  No  

31. More effectively communicated what is expected from you?  
   Yes  No  

32. Consistently communicated with you  
   Yes  No  

33. Taken time out of his/her day to discuss and address situations with you?  
   Yes  No  

34. Offered you more feedback on your job performance?  
   Yes  No  

35. Become more of a mentor/coach?  
   Yes  No  

36. Please briefly describe three noticeable improvements in your manager/supervisor in the last 6 months:

1. 
   
2. 
   
3. 

37. Please briefly indicate what areas your manager/supervisor still needs to improve upon in order to be a more effective leader:

1. 

2. 

3. 

WORKSHOP EVALUATION
TORONTO SESSIONS

Name of Program: IRMC Canada Leadership Series 2005 – 2006
PROGRAM 1

Part A provides a Quantitative Assessment, and Part B gives you the opportunity for Qualitative feedback.

Part A Quantitative Evaluation:
Please circle the number on the 1-5 scale (where 1 = poor, and 5 = excellent) that best represents your assessment of the various elements related to the training program.

1. Workshop Content:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not relevant, did not Meet expectations</td>
<td>Partially relevant, somewhat met my expectations</td>
<td>Relevant and met my expectations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments on this element (optional):

2. Workshop Materials:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not appropriate or Helpful</td>
<td>Partially appropriate and helpful</td>
<td>Appropriate and helpful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments on this element (optional):
3. **Learning Environment:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Detracted from my Learning</td>
<td>Helped me learn somewhat</td>
<td>Helped enhance my learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments on this element (optional):

4. **Application:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I cannot use what I Learned</td>
<td>I can use some of what I learned</td>
<td>I can definitely use what I learned</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments on this element (optional):

5. **Workshop Instructors/Facilitators:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not effective</td>
<td>Somewhat effective</td>
<td>Highly effective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments on this element (optional):

6. **Overall Satisfaction with Workshop:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments on this element (optional):
Part B Qualitative Evaluation:

1. Please indicate a few important issues or topics the workshop has clarified for you as a Supervisor or Manager, which will help you to do your job more effectively:
   A.
   B.
   C.

2. What were a few features about this workshop that you especially liked and enjoyed?
   A.
   B.
   C.

3. Do you have any comments or suggestions that you would like to share with the seminar facilitators which you believe would help improve future sessions?
   A.
   B.
   C.

4. Do you have any questions you would like to ask, or feedback you would like to offer to:
   A. Senior Management, or the HR Team, who sponsored the session
   B. The Workshop Leaders
Appendix E

Consent Form

Analysis of Training – 590 GHRD
St. John Fisher College

Study of the Effectiveness of the training program at CBCL

1. What is the aim of the study? The aim of the study is to determine if the training being done by Pulcrum Consulting Inc. is effective at the three components outlined: 1. You as a Professional, 2. You and your team, and 3. You and the Organization.

2. How was I chosen? You were chosen by the Human Resource Director, Danielle Parker because you did not participate in the initial focus group sessions. You are, however, taking part in the training programs being offered over the next few months.

3. What will be involved in participating? Two 45-minute interviews will be scheduled – one in September before the training begins and one in March at the end of the training programs.

4. Who will know what I say? Your name will be kept confidential, but your responses will be shared with other employees at CBCL, as well as the students and friends who attend colloquium at St. John Fisher College at the end of the Graduate Human Resource Development Program.

5. What are my rights as a respondent? You have the right at any time to decline answering the interview questions. It is also within your right to indicate to the interviewer any portion of the interview that you do not want to be shared with other people at CBCL or the students and friends who attend colloquium at St. John Fisher College.

6. If I want more information, whom can I contact about the study? For further information, you may contact Sheila M. Coney at sconey@sjfc.edu.

Sheila M. Coney – interviewer

Respondent, date
Upper Level Management Interview Questions

1. What is your definition of a strong leader?

2. Please describe your philosophy of leadership and style of management?

3. What skills do you feel you need to improve on to become a better leader? Do you think the training will/has helped?

4. When an employee comes to you with a problem how do you address the situation?

5. What you see an employee or a group of employees are not motivated how do you go about encouraging motivation?

What about teamwork?

6. What are some of the key issues between departments? And what have you done to assist in improving upon these issues?
7. How do you handle conflict among the employees that you supervise?

Can you give a specific example from the past 2 months?

8. How satisfied do you think your employees are with your leadership at CBCL? Why?

9. Do you think that your employees feel that what they do is valued by you? If not, how can you improve on that? And if yes, why do you feel that way?
Appendix F

IRMC Leadership Development Series
2005-2006

QUIZ

To Evaluate the Learning of IRMC Supervisors and Managers

Based on the Workshops of September
2005 through January 2006

Distributed:
Toronto: February 13-14
Cambridge: February 16-17

 Supervisor ________
Manager ________

Attended: September ____
          October ____
          November ____
          January ____

Toronto ________
Cambridge ________
IRMC Leadership Series 2005-2006
Review Quiz

Instructions: For each of the questions below, please provide the answer you believe fits best with the question. Do not leave blanks; in some questions a partially correct response may be worth a half-point.

Q1: Please fill in the blank to the words below:
"In order to be a PRO, you have to practice GROE"

G
R
O
E

Q2: In the Thomas-Kilman Inventory on conflict resolution styles (which you filled out in the January session), the five approaches or styles of dealing with conflict are:
A
C
C
A
C

Q3: The Latin derivation for the word “Supervisor” is/means ____________
The Greek derivation for the word “Supervisor” is/means ____________

Q4: A person who is U ____________, is U ____________, they are U ___________.
(Hint: This is the same word)
Q5: The 3 levels of Psychological Maturity are (from least desirable to most desirable):

D __________________, or Level One
I __________________, or Level Two
I __________________, or Level Three

Q6: Level One people usually _______________ problems

Level Two people usually _______________ problems

Level Three people usually _______________ problems

Q7: “C _______” is the single most powerful method of enhancing human performance ever devised.

Q8: List the steps outlined (in the film, The Practical Coach) for the Two Minute Challenge, to deal with problem behavior in the workplace:

S ____________
W ____________
R ____________
A ____________
A ____________

Q9: Problem behavior ignored or tolerated is problem behavior ____________.

Q10: The four steps involved in successfully resolving the Project Planning Situation, or completing any Project, are:

P ____________
O ____________
I ____________
Q11: Please explain what the word “Synergy” means:

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

Q12: “Usually, we evaluate ourselves based on our I___________. But, we judge others, and they judge us, based on B___________.” (Rudolf Dreikurs)

Q13: One-third of our success is based on our IQ. Two-thirds of our success is based on our ________.

Q14: Our “Attitudes” consist of two components: T_________ and F_________

Q15: We have “Attitudes” about three topics:
1) ______________
2) ______________
3) ______________

Q16: The single biggest deficiency of most supervisors and managers is that they do not __________________________________________.

Q17: What is the key difference between “Effectiveness” and “Efficiency”?

Effectiveness is: ________________________________________________

Efficiency is: ________________________________________________
Q18: What does “Pareto’s Law” mean, or refer to?

Q19: In our minds, the Past is located in our ____________, and the Future is located in our ____________.

To be mentally healthy, we should:

L ____________ from the Past,

L ____________ in the Present, and

P ____________ for the Future

Q20: In any list of things to do, whether you like it or not, some things are ______

Q21: What do the words “Big Rocks” refer to, or mean?

Q22: What does the expression “Tough Love” mean?

Q23: For mediocre supervisors and managers, their First Priority is ___________________________; and their Second Priority is ___________________________. 
Q24: The main purposes of having a Team Covenant are:
A. To hold your team accountable to their Covenant and to make them feel guilty and ashamed when they deviate from it
B. To show your team that you are not afraid to receive some constructive feedback from them, and to be able to offer them some useful feedback as well
C. To make the ‘implicit explicit’ by writing down what you expect from your team and what they expect from you, reviewing these expectations, and making sure they are appropriate and realistic
D. To make accountability and desired behavior a “two-way street”, where both you and the staff make promises and agree to be given feedback on the performance of those promises
E. To make managing your staff easier by consolidating what they most need from you into a list of no more than 8-10 items that they all agree to
F. All of the above
G. B through E, but not A

Q25: In communicating, and making presentations, we have three different “Tools of Influence”.
We have a V _______________ Tool

We have a V _______________ Tool

We have a V _______________ Tool

Q26: The Two most important parts of a Presentation are the _______________

and the _______________.

Q27: What does “WIIFM” stand for? ________________________________

Q28: What are the Four Benefits of expressing appreciation, saying Thank You, and positively acknowledging a person who has provided you some beneficial product, service or idea?
The Four Benefits are:
1. _______________________________
2. _______________________________
3. _______________________________
4. 

Q29: What does this “Formula” mean, concerning your participation in IRMC’s Leadership Workshops:

\[ L \times A = C = S, \text{ or } P \]

Q30: According to Mary Kay, founder of the well-known cosmetics company, the two things more important than sex and money are:

1. 

2. 

Q31: The sound or word that is the most important to hear in helping to define our identity is: ________________________________.

Q32: According to Lee Iaccoca, former CEO of the Chrysler Motor Company, every business is really only about Three Words. These three words are:

P ____________________

P ____________________, or Services

P ____________________

Q33: Please complete this expression:

*If you give a man a fish, you ________________________________

Why is this idea important to being a good supervisor or manager? _____
Q34: When a person is “Anxious”, or “Fearful”, they are thinking about which time period? Check the time-period you believe is the best response.
   Past
   Present
   Future

   What are their thoughts or beliefs about this situation?

When a person is “Angry”, or “Bitter”, they are thinking about which time period? Check the time-period you believe is the best response.
   Past
   Present
   Future

   What are their thoughts or beliefs about this situation?

Q35: Suicide and homicide are P_______ S_______ s for T_______
     P_______ s.

Q36: The main reason seminar participants were asked to write “copious notes” about the principles and concepts discussed during the sessions is because the average person, without the benefit of notes, will forget about _____% before they leave the room in which the information was presented.

Q37: According to William Glasser’s research on how people learn, three of the more effective approaches to helping others learn would be:
   A. Let them read; let them see and hear; and let them discuss with others
   B. Let them hear; let them discuss with others; and let them experience
C. Let them discuss with others; let them experience; and let them teach others
D. Let them experience; test them with a quiz like this; and let them teach others
E. Let them see and hear; let them write about it in their own words; say/do nothing and hope they will pick it up on their own

Q38: "As adults, we get to choose our B__________, but we do not get to choose the C___________. The C___________ will choose us".

Q39: G__________ and R__________ define our Work Responsibilities.
O__________ and E__________ define our Work Relationships.

Q40: What we T__________, will determine how we F__________, which in turn will determine our B___________.

Q41: What is the difference between these two companies, one that has an Organization Chart like the one on the Left, the other with the Organization Chart on the Right?

Left:

Right:
Q42: Which department in IRMC will produce more effective results over time? (Circle the one you select)

A. A department that has Superstars, with an Average Coach or Leader

B. A department that has Average Players, but a Superior Coach or Leader

Why did you choose A or B? __________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________

Q43: Without Feedback and Awareness, most people will usually ____________

________________________________________________________________________________

Q44: In general, we should praise and recognize others in ____________.

But, we should criticize or provide negative feedback in ____________.

Q45: According to research, the single most frequent reason an employee leaves their company is ____________________________________________.

Q46: Effective Supervisors and Managers in IRMC should derive their job satisfaction from ____________________________________________.

Q47: The three major things that employers look for in considering a candidate to join their company are:

1. ____________________________________________

2. ____________________________________________

3. ____________________________________________
Q48: Managing our attitudes at work is important because:
A. It helps keep us focused on our roles and goals
B. Decisions and behavior based on strong emotions are often regretted later
C. People prefer to work with others who are stable, predictable, and not moody
D. Positive people, with positive attitudes, often achieve more and rise higher in organizations than those considered “negative”
E. All of the above
F. A, B and C, but not D and E

Q49: Approximately, what percentage of the Canadian population is:

Neurotic: __________%  
Mentally Healthy: ________%

Q50: As a Supervisor or Manager, your Title gives you authority, but it is your _____________________________ that actually earns you ____________________________.

Q51: The Rev. Jesse Jackson said: “It is more your A _____________, than your A _____________, that will determine your A _____________”.

Q52: Although we work at IRMC, with our colleagues, psychologically, we actually work for ________________.

Q53: Herzberg’s Theory of Motivation (Motivators and Hygiene Factors) suggests that which of the following, in the long run, will be the most motivating for most employees:
A. Money
B. Threats, fear and punishment
C. Benefits and perks of the title
D. Achievement, learning, and recognition
E. Interpersonal relations with co-workers
F. Working conditions (equipment, space, heat, safety, etc.)
Q54: What are some of the characteristics, activities, habits and behaviors which distinguish:

Effective Leaders: ____________________________

__________________________

__________________________

Ineffective, Coercive Bosses: ____________________________

__________________________

__________________________

Q55: On the subject of running effective meetings, “PDORA” stands for:

A. Power, Delegation, Obligations, Reality, and Attitudes
B. Peaches, Dates, Oranges, Raisons, and Apples
C. Purpose, Desired Objectives, Reality, Agenda
D. Purpose, Desired Outcomes, Roles, Agenda
E. None of the above

Q56: “Let me see if I have this clear: you think we should do X first, and then do Y and Z. Is that right?” This statement is an example of:

A. Summarizing
B. Building
C. Testing Understanding
D. Shutting Out
E. Process Check

Q57: “Excuse me, let me get us back on track with our meeting objectives. We have been talking about X but that is not related to our agenda. I think we need to move our discussion to the next agenda item and stay focused on the desired outcome”. This statement is an example of:

A. Bringing In
B. Building
C. Process Check
D. Giving Information
E. Tension Relieving
Q58: “OK, finally we have this issue resolved. Jim you have agreed to do A. Sally, you agreed to do B. And Larry, you agreed to do C”. This statement is an example of:
A. Summarizing
B. Disagreeing
C. Building
D. Shutting Out
E. Attacking/Defending

Q59: As a facilitator in a meeting, your primary goals are to:
A. Ensure that the desired outcomes are achieved on all or most topics
B. Ensure that all attendees have an opportunity to share their ideas and be heard respectfully by the other attendees
C. Ensure there is clarity on what has been shared, what has been decided, and what follow up is needed after the meeting
D. Ensure that the process of the meeting works effectively; that people are satisfied with how the meeting is running; and that people stay on topic
E. All of the above
F. A through C, but not D

Q60: The model of “Feelings-Facts-Solutions” is useful for:
A. Resolving disputes at restaurants over problems with the bill
B. Helping the politicians in Parliament get along better with each other
C. Solving the conflicts going on in the Middle East
D. Dealing with strong emotions that may emerge in team meetings or forums
E. Every agenda item that may come up in a meeting or team session
F. None of the above

Q61: In the GROW model of coaching, the R stands for:
A. Response
B. Roles
C. Reality
D. Relationship
E. Risks
F. None of the above
Q62: In the GROW model of coaching, the W stands for:
A. Write It Down
B. Week From Now
C. When Do I Start
D. What’s Next
E. We Got It Done
F. None of the above

Q63: Using the GROW model of coaching, approximately what percentage of the time should you the ‘coach’ be speaking, and what percentage should the ‘client’ be speaking?

You the Coach: _________%; the Client: _________%

Q64: To be effective in using the GROW model of coaching, what are FOUR important things to remember as the Coach:

1. ____________________
2. ____________________
3. ____________________
4. ____________________

Q65: Please distinguish the differences between these two words:

Dialogue: ____________________
_________________________
_________________________

Discussion: ____________________
_________________________
_________________________

Q66: The five criteria for developing any goal are:

S ____________________
Q67: In life, as in driving your car, why are “Windshields” so much larger than “Rear-View Mirrors”?

Q68: One of the principles presented was “Usually, we evaluate ourselves based on our intentions. But, we judge others, and they judge us, based on behavior”. What does this statement mean?

A. Nothing. It is gibberish that simply sounds insightful but really is not
B. That our intentions are more important than our behavior
C. That we should get feedback routinely to ensure that our behavior matches our intentions, as people cannot ‘see’ our intentions, only our behavior
D. That ‘walking the talk’ is not as important as ‘talking the walk’
E. That all behavior should be judged in relation to the intentions behind it

Q69: One of the Problem-Solving techniques presented during the workshops was Force Field Analysis. This involves looking at the “Forces” involved in achieving a desired goal and categorizing them into either:

F ___________ Forces (that serve to help us reach the goal); and
O ___________ Forces (that serve to prevent us from reaching the goal)

Q70: Canadian Geese almost always fly in a “V” formation. They are considered one of nature’s best examples of natural teamwork. What are a few ways in which Canadian Geese work as a team, and how does this help them?
1. 

2. 

3. 

Q71: Peter Drucker stated: “Doing things right is not as important as doing the right things. For of what use is it to do the wrong things right”? In brief, what does this statement mean?

4. 

5. 

Q72: In the video “Love and Profit” (which we saw in the September program), the speaker James Autry discussed FOUR key practices related to Leadership. These are:

1. H ____________

2. T ____________

3. S ____________ T ____________

4. C ____________

Q73: One of Autry’s main points was that we need to share information with people, and that we have to trust them with it. Two of his statements on this subject of trust are memorable:
“If you do not trust the people, you make them U_____________”.

“If people do not get the information they need, they _______________” (3 words)

Q74: Describe a couple of the benefits and advantages of incorporating Action Learning Team assignments as an important component of the IRMC Leadership Development Series:

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

Q75: Describe THREE specific methods you use in your role as a Supervisor or Manager to increase an employee’s motivation:

1. ___________________________________________________________________

2. ___________________________________________________________________

3. ___________________________________________________________________

Q76: Words and phrases such as “I’ll try”, “Hopefully”, “I will do my best”, “Maybe I can do it”, etc. are often used by people who:

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

Q77: When developing a Covenant with your staff, it is important to ensure that your Obligation list is longer than your Expectation list. Why is this important?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
Q78: Who in IRMC is responsible for managing the Human Resources in the organization?

Q79: In IRMC, as in any other organization, whose efforts more than any other get you promoted?
   A. Senior Management
   B. Your Peers
   C. Your Boss
   D. Your Mentor
   E. Your Team
   F. Your Customers
   G. Harvey and Seth

Q80: What are THREE important changes you have made in how you manage and work with others as a result of this Leadership Development Series?
   1. 
   2. 
   3. 

Bonus Question:
Q81: In face-to-face communications, research suggests that persuasiveness and believability are determined by these factors, in these percentages:
   A. Body language, 55%
      Voice tone, 38%
      Words used, 7%
   B. Style of attire and grooming, 50%
      Reading vs. talking without notes, 30%
      Smiling or not, 20%
   C. Body language, 62%
      Voice tone, 23%
      Words used, 10%
   D. Preparation and content of talk, 55%
      Speed of talking, 38%
      Grooming and appearance, 7%
   E. None of the above
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Sheila M. Coney
3690 East Ave.
Rochester, NY 14618
March 6, 2006

IRMC
1210 Sheppard Avenue East
Suite 700
Toronto, Ontario, M2K3C4

Dear Participant:

As you are aware IntelliRisk Management Corporation (IRMC) has enlisted Fulcrum Consulting Inc. to assist in further developing the leadership skills of the supervisors, managers, and executives. You have been asked to complete the following Training Satisfaction survey to determining if the training has been effective at improving leadership skills and increasing overall employee satisfaction.

You may at any time decide not participate in this study. Please keep in mind that all of the responses to the surveys will be kept confidential. The individual survey responses will never be revealed to anyone within IRMC. Your results will used for the sole purpose of determining if training has been effective for the supervisors, managers, and executives.

If you do decide to take part in this study, your responses are greatly appreciated and will be of great assistance in determining if the overall training program was successful. Please complete and return the survey no later than March 17, 2006.

Thank you,

Sheila M. Coney
# Training Survey

*By completing this questionnaire you are implying that you consent to your responses being used as part of this study.*

## In the past 6 months have you:

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Kept your employees more informed?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Addressed your employees by name more often?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Praised your employees for a job well done?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Recognized your employees for their accomplishments?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Acknowledged them more for the work that they do?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Gathered everyone together to create a covenant?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Involved the members of your team in the decision making process?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Involved your team more in assisting with solving problems?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Scheduled structured meetings?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Appointed a facilitator at each meeting?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Utilized an agenda at each meeting?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Summarized the important points of each meeting?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Appointed an individual to take notes at the meeting?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Asked your employees for feedback on your performance?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Communicated more effectively with your employees about what is required from them?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Consistently communicated with them – taken time out of your day to discuss/address situations with them?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Offered feedback on their job performance?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Become more of a mentor/coach?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 19. Please describe three noticeable differences in your management/ supervisory skills in the last 6 months:

- a.  
- b.  
- c.  

### 20. Please indicate what areas as a manager/supervisor you need to improve upon in order to be a more effective leader:

- a.  
- b.  
- c.  
Appendix H

Direct Report Responses

36. Please briefly describe three noticeable improvements in your manager/supervisor in the last 6 months:

- Spending more time with employees. Trying to listen more than previously.
- Nothing new, they have all been doing their jobs properly and fairly, nothing to complain about or ask for them to change.
- Provided us with expertise whenever required. Assisted in better understanding of the jobs and prospect of collecting. Provided us feedback on our performance to upgrade ourselves.
- She seems much more pleasant and approachable. She will always help with doubles. She is a very good motivator.
- Very helpful. Make the work environment friendly and enjoyable. All staff are treated equally.
- More positive attitude and more helpful. Starting to show more effort in recognition. Keeping us updated with new items.
- Always is on top of things that need to be done. Treats people fairly. Understands.
- Less profanity on the floor. Less public arguments.
- Reduction in the use of profanity. Reduction in verbal discipline in front of co-workers.
- Has become more technological. Handles team with more confidence. Resolving problems faster.
- Compliments me on doing well, getting better. A lot of positive feedback. Make sure we have everything we want and need to get to achieve what is required of us.
- Shows confidence in my ability to work independently. Shares knowledge and experience when asked. Fair and flexible with all department staff.
- More involved in problem solving. Listens to concerns/suggestions.
- Supervisor is making the effort to know that all tasks are being completed by staff.
- Was always fine at her job.
- No significant changes as he is too busy in problem solving.
- Started praising for a job well done. Communicate more. Less uptight – getting more comfortable with his position.
- Good coach. He is there when you need him. Gives feedback in a timely manner.
- Expressed his appreciation for my commitment. Involving in more complex projects. Given more space for independent decision regarding my work.
- Emotionally controlled. Integrity.
- Communicate better. Express issues better. Easier to talk to.
• Has been able to address my concerns more quickly. Has gotten answers to questions I have voiced to others. Have accommodated my scheduling problems.
• My manager has become more diplomatic in problem solving. I have been here for 2 years and have been happy with every aspect of my manager.
• We are more aware of what is going on as a company.
• Positive reinforcement.

37. Please briefly indicate what areas your manager/supervisor still needs to improve upon in order to be a more effective leader:
• Need to inform us of changes and updates. Better training with new employees. Undated list with extensions and names when inbound calls come in.
• They are all fine they way they are and always have been.
• Time management. Involve in decision making.
• Emphasize more on training. Group discussions to bring out confidence and better able to deal with files. Facilitate team work.
• Focus on training more. Training was started, but never finished.
• Be tougher. More communication with client. Weeding out dead weight (collectors.).
• Set reasonable goals. Pressure is good, too much is uncomfortable. Training is necessary for new employees.
• Hold more meetings. More consistency on the floor. More effective training when collectors are switched from the group.
• To keep an eye on individuals wasting company time by leaving their seats frequently and attending to personal matters. To review files mishandled by individuals.
• Needs to take the time to give opportunity to address work concerns. Needs to take complaints seriously and try to find resolution. Needs to show appreciation for what we do and not act like we can just be replaced.
• Take people aside to speak to them. Not to embarrass employees on the floor. Needs to know how to work the system.
• Award those who give more than expected. More incentive programs.
• Actually use feedback provided by others to increase personal effectiveness. Avoid showing frustration that may discourage others. Show sincere appreciation for others’ achievements and good work.
• Learn to work the number.
• Follow through needs to be worked on in certain circumstances.
• Offer praise and encouragement when appropriate. Designate more responsibility to staff.
• More feedback. More understanding of the job I am doing. Make sure that all parties are aware of new stipulations.
- Supervisor should relay client changes to every person needed. Manager should ensure supervisors relays pertinent information to all parties.
- Interpersonal relationships. Too self-centered and obsessed with own problems.
- Communication. Preferential treatment to some collectors. Constant swearing on the floor.
- Still untrusting. Does not believe in others ability. Sometimes too slow to react.
- Transparent. Execution. Delegate.
- Managers and supervisors need to address employees as a person, not as a number.
- Attitude (very rude at times). Yells and talks in a disrespectful manner. Needs to be more understanding.
- More group meetings. Communication. One on one.
- Praised staff. Solve problems when they come up. Say something and stick to it.
- To be less forgiving of others repeated mistakes when it causes more work for the rest of the team.
- My current manager needs to be less agitated. Sometimes feels things are too personal which are not. Needs to listen a little bit more to staff concerns and not take them as a personal attack.
- Answer questions without being condescending.
- Structured meetings.
Appendix I

Supervisor and Manager Responses

19. Please describe three noticeable differences in your management/supervisory skills in the last 6 months:
   - Take more time with staff. Be more approachable. Send daily “thoughts” of the day.
   - The way I speak to others. Praise efforts more often. Communicate more often with the staff.
   - Keep sarcasm out of emails.
   - Better time management. More detailed communication.
   - Addressed them by name. Recognized for their accomplishments. Communicated more effectively.
   - Better communication – keeping the lines open. Getting more feedback from the staff. Working together better as a team – trusting the staff to do more.
   - I try to empower employees with knowledge. I trust them more.
   - More conscious of recognizing and praising good work by staff. More organized meetings. Better at delegating tasks.
   - Less aggressive.
   - More success in repairing the bad communication in our department. Taken more time to sit with my staff. Felt more positive feedback from our group.
   - Better managing my time. More organized.
   - Team work. Time management. Help others.
   - Calmer. Seek advice more from staff/peers. Spend more time coaching new staff.
   - Moved onto larger projects. Doing less repetitive tasks. More appraisal of staff members.
   - More listening skills. More feedback.
   - Look more at employees’ point of view. Look more at peer point of view. Look more at managers’ point of view.
   - More structured. Better at informing staff. Take more time to listen.
   - Listen more. Being calm in any situation. Acknowledging employees for good work.
   - Great confidence. More input in planning.
   - More patience. Listen to my peers more.
   - Providing feedback more consistently. Holding team meetings. Ask for feedback.
20. Please indicate what areas as a manager/supervisor you need to improve upon in order to be a more effective leader:
   - Defining their roles.
   - Patience.
   - Make more on one time with the staff. Offer more feedback.
   - Involve team members in problem resolution. Have more structure to my meetings. Smile more.
   - More praising.
   - Regular meetings.
   - Time management.
   - Understanding what they are feeling (at work, at home). Be more patient. Be a role model.
   - Patience.
   - Effectively communicate. Delegate more!
   - Get even better at delegating.
   - Involving my staff ore in the decisions I make. Be more of a mentor for my group. Get less caught up in who does not like me for silly reasons.
   - Time management. More consistent providing feedback to my staff. Be more demanding.
   - Participation. Structured meetings. Sharing thoughts.
   - Confidence.
   - Need to listen more. Ned to spend more time with Jr. staff.
   - More delegation. More work with time management.
   - THE COMPANY HASN’T TAKEN THE INITIATIVE TO MAKE SURE ALL THAT WAS LEARNED WAS IMPLEMENTED!
   - More meetings.
   - More patience – I can never get enough! More thoughtful in dealing with employees “personal” issues. Communication style needs to be less aggressive when dealing with problem situations.
   - More thorough communication with my peers. Be more patient.
   - Listen a bit better. Handle employee confrontation a bit better. Keep a better paper trail on poor performers.
   - Being more firm. Scheduling meetings.
   - Time management. Organization.
   - Delegating some duties. Seek more advice from staff/peers.
   - Addressing discipline. Meet and greet with all team members more consistently.