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The process through which an employee learns and adapts to a new position in an organization is often referred to as organizational socialization. Failure to provide employees with adequate socialization has been linked to negative behaviors, unmet expectations and higher levels of turnover. One of the most common ways to socialize new employees is through socialization training programs that provide a wealth of information about the job, work environment, and broader organization. Despite the documented importance of socialization, and the widespread use of socialization training programs, the effectiveness of socialization training has received relatively little research attention. The current study attempts to answer calls to integrate previous research to propose a more effective socialization training program. Using a sample of college-age, part-time workers at a university childcare center, half of the center’s new employees received the center’s standard orientation program consisting of organization and task information. The other half received additional training that provided role information as well as other job-relevant socialization material. Independent samples t-tests were then utilized to assess group differences in mean levels of training satisfaction, role clarity, motivation to learn, and performance at a later date to see if increased amounts of socialization-relevant information provided during orientation helped to facilitate the ongoing socialization process. While results of the analyses yielded no significant differences between groups, the experimental condition did show elevated levels of role clarity and motivation to learn. These outcomes also had medium to large effect sizes. Interpretation of these results, however, are clouded by the use of a small sample size that may have limited the study’s ability to detect group differences, as well as a somewhat incomplete presentation of the experimental content by center training staff. These limitations make it difficult to draw solid conclusions from the study’s findings. Future studies looking to expand on the current research would benefit from utilizing a sample large enough to provide the statistical power needed to detect group differences. A stronger, better-controlled manipulation may also help to clarify the effect role information has when provided during an orientation program. Finally, as the current study utilized a part-time, low complexity position, future research may also seek to investigate how role information might affect similar outcomes for jobs with varying levels of complexity and commitment.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The process through which an employee learns and adapts to a new position in an organization is often referred to as organizational socialization (Chao, O'Leary Kelly, Wolf, & Klein, 1994). This process focuses on the ways an employee learns the culture, values, roles, skills, expectations, and other information necessary to effectively execute his/her position within an organization (Van Maanen & Schein, 1979). The time line for the socialization process has been defined in multiple ways. From the broadest perspective, it is the entire process of learning encompassing all of the transition in a person’s career (Van Maanen & Schein). A more finite perspective suggests that, depending on the complexity of the job, it can be up to nine months until an employee is able to master all the demands of a position (Feldman, 1981). Either way, socialization is an ongoing process crucial for allowing newcomers to get up to speed and fully contribute in their new positions (Van Maanen & Schein).

The importance of organizational socialization can be seen at many levels. Employees are changing jobs more than ever before, and studies show that a quarter of employees are currently in the process of acclimating to a new organization or position (Rollag, Parise, & Rob, 2005). As the number of newcomers in an organization increases, so does the need to integrate them into the system and enable them to become contributing members of the organization. Failure to adequately socialize employees has been linked to outcomes such as counterproductive work behaviors, unmet expectations and higher levels of turnover (Wanous, 1992; Wanous & Colella, 1989). In contrast, successful socialization has shown to relate to job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and decreased turnover intentions (Allen & Meyer, 1990; Ashforth & Saks, 1996). As recruitment and selection are expensive undertakings for an organization (Bauer, Morrison, & Callister, 1998), the importance of socialization may have never been greater.
THEORIES AND TAXONOMIES OF SOCIALIZATION

Despite the documented importance of socialization, it has received relatively little research attention compared to other areas of organizational research (Becker, 2002). Of what has been studied, perhaps the most dominant theory in socialization research to date has been the theory of uncertainty reduction (Falcione & Wilson, 1988; Lester, 1987). Uncertainty Reduction Theory (URT) proposes that when an employee enters an organization or assumes a new position within an organization, s/he experiences high levels of uncertainty. This uncertainty typically causes discomfort that the employee is motivated to reduce. To reduce this uncertainty, the employee gathers information in various domains and from various sources. The information acquired then serves to make the work place more understandable, predictable, and controllable. It is through this process, as an employee gathers the necessary information to comprehend and function in his/her new environment, that successful socialization takes place. This theoretical concept has served as the basis for much of what is known about socialization in terms of training, tactics, and information seeking (Saks & Ashforth, 1997).

In keeping with URT, many researchers have viewed socialization as a learning process. In this context, studies have shown that there are four distinct contextual domains that are relevant to the socialization process: task, role, group, and organizational domains (Feldman, 1981; Fisher, 1986). The task domain deals with all aspects related to the actual execution of the job: how to perform task assignments, use equipment, etc. The role domain focuses on non-task specific expectations for the position. These would include appropriate behaviors as well as boundaries of authority and responsibility. Group processes are concerned with group structure, group norms/values, and how the group functions as a unit. The organizational domain is made up of information regarding organizational structure, history, organizational goals/values, politics, and language. Research has shown that employees who believed that they possessed more knowledge in these information domains were more satisfied, more committed, and better adjusted (Ostroff & Kozlowski, 1992). Studies have also shown that knowledge in the task and role domains were most important to successful socialization and that knowledge tended to be lowest in the organizational domain (Ostroff & Kozlowski).
A second model of relevant socialization information domains was proposed by Chao et al. (1994). Chao and colleagues believed that previously suggested conceptualizations of socialization content domains (i.e., as proposed by Feldman [1981] and Fisher [1986]) lacked specificity. This, they argued, made it difficult to connect socialization content domains to specific socialization outcomes. They instead based their framework on the idea that dimensions of socialization should be independent, such that socialization in one area is not related to socialization in another. They reasoned that this would allow examination of the relationships between individual dimensions and outcomes. With this idea in mind, Chao and colleagues conceptualized and developed a set of six socialization domains: performance proficiency, people (establishing relationships with organizational members), politics (formal and informal power structures in an organization), language (technical language as well as any slang or acronyms specific to an organization), organizational goals and values, and history (an organization’s traditions customs and rituals). In the first phase of a longitudinal study using 6000 college graduates employed full-time, participant responses were factor analyzed, reproducing the six a priori socialization domains. In the second phase, Chao and colleagues then assessed the effect of these six domains on the employees, differentiating between job incumbents, organizational newcomers, or job changers within an organization. Results showed incumbents possessed the most knowledge in the six domains, followed by job changers and then newcomers. The study also showed the content domains were related to various levels of career effectiveness. While the Chao et al. model seems promising, there has been little follow-up research testing it.

The fact that Chao and colleagues (1994) drew from classic sources of socialization research (Bennis, Schein, Steele, & Berlew, 1968; Feldman, 1981; Fisher, 1986; Schein, 1971) to develop their six domains can be seen in some of the overlap of their model and those of Fisher and Feldman (see Table 1). Performance proficiency equates well with the task domain. Organizational goals and values, history, and language could very well fit in Fisher and Feldman’s broader organizational domain. Chao et al.’s people and politics could also fall under the organizational domain, or could be encompassed by the group domain. One area that appears to be missing in the Chao et al. model, however, is the role domain. This researcher believes this omission to be a key weakness in the six-dimension model. As a means to influence new employees thinking and behavior, the role domain offers a unique
Table 1. Similarities Between Chao et al.’s Socialization Domains and Original Four-Domain Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance Proficiency</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals &amp; Values</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politics</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

possibility to align employee responsibility with organizational goals. To omit role information from the socialization model, and fail to recognize an employee’s need to understand organizational expectations, misses a chance to synchronize individual and organizational priorities. The current study investigates the possibility of better facilitating the socialization process by adding role information content to a traditional new employee orientation program.

**Socialization Information Sources**

To obtain information in any relevant socialization domain, an employee draws on a variety of sources. Much of the needed information comes from social interaction with supervisors and coworkers (Morrison, 1993; Ostroff & Kozlowski, 1992). Studies have also shown that at different times in the adjustment process, newcomers will seek out different types of information and employ different information seeking strategies (Miller & Jablin, 1991; Morrison; Ostroff & Kozlowski). Of the different types of strategies, the majority of information has been shown to come from observation and experimentation (Ostroff & Kozlowski). This finding is noteworthy in that, as a means to gather essential information, it is a time-consuming process. The ease with which employees learn their roles affects their adjustment (Gommersall & Meyers, 1966). If an employee were able to amass the needed information in a more direct manner, it would then follow that the employee would be better able to adjust to the demands of the job and organization. Furthermore, the more quickly an employee can gather the needed information, the less time it will take for them to become socialized and the faster they will reach desired levels of performance.
While informal social interactions serve as a major source of information for new employees, formal socialization training programs also seek to reduce newcomer’s uncertainty by providing needed information. Socialization training programs can provide a wealth of information about the job, work environment, as well as the broader organization. One of the most studied concepts in socialization training research is Van Maanen and Schein’s (1979) Model of Socialization Tactics. They proposed a set of six opposing techniques that an organization could use to influence the socialization process of an employee: (1)-collective vs. individual, (2) formal vs. informal, (3) sequential vs. random, (4) fixed vs. variable, (5) serial vs. disjunctive, (6) investiture vs. divestiture. Collective vs. individual deals with the context in which the newcomer is socialized. In a collective setting all new employees share common experiences. Individual, by the nature of its name, offers unique experiences for each new employee. In an informal experience, a newcomer will learn on the job, while a formal experience has new employees separated from current employees as they learn. Sequential tactics provide information about the order of experiences a new employee will go through, and fixed tactics provide a concrete timetable of when these stages will occur. By contrast, random and variable tactics provide no such ordering or time line restrictions. The last two categories deal with the social context in which employees learn relevant socialization information. In a serial process, current employees provide models of behavior and responsibility to new recruits while a disjunctive process leaves new employees without such role models to assess situations. The last two, investiture vs. divestiture, deals with the degree to which newcomers receive feedback from current employees after they have joined the organization.

Van Maanen and Schein (1979) argued that how these tactics are applied influences an employee’s adjustment. Jones (1986) identified the first of each of the six pairs of socialization techniques as institutionalized socialization tactics. For the sake of simplicity, I will refer to these institutionalized socialization tactics as socialization training. Jones found that socialization training reduced uncertainty and anxiety, as predicted by Uncertainty Reduction Theory. Many other studies have also investigated the use of socialization training and have found it to be positively related to job satisfaction and commitment, and negatively related to role ambiguity, role conflict, and turnover intentions (Ashforth & Saks, 1996; Saks & Ashforth, 1997). Taken together, these studies suggest socialization training
can be used in a strategic manner to ease an employee’s transition into an organization and influence subsequent attitudes and behavior.

Perhaps due in part to the successful outcomes associated with institutionalized socialization tactics, formal socialization training programs have become the primary means of socialization for many newcomers (Feldman, 1989). These training programs are often the first interaction that an employee has with an organization (Tannenbaum, Mathieu, Salas, & Cannon Bowers, 1991), and they can be formative in helping an individual develop expectations for their new position (Feldman, 1989). These early training programs can serve as an excellent source of valuable socialization information, including information about organizational and group norms, values, and ideologies (Feldman, 1989). These programs take on additional importance because newcomers are most susceptible to organizational influence during entry (Van Maanen & Schein, 1979). Any attempt to align organizational and individual values and expectations would have the greatest chance of success during these early programs.

**REVIEW OF WORKPLACE TRAINING THEORIES**

According to McGehee and Thayer (1961), workplace training is the formal procedure a company utilizes to facilitate learning so resultant behavior contributes to attainment of company goals and objectives. To this end, workplace training effectiveness research has identified a series of broad steps that have been shown to make the training process more effective. A three-stage model of training, beginning with a *needs assessment*, leading to the *content design and delivery* of material, followed by an *evaluation* of the program, has become one of the more widely recognized models of training effectiveness (Goldstein & Ford, 2002). The *needs assessment* concerns the investigative process through which an organization identifies their specific training focus. It is also during this process that the objectives of the program are laid out. *Development and delivery* deal with the creation of the content of the training program and presentation of the information to the employees. The final stage, *evaluation*, assesses if the program has achieved the objectives laid out during the needs assessment phase. To maximize the effectiveness of an organization’s training program, scholars recommend attention to each aspect of this model.
Working from McGehee and Thayer’s (1961) definition of training and incorporating the three-stage model of training effectiveness, I propose that socialization training would more quickly integrate new employees into an organization by providing the requisite knowledge needed to help them reach desired levels of performance. Several published studies can be seen as contributing to the needs assessment phase, identifying both the need for socialization training and possible objectives of socialization training programs (Cooper-Thomas & Anderson, 2002; Feldman, 1989; Fisher, 1986; Morrison, 1993; Ostroff & Kozlowski, 1992; Wanous, 1992). Presently, however, less research has focused on the design and delivery or evaluation phases.

**CONTENT OF SOCIALIZATION TRAINING**

Socialization training can take numerous forms, including orientation training, job skill training, or legal liability training. However, the most common form of socialization training employed by organizations is orientation training (Bassi & Van Buren, 1998). Orientation training is a form of socialization training intended to introduce new employees to their jobs, organizations, and the people with whom they will work (Klein & Weaver, 2000). A study of organizations in Great Britain showed that of 300 randomly selected companies, 90% conducted some form of orientation training (Anderson, Cunningham-Snell, & Haigh, 1996), while another survey found that 64% of recent college graduates from East and West Coast universities underwent some form of orientation training (Louis, Posner & Powell, 1983). Because orientation training is the most commonly utilized form of socialization training, henceforth, the terms “orientation training” and “socialization training” will be used interchangeably. Also, even though socialization is a process relevant to both new employees and existing employees who transition into a new position within the same organization, the current study uses the term “orientation training” to refer only to “new employee socialization training”.

Despite the widespread use of orientation training, this type of training does not necessarily use theory-based content to facilitate socialization. In fact, very little research has focused on orientation training specifically as a tool for successful socialization (Wanous, 1992). The few studies that have examined organizations’ use of orientation training programs have shown disappointing results in the programs’ effectiveness. Some
early studies found orientation training to be widely available but rated by new employees to be only somewhat helpful (Chatman, 1991; Louis et al., 1983; Nelson & Quick, 1991; Saks, 1996). The studies also found that the availability of orientation training was generally not related to outcomes traditionally associated with successful socialization.

One reason for these disappointing findings could lie in the content of the programs. Anderson et al. (1996) found the content of orientation programs to be broad and general in nature; the five most frequent topics included employee health and safety, general terms of employment, general human resources policies, organizational structure/history, and general training provisions. The study further questioned the usefulness of these types of programs, suggesting that this wide range of information might instead overwhelm newcomers and have detrimental effects to the socialization process. The study concluded that organizations tend not to use orientation training as a socialization tool to increase newcomer inclusion, but instead used it as a means to dispense information, much of it irrelevant to the socialization process (Anderson et al., 1996). Perhaps this unfocused nature of orientation training is why other research has found informal means of socializing new employees to be more influential in the socialization process (Ostroff & Kozlowski, 1992).

A more effective way to design orientation training may be to focus on content relevant to socialization. Building from theories of the socialization process, more effective orientation training may focus content not on information such as employment terms and HR policies, but instead on Fisher/Feldman’s or Chao et al.’s (1994) information domains, because acquisition of socialization-relevant information has already been shown to facilitate successful socialization (Ostroff & Kozlowski, 1992). Providing such relevant socialization information may improve the effectiveness of the programs. Indeed, Ostroff and Kozlowski found that employees who believed they possessed more knowledge in the task, role, group, and organizational domains reported feeling more adjusted, as defined by their feelings of independence, acceptance by co-workers, and comfort in their work situation. This same study also found that of these four domains, task and role were the most important to successful socialization. Therefore, designers of orientation programs should ensure their content includes these two domains.

One study examines orientation training specifically designed to facilitate socialization (Klein & Weaver, 2000). It is also the only study to specifically examine the
content of an orientation program. This study is of particular interest because it is one of the
only studies to differentiate new employee orientation training from initial technical or skill
training. Klein and Weaver (2000) examined the effect of attending a voluntary orientation
program on the learning of socialization information. In particular the program sought to
help employees feel more a part of the organization, become more familiar with the
organization’s culture and goals, and to educate them on workplace principles. Unlike other
studies, however, Klein and Weaver did not use the more traditional four socialization
domains (task, role, group, organization) but instead used those suggested by Chao et al.
(1994). Employees attended a three-hour orientation training where they participated in
lectures, discussions, and activities, which provided them with information about the
organization’s mission, history, workplace principles, traditions, and language. Klein and
Weaver found employees who attended the orientation to be better socialized on the Chao et
al. domains relevant to the content of the orientation training. Furthermore, the study also
found that employees who attended the orientation had higher levels of organizational
commitment, and this relationship was fully mediated by socialization-relevant knowledge.

In an attempt to identify the most effective content for orientation training, the present
study extends the findings of Klein and Weaver (2000) by supplementing the inclusion of
organizational information with role information. The study retains organizational
information in orientation training because research has shown it to be typically included in
orientation training programs (Anderson et al., 1996). Additionally, studies have shown the
inclusion of organizational information to lead to higher levels of socialization when
included in an orientation training program (Klein & Weaver). Because previous research
has already found task and role information to be the most influential to successful
socialization (Ostroff & Kozlowski, 1992), inclusion of these types of information seems
necessary for a successful orientation training program. The findings of Anderson et al.
suggest, however, that neither is typically included in an orientation training program. As the
present study focuses on orientation training, the inclusion of role information seems the
logical choice to include.

Previously, roles were defined as non-task specific expectations for a position,
including appropriate behaviors as well as boundaries of authority and responsibility. As it
applies to the current study, role information would serve as a bridge between the goals of
the organization (organizational information) and the daily tasks an employee undertakes (task information). This connection between different types of socialization information is what would facilitate achievement of distal socialization outcomes such as organizational commitment and job satisfaction.

**EXPECTED OUTCOMES OF SOCIALIZATION TRAINING**

A second goal of the current study is to address another issue: identification of appropriate outcomes by which to evaluate the effectiveness of orientation training. When orientation training is designed to facilitate the socialization process, the desired outcomes of training are those associated with successful socialization. Most studies investigating the socialization process use traditional measures such as satisfaction, turnover, work stress, and affective commitment. However these criteria may not be accurate measures of a specific orientation training intervention, because such distal criteria may be affected by a multitude of factors besides the orientation training itself (Ostroff & Kozlowski, 1992). Indeed, Wanous (1992) suggests the need to differentiate orientation (i.e., early socialization or onboarding) from the entire socialization process. He points out that orientation training programs take place, or should take place, during the first week of employment, whereas socialization is an ongoing, more encompassing process. Even if the orientation training is viewed as part of the greater socialization process, to evaluate the effectiveness of a particular intervention by the same criteria used to determine the desired end result of the entire socialization process seems too much to ask of a program typically begun and ended on the first day of employment. Because training evaluation focusing on proximal outcomes should suffer fewer threats to internal validity, I recommend that proximal outcomes of socialization training should be included in studies examining socialization training effectiveness. To better evaluate the impact of orientation training, it then becomes essential to identify the appropriate proximal outcomes.

**Proximal Outcomes of Successful Socialization Training**

Individuals who receive role information should have a greater understanding of role expectations and their place within the organization than those who do not receive explicit role information. This greater understanding should in turn lead to reduced uncertainty about
their role in the organization. As URT suggests, individuals who have decreased their uncertainty through the acquisition of information have achieved a level of socialization. Thus, individuals who receive role information should possess a greater amount of information in the role domain, show higher levels of role clarity, and thus be better socialized.

Hypothesis 1: Employees who receive role information through orientation training will show higher levels of role clarity than employees who do not receive role information through orientation training.

Although orientation training can provide information in some of the relevant socialization domains, it leaves other important information to be learned in further training or through hands-on experience. One question to be asked then is: how can orientation, as the first experience an employee has with an organization, be used to influence subsequent learning? In a study of military trainees, Tannenbaum et al. (1991), found training reactions and training fulfillment, defined as “the extent to which the training meets or fulfils a trainee’s expectations,” were positively related to continued training motivation. Translating this to socialization research, an employee who obtains more socialization-related information would be better able to make sense of his/her situation to reduce uncertainty. Indeed, employees who possess more knowledge have been shown to be more satisfied and better adjusted (Ostroff & Kozlowski, 1992). As such, an employee might find a training intervention that provided a greater amount of relevant information to be more satisfying than one that did not. These higher levels of satisfaction and fulfillment might lead to higher levels of motivation for training or learning in other relevant socialization areas. In this way orientation can serve to not only socialize employees through providing needed information, but also as a tool to help facilitate the entire socialization process. If such is the case, then one objective of a new employee orientation should be to better motivate employees to continue the learning process throughout the socialization period. As such, the program should be evaluated not only by the knowledge it provides, but also by the behaviors it inspires. It is important to note, however, that while the increase in motivation to learn is predicted to result from an increase in training fulfillment, the current study is not focused on demonstrating that training fulfillment is a mediator for motivation to learn. Such mediation has already been show in the work of Tannenbaum et al. (1991). The present study seeks to
explore the types of content that can maximize the effectiveness of a new employee orientation, not investigate the means through which these changes may occur.

Hypothesis 2: Employees who receive role information through orientation training will report higher levels of training fulfillment than those who do not receive role information through orientation training.

Hypothesis 3: Employees who receive role information through orientation training will report higher levels of motivation to learn job relevant information than those who did not receive role information through orientation training.

**Distal Outcome of Successful Socialization**

Organizational socialization employs a series of tactics designed to help newcomers more quickly get up to speed. In attempting to learn needed socialization information studies have shown that newcomers traditionally spend a majority of their time focusing on role orientation (Graen, Orris, & Johnson, 1973). Research has also shown that new employees usually obtain information through the more time consuming process of observation and experimentation (Ostroff & Kozlowski, 1992). Providing this information directly at the very onset of the socialization process should decrease the time needed for new employees to learn this type of knowledge and decrease the time needed to reach effective levels of performance.

In socialization research, most studies have focused on individual-level attitudinal outcomes, such as organizational commitment and job satisfaction (Cooper-Thomas & Anderson, 2006), and only one study focused on measures of learning socialization-relevant knowledge (Klein & Weaver, 2000). In the practitioner world, Anderson et al. (1996) found that organizations rely almost exclusively on reaction measures to assess their orientation training, to the exclusion of assessment on higher stages. One thing that has been notably missing from the evaluations of socialization training is measures of performance (Cooper-Thomas & Anderson). The scarcity of performance evaluation as a socialization training outcome is somewhat surprising, given that organizations intend for institutionalized socialization tactics to influence behaviors and attitudes of the incoming employees (Anderson et al.). Furthermore, the few studies that have included performance measures (Bauer, Bodner, Erdogan, Truxillo, & Tucker, 2007; Morrison, 1993; Saks, 1995) examined task training as well as non-skill based socialization training. While these studies have shown a positive relationship between socialization training and performance, the inclusion
of task training moves the studies away from the form of orientation training the current study seeks to investigate. The current study includes a measure of performance to evaluate the effect a non-skill based socialization training has on an employee’s ability to more quickly reach desired levels of performance.

Hypothesis 4: Employees who receive role information through orientation training will show higher levels of performance than those employees who did not receive role information through orientation training.

**SUMMARY**

With such a large numbers of organizations using training as a means for socialization, and such disheartening results from orientation training effectiveness research, there is a compelling need to combine what is known about training with what is known about socialization. In fact numerous studies have called for this combined effort (Anderson et al., 1996; Ostroff & Kozlowski, 1992; Saks & Ashforth, 1997). Saks and Ashforth suggested the use of training procedures for needs assessment, design, and identification of appropriate criteria for evaluation. Others have called for research to identify the appropriate content for socialization programs, i.e., which information domain (task, role, group, or organization) should be included. Still others have spoken of the need to include the goals of the organization in the socialization process (Cooper-Thomas & Anderson, 2006). The current study attempts to answer these calls and integrates previous research to propose more effective orientation training content and a wider variety of outcome measures.
CHAPTER 2

METHOD

PARTICIPANTS

Participants for this study were 22 part-time employees recently hired at a university childcare center. Over 85% of the participants were female, and ages ranged from 18-25, with a mean age of 21 years. Of the participants, 52% were Child and Family Development (CFD) majors and participants had completed an average of 12.5 units of CFD coursework. Other participants had majors in nursing or other care-related fields.

PROCEDURE

Participants underwent orientation training designed to provide employees with important organizational information and to help facilitate the socialization process. Training was conducted by the center’s supervising teachers and was mandatory for all employees. Training took place before employees began their job functions and lasted between two and two and half hours in length. Trainees were assigned to either an experimental or control condition based on the classrooms to which they were assigned to work. The two groups were created so that participants in both conditions would be handling equivalent responsibilities and tasks, and would be working with children of similar ages or who were in similar stages of development.

Both the experimental and control groups received the same organizational information in a meeting with the assistant director of the childcare center. After this initial meeting, the control group went directly to task training with their supervising teachers, whereas the experimental group received additional information before beginning task training. This additional training included a description of the employee’s primary role, how that role links to organizational goals, and how the link between employee role and organizational goals can provide task significance (see Appendix A for training handout slides). Because role information serves as a bridge between organizational goals and specific job tasks, both organizational goals and task types were mentioned in the
experimental training. However, detailed task information was not provided until after the experimental training.

A combination of observation of part-time teachers and consultation with supervising teachers led to the definition of the role using the mnemonic MōDS, which stood for Maintenance, Observation, Documentation, and Supervision. Each of these four role components was linked to the organization’s goals as well as to example tasks/daily duties. Experimental group participants were then given an exercise to help them practice the link between specific job tasks and role components (Appendix B). This additional training for the experimental group took approximately 30 minutes.

Prior to delivering the training to participants, supervising teachers of the experimental group took part in a train-the-trainer session with the researcher to learn to deliver the experimental content (Appendix C). Train-the trainer material introduced the concept of an employee’s role to teachers and provided examples of the different ways role information could benefit employees. The session attempted to show the teachers how role information could serve as a bridge between the organization’s goals and the tasks the employees were expected to perform. The training showed teachers how to clarify the role components (referred to as employee responsibilities) and use these role components to provide a framework for all the tasks the employees would be expected to perform. It also detailed how role components and daily tasks connected back to the organization’s goals. As the current study focuses on the benefits of including role information in a new employee orientation, the primary goal was to clearly communicate what the employee’s role is.

Immediately preceding task training, each participant completed a self-report survey to measure levels of training fulfillment, role ambiguity, and motivation to learn (Appendix D). Five weeks after the training, teachers evaluated the participant’s job performance (Appendix E). Also at five weeks, participants completed a second survey similar to the one issued following the training. The second survey assessed role clarity and motivation to learn. This time, however, the follow-up self-report survey was used for exploratory purposes only.
MEASURES

The following surveys were utilized at various points throughout the course of the study to assess participants levels on the variables of interest.

Pre-Training Self-Report Survey

Before the socialization training, participants were asked a number of demographic questions that could be used to control for trainee characteristics that may affect key study outcomes. This survey included questions about the participant’s age, major, tenure at the childcare center, number of units of childcare-related coursework, and previous experience working with young children (Appendix E).

Post-Training Self-Report Survey

A self-report survey was distributed to participants immediately following the socialization training. The survey consisted of 41 items, and the relevant measures are described below. Unless otherwise noted, participants responded using a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree.

An understanding about what an employee is expected to accomplish, how his/her performance will be evaluated, and what authority he/she has is called role clarity (Rizzo, House, & Lirtzman, 1970). Role clarity was measured using Rizzo et al.’s six item scale (e.g., “Clear, planned goals and objectives exist for my job”). Unlike Tannenbaum et al.’s (1991) study on training fulfillment, the current study was not able to assess participant’s specific pre-training expectations. Instead the current study makes use of four items designed to measure the participants opinion of the utility of the program (e.g., “The information provided at training has been relevant to what I will be doing on the job”) as well as the extent to which they feel the program has prepared them for their jobs (e.g., “I will be better able to perform my job now that I have received this training”). Items were adapted from Ostroff’s (1991) scale of employee training reactions. Building off Tannenbaum et al.’s (1991) finding that higher levels of training fulfillment lead to higher levels of motivation to learn, the motivation to learn scale uses five items to assess how the training influenced the participants desire to continue acquiring information relevant to their job. Sample items include “I am motivated to learn the training material” and “I want to learn how I can
perform my job more effectively.” These questions were adapted from Tharenou’s (2001) study on the relationship between training motivation and participation in training programs.

**Supervisor Ratings of Performance**

Center supervising teachers assessed participants’ *job performance* five weeks after the training. The study made use of the performance rating system designed by and currently being used by the center. Participants were rated on skills such as classroom management, teacher-child interactions, and curriculum and programming. Responses of participant’s performance were recorded using a four point Likert scale ranging from unsatisfactory to exceptional.

**ANALYSES**

To test the proposed hypotheses the current study employed a series of independent sample *t*-tests. All analyses were conducted using PASW 17.0. Participants’ responses to each item of the outcome measures were averaged to create a single score for that measure. The control and experimental groups were then compared based on their averaged scores for each measure: *role ambiguity, training fulfillment, motivation to learn*, as well as *performance*. 
CHAPTER 3

RESULTS

Table 2 provides means, standard deviations, zero-order correlations, and reliabilities for all study variables. Inspection of the correlation table indicates stability of repeated measures, as well as possible same-source bias observed by the high intercorrelations of measures at Time 1. A large correlation was observed between Role Clarity at Time 1 and Motivation to Learn at Time 2. More about this notable correlation will be mentioned in the Discussion section.

Table 2. Descriptive, Correlations and Reliabilities of Study Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Role Clarity 1</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Role Clarity 2</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.73**</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Training Fulfillment</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.70**</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Motivation to Learn 1(^a)</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.58**</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.46*</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Motivation to Learn 2</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.81**</td>
<td>.63*</td>
<td>.69*</td>
<td>.62*</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Performance</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: \(N = 21\); Scale reliabilities are listed along diagonal in bold.
\(^a\) \(N = 19\)

** \(p < .01\), * \(p < .05\) (two-tailed)

Perhaps due to the limited sample size, estimates for the original five-item motivation to learn scale at Time 1 were unreliable \((\alpha = .003)\). To explore this unexpected low reliability, closer examination of the scale and individual responses was undertaken. Results indicated that removal of item three, “I believe I can learn more from this training then others”, would improve the scale’s reliability, so it was excluded from all subsequent analyses. Still, reliability remained at an unacceptable level \((\alpha = .440)\). One item of the scale, item two, “I am not willing to exert extra effort to learn the training material” was reverse coded. It was possible that lack of attention to the question’s negative wording may have caused participants to misrespond. With such a small sample size, even a few outliers could greatly impact reliability. Examining the individual responses, it appeared this might
have been the case for three participants; that is, three participants responded strongly to both positively and negatively worded items. Removing these three participants believed to have provided errant responses for item two yielded a reliability of .771. While motivation to learn at Time 2 did not show similar reliability issues with the full scale, analyses were conducted based on the four-item scale for the sake of consistency. The three respondents who were dropped from the Time 1 motivation to learn scale did not provide survey responses at all for Time 2. All data provided at Time 2 was utilized.

To conduct the analyses, independent $t$-tests were employed. Table 3 provides the obtained inferential statistics and effect sizes of the study variables. While results showed no significant differences between control and experimental conditions, they did reveal findings of interest nonetheless. For Hypothesis 1, role clarity, a value of $t(16) = -1.13, p = .277$ was obtained. While not significant at the .05 level, these results did, however, yield a medium effect size, $r = .30$. Taking into account the small sample, but looking at the size of the effect, it is possible that there was a difference between the two groups, but due to lack the statistical power a significant difference could not be detected. In this way, although Hypothesis 1 was not supported using traditional levels of significance, the effect size hints that there could be an effect of the manipulation (Figure 1). Training fulfillment, Hypothesis 2, showed no significant difference or effects and received no support ($t(16) = -0.383, p = .707$). Similar to role clarity, results for motivation to learn at Time 1 also failed to reach traditional levels of significance, $t(16) = -1.741, p = .101$. The experimental group had a mean score of 4.87 compared to 4.60 for the experimental group (Figure 2). The difference between groups also yielded an effect size of .4. Interpretation of these results, however must take, into account the small sample size and the need to exclude some of the data provided for this measure. The discrepancy between motivation to learn scores at Time 1 ($t(16) = -1.741 p = .101$) and Time 2 ($t(10) = -.343 p = .739$) further suggests the effect of the experimental manipulation during the initial training. Were analyses able to be conducted with a more complete sample motivation to learn seems likely to yield significant results. In this way, Hypothesis 3 while not supported, might warrant further investigation with a larger sample. No support was found for Hypothesis 4, which examined overall performance ($t(15) = .579, p = .571$).
Table 3. Group Means, Inferential Statistics, and Effect Sizes of Study Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Control M</th>
<th>Experimental M</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>d</th>
<th>r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Role Clarity 1</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>-1.13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>-.56</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Clarity 2</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>-.77</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>-.49</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training Fulfillment</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>-.38</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation to Learn 1</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>4.87</td>
<td>-1.74</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.87</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation to Learn 2</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>-.34</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: N =18 for Time 1, N = 12 for Time 2

Figure 1. Group means for role clarity at Time 1.

Paired sample t-tests were also run to see if there was an overall difference in scores for role clarity or motivation to learn between Time 1 and Time 2. Analyses yielded no significant findings between the two times.

To investigate the possible impact of control variables on the variables of interest, a series of General Linear Model analyses were conducted. Total hours worked, participant’s major (Child and Family Development [CFD] vs. all others), number of CFD course work units completed at the time of the training were regressed on role clarity (both times),
training fulfillment, motivation to learn (both times), and overall performance. Only hours worked predicted significant variance in overall performance after five weeks $F(1) = 9.78, p < .01$. The variance explained by hours worked in performance is not surprising as it follows that employees who worked more might be more likely to have learned and practiced the skills required for better performance. No other significant results were found for any other variables of interest suggesting that control variable had no impact on outcomes.
CHAPTER 4

DISCUSSION

The current study was one of the few attempts to use new employee orientation as a tool to facilitate socialization (Klein & Weaver, 2000). It adds to the literature by using theory-based content to investigate a non-skill based orientation. It also seeks to identify more appropriate socialization training outcomes (Saks & Ashforth, 1997). While the results were somewhat unclear, the study did yield findings of interest.

First, a medium effect size between group’s levels of role clarity suggests that providing direct role information may have indeed allowed employees to have a greater understanding of their role. As predicted, employees who were explicitly told their role did seem to have higher levels of role clarity. While results of the $t$-test did not reach traditional levels of significance, the magnitude of the effect nonetheless suggests there may be a benefit of the intervention. Further studies may wish to make use of a larger sample to better investigate the effect of directly providing such information.

More promisingly, participants in the experimental group showed marginally significant levels of motivation to learn after being provided with direct role information. While constraints in the sample may again have clouded the validity of the finding, it nonetheless at least suggests the possible benefit of role information in a new employee orientation. Wanous (1992) has expressed the need to separate orientation from the greater socialization process, and one of this study’s proposed proximal outcomes was improved socialization. The difference in motivation to learn between the two groups suggests that an orientation that provides employees with socialization relevant content may in fact do just that. Employees who were provided role information showed indications of being more motivated to learn additional socialization relevant material in upcoming training sessions.

Tannenbaum et al. (1991) found that training fulfillment was related to continued training motivation. Providing role information was predicted to increase training fulfillment, and participants who showed increased training fulfillment were predicted to show increased motivation to learn. Despite receiving more socialization-relevant content,
the experimental condition showed no difference in training fulfillment. It is possible that providing role information did not increase participant’s opinions of the training’s utility, but instead may have had the effect of presenting the job as more involved than participants had originally thought. The role information may have introduced possible job skills or abilities participants had not been aware were needed. As such they might have left the training feeling there was still a great deal to be learned in subsequent training sessions to be able to meet all the job responsibilities. Such a possibility would be supported by the findings of Quinones (1995) who found the way in which training was framed, advanced vs. remedial, in a pre-training context influenced training motivation. New employees who may have originally believed the training to be remedial, could have, upon receiving role information, suddenly have found the tasks involved to be more advanced that previously believed.

Employee engagement may offer an explanation for the high correlation between Role Clarity at Time 1 and Motivation to Learn at Time 2. Such a correlation might suggest that employees with a greater understanding of the position might be more engaged, which then in turn might lead to an increase in Motivation To Learn. In the present study, this might suggest that those participants who understood the position to be more than simply babysitting were more motivated to learn about child development. Future research can examine the role of employee engagement as an outcome of socialization.

No support was found for the hypotheses that directly providing role information helped employees reach higher levels of performance at five weeks. Analysis revealed instead that performance ratings were best predicted by the number of hours worked at the time of the ratings. This finding was not surprising, as those who worked more would have had a chance to learn to perform the job better. However, these results offered no support for the use of socialization training as a tool to improve performance.

Like all studies, the current study had limitations. Two limitations in particular may have most significantly impacted the results: sample size and the execution of the intervention itself. First, the study was conducted with a severely limited sample size. I expected to enroll larger numbers of participants in each group, but because of organizational realities beyond our control, only a small number of participants were included in each group. Despite the low number of participants, the researcher was unable to increase the
sample size. Organizational constraints allowed only one opportunity to conduct the experimental training. As such it was not possible to supplement the groups with additional employees who were hired throughout the course of the year. The different job tasks for different positions in the center also limited the sample size. To be sure both control and experimental groups performed equivalent tasks and held equivalent responsibilities only employees working with children of a certain age range could be included in the study. New employees assigned to infant care, which contained an entirely different set of tasks and responsibilities were thus excluded from the study. This decision omitted approximately a quarter of the center’s new employees. Because the study was conducted with such a limited sample, any effect the intervention may have had would have been very difficult to detect. To obtain a significant difference using such a small sample would require an intervention with tremendous power.

Given the nature of the manipulation, a one-time training supplement designed to last approximately 30 minutes, it is quite conceivable that the intervention simply did not possess the necessary strength. While observed effect sizes were large enough to suggest some impact of the manipulation, the manipulation still might not have been strong enough to show a statistical difference. Any effect the manipulation might have had may simply have been lost due to compromised power. In the future it would worthwhile to attempt the study again with an organization better able to provide the sample size needed to investigate possible effects of a socialization intervention.

A related limitation that hampered the study was the implementation of the intervention itself. In an attempt to create employee buy-in, researchers made the decision to use center instructors to deliver the training. Prior to the training, researchers provided instructors with a “train the trainer” session detailing both the goals of the training and how to conduct the experimental manipulation. The training’s purpose was to help employees understand their role within the organization and how they, in that role, help the organization achieve its goals. The training was designed to explicitly state the employee’s role and detail primary role components (responsibilities) that supported that role. Both of these were then to be connected to greater organizational goals. For example, to fulfill their role to assist in children’s development, teachers had responsibilities of observing and supervising children, as well as maintaining the classroom environment and documenting children’s actions and
activities. A job task that could be classified as a maintenance responsibility, such as setting a table for snack time, was to be connected back to the greater employee role, by showing the teachers how such an action would provide an opportunity for the children to practice communication and sharing as well as work on their coordination and motor skills. At the conclusion of the session instructors assured the researchers that they felt comfortable with the content and goals of the manipulation and were capable of administering it effectively.

During the actual employee training, however, instructors focused on job tasks and how those tasks connected to role components, without strongly linking those job tasks to the role and the organizational goals. Other important information such as what the employee’s specific role was, how role components support that role, and how the role connected to organizational goals were only mentioned briefly in the training. For example, supervisors discussed how job tasks such as changing diapers and washing dishes after snack time would fall under the maintenance category of responsibilities, without explaining how such tasks could aid in child development. Although role components are a type of role information and relevant to effective socialization, they were only a portion of the intervention. In this way it is possible that the intervention did not create a strong enough manipulation to differentiate the two conditions. Without clearly receiving the role information intended, any differences found between the two groups would then most likely be due only to chance. Given the organizations use of annual trainings only and the project’s time constraints, it was not possible for the researcher to repeat the intervention with a new pool of participants to ensure the material was properly delivered. It goes without saying that in the future it would be beneficial to ensure the experimental group receives the full strength of the treatment. Unfortunately, the failed implementation of the study severely limits its findings, both significant and non-significant.

Additional limitations of the study might also have come from the organization selected. While there is great responsibility involved in child-care, it is primarily a low complexity job: job tasks are relatively simple. Most responsibilities requiring specialized childcare skills were designated to trained, full-time supervisors. As such, roles may be less complex, and employees may require less information to become successfully socialized. In this way, providing direct role information for a job where employees are easily and quickly able to acquire the necessary information on their own may not provide an advantage. This
diminished need for role information might explain the lack of difference in role clarity between conditions. The low complexity nature of the job simply may not have required any additional explanation beyond what the employees already believed it to be.

The nature of the job might have also limited the effect that role information may have had on performance as well. The hypotheses that employees who receive direct role information would reach higher levels of performance sooner was based on the belief that in order to perform most effectively an employee needed clear understanding of their specific role. If role clarity was not a concern, then performance would not be related to role clarity. Employees who received role information would have no greater understanding of how to better perform the job than those who did not. It is interesting to note, however, that while the low complexity nature of the job may have hampered the study’s ability to detect differences in role clarity and performance, it is possible that this same low complexity helped account for the one marginally significant finding. While the role itself may have been particularly simple, the additional information provided in the training may have alerted participants that the job contained more tasks than they originally believed. While the manipulation did not alter their belief in what their role was, it may have altered their belief about what went into fulfilling that role. Similar effects might not have been found for jobs of higher complexity, where employees may be more aware of the complex nature of their job.

In this way, role information may have a unique effect for low complexity jobs. Organizations may then be able to use role information to increase employee’s motivation to train for jobs they originally may have wrongly believed to be overly simplistic. Future investigations may want to look at jobs of different complexities for differing effects.

Lastly the type of participants may have limited the study. The childcare center used part-time, employees who are primarily students. As students, their positions at the center were not their primary focus, and for many this position was not even connected to their programs of study. It is possible that participants simply may not have cared enough about their positions to make the investment necessary to learn all aspects of the job or how to perform at higher levels. While measures of organizational commitment are unlikely to be informative for a new employee orientation, some measure of pre employment motivation might have been beneficial.
While the current study by no means answers the question of how to best facilitate new employee orientation, it does provide some insight into the types of content that may be beneficial to employees. Despite the lack of significant differences between conditions, the effect sizes observed do seem to suggest that further exploration into the inclusion of role information in a new employee orientation may be warranted. Employees who received role information did seem to be trending toward higher levels of role clarity and training motivation. Results, however, are at best only exploratory. Future studies that utilize a larger sample and more adequately control the implementation of the manipulation may be able to strengthen the internal validity of their findings and provide more conclusive evidence. As socialization is an area that touches all organizations, continuing examination of methods to best facilitate the process seems to be a most worthwhile endeavor.
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APPENDIX A

TRAINING CONTENT
To be the best teacher you can be... Learn The MŌDS!

What Are MŌDS?

- MŌDS are what is expected of you as teachers
- MŌDS are your job responsibilities
- MŌDS help you fulfill your role at the center
  - To assist in the children’s development through the use of Emergent Curriculum

What Are the MŌDS?

- Maintenance
  - All duties outside direct childcare
- Observation
  - Directed at recognizing children’s development
- Documentation
  - Recording all information of activities and health
- Supervision
  - All duties that involve direct childcare
MÖDS are ways to...

Help you organize your job tasks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maintenance</th>
<th>Observation</th>
<th>Documentation</th>
<th>Supervise</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Set up Breakfast</td>
<td>Notice what children are</td>
<td>Photograph</td>
<td>Maintain proper teacher/child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>interested in learning</td>
<td>activities</td>
<td>ratio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare mats for</td>
<td>Notice any cuts, bumps</td>
<td>Take meeting</td>
<td>Encourage children to use their</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nap time</td>
<td>or bruises</td>
<td>notes</td>
<td>words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clean up table from</td>
<td>Notice how children are</td>
<td>Fill out</td>
<td>Be sure children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>activity time</td>
<td>interacting with others</td>
<td>Accident</td>
<td>wash their hands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>reports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MÖDS are ways to ...

See how every task helps the children

• Setting up a meal

Provides an opportunity to practice group behaviors and coordination skills

MÖDS are ways to...

Help you help the children grow

1. Center enables and fosters child's development
2. Set up activity table
3. Include child's patience in daily report
4. Remind child to wait their turn
5. Notice how child's patience has grown
MŌDS are ways to...
Help improve your teaching skills

- Documentation
- Observation
- Supervision
- Maintenance
APPENDIX B

TRAINING ACTIVITY
For this exercise, participants were given sets of different colored circle stickers, with each color corresponding to each of the role components (MŌDS). They were instructed to use the stickers provided to categorize each of these tasks according to the appropriate corresponding role component.
APPENDIX C

TRAIN THE TRAINER CONTENT – SLIDES AND NARRATIVE EXPLANATION
Socialization Information

Role Information
“What”

Organizational Information

Task Information
“How”

Role, Responsibility, & Tasks

• Position
  — Doctor
• Role
  — Provide care to patients
• Responsibilities
  — Perform examinations
  — Administer tests
  — Prescribe treatment
  — Perform procedures
• Different tasks for different doctors

Organizational Orientation Objectives

• Understand center’s philosophy
• Know responsibility to the center
• Focus on the children
Role and Responsibilities for Assistant Teachers

• Role
  – Assist in the development of the center’s students through the use of emergent curriculum

• Responsibilities
  • Maintenance
  • Observation
  • Documentation
  • Supervision

MŌDS Goals

• Organize Job Tasks
  – Help employee’s remember them

• Tie tasks to employee role
  – Increase motivation for tasks
  – Reinforces organizational goals

• Introduces method to expert performance
  – Explicitly states the 4 responsibilities employees have
Studies on new employees have shown that traditionally in looking at job relevant information, two categories tend to take the most time to master: the **How** and the **What**

The **How** concerns the actual execution of the job?
- How do I do this?
- What is the next step?
- How do I use this?

These are some questions an employee might have concerning the **How** of their job. These questions are often thought of as referring to the **Tasks** of the job.

The **What** deals with the expectations of the job.
- What am I responsible for?
- What are the limits of my authority?
- What are my top priorities?

These are some questions an employee might have concerning the **What** of their job. These questions are often thought of as referring to as the **Role** of the job. Often people will consider an employee’s **Role** as being made up of the **tasks** they perform

In looking further at an employee’s **role**, often the overall **role** of a job can be made up of smaller responsibilities:
- Position:
  - Doctor
- Role:
  - Provide patient care:
- Responsibilities:
  - Perform examinations
  - Administer tests
  - Prescribe treatment
  - Perform procedures

Within these responsibilities, the **tasks** each person uses might be different, but they still fit within the same responsibility, and are used to help fulfill the overall role. For example, the types of tests, treatment, and procedures will be different depending on the type of doctor (orthopedic surgeon vs. dermatologist) but each will ultimately be serving the role of providing patient care

With this all this in mind, we want to try to help new employees absorb all the information of training. We will do this by first by helping them to better understand their role and responsibilities within the Development center, and in doing so provide them a way to help organize the task information.
Identified Organizational Orientation Objectives:

- To understand emergent curriculum
- Understand responsibility to the center
- Know to focus on the children

**What do we want to do?**

We want to be sure that all employees know what is expected of them. Not only the tasks that they will have to carry out, but also what is their role in the organization. In this case, we want them to know that they serve as an integral part in the center’s goals. That they are important and influential in each child’s development process

**How do we want to do this?**

First by helping clarify their responsibilities. By providing a simple basic framework that they can use to understand and clarify all the information they will be learning. Second by letting them know that everything expected of them is going to the greater purpose of helping the children. Setting up breakfast might seem a simple boring task, but it is really providing the children with an opportunity to practice their coordination and independence. Someone needs to be responsible for providing that opportunity for the children. Supervising the children so they don’t hit each other not only keeps them safe, but also can be an opportunity for children to learn to use their words and better express themselves. It is these deeper connections we want to point out to the staff.

**So what do want them to know is expected of them?**

We want them to know that they are responsible for assisting in the development of the center’s students through the use of emergent curriculum. We want them to know that all the classroom responsibilities they have all support this idea. We want them to know that in the simplest form, this is achieved through four categories of responsibilities

**What are those categories?**

Supervision, observation, documentation and classroom maintenance.
Supervision would include all duties that involve direct childcare - watching during playtime, assisting during meetings, assisting during learning activities, bathroom duty etc. Observation differs from supervision in it is directed at specifically assessing the children’s development. Documentation would be recording all necessary information - progress reports, accident or injury reports, daily activities, and photographs. Lastly Classroom Maintenance includes all duties outside of direct childcare. This would mainly include any setup or cleanup responsibilities.

**How do those responsibilities assist the children’s development?**

In lots of ways. As mentioned before, if no one sets up breakfast, the children lose an opportunity to grow their coordination and practice their independence. If assistant teacher aren’t observant, they won’t be able to help master teachers plan lessons the children are interested in. If someone isn’t there to intervene in an argument over a toy, a child misses an opportunity to learn to share or to express their frustration in a way besides crying and hitting. These might seem to the employees as unconnected tasks, but we want to be sure they realize that even the littlest job they have is part of how they personally aid in the child’s
development. As supervising and master teachers you understand better than anyone where and when these opportunities present themselves. Please use your expertise to highlight and illustrate any and all development opportunities new teachers might not otherwise recognize.

**Don’t different age groups have different responsibilities?**

Much like the example of the doctor, teachers in each age group will use different tasks to carry out their responsibilities, and some age groups might devoted more time to one responsibility over another, but all teachers in all groups still have the same responsibilities. For example, supervision for toddlers will be different than supervision in pre-school, but it is still supervision and can be used to assist the children’s development.

**Is there anything else we want to tell the new teachers?**

To help the new employees understand how everything they do plays a role in the children’s growth, it might be useful to help explain how each smaller task fits into one of the four categories. Helping the employees organize the tasks within the four responsibilities might help them lean more quickly and better understand how the individual tasks supports their over all role. For example, as you instruct the teachers how to perform certain job functions, it might be helpful to also point out where that task fits, such as, “here is where you slip into your observation mode”, or “this falls into the category of documentation responsibilities”. Also once teachers understand what the responsibilities are and how they apply to their job expectations, it might also be helpful to let the teachers know that as they become more comfortable with their job they will not only be moving quickly between the responsibilities, but sometimes be performing more than one at a time. For example, while they clean up breakfast (maintenance) they also need to be aware they maintain the proper student teacher ratio (supervision). Let them know that the best teachers are those that know and can quickly and easily perform all their job responsibilities.
APPENDIX D

SURVEY ITEMS
Role Clarity

1. I know exactly what is expected of me
2. I know how to divide my time properly
3. Explanations are clear of what has to be done
4. I feel certain about how much authority I have
5. I know what my responsibilities
6. Clear, planned goals and objectives exist for my job

Training Fulfillment

1. The information provided at training has been relevant to what I will be doing on the job
2. My training thus far has been similar to what I expected
3. I will be better able to perform my job now that I have received this part of the training
4. Overall, I am satisfied with the training I have received at this point

Motivation to Learn

1. I am motivated to learn the training material
2. I am not willing to exert extra effort to learn the training materials
3. I believe I an learn more from this training than others
4. I want to learn how I can perform my job more effectively
5. I am willing to put in effort to learn to perform my job more effectively
APPENDIX E

PERFORMANCE EVALUATION
Performance Evaluation: Review and Planning

The Master Teacher can assist in the professional development of the staff through observation, conferencing, and goal setting.

1. PROFESSIONALISM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exceptional</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Comments:

2. ENVIRONMENT
Ensures a clean and healthy environment. Aware of licensing requirements. Promotes safety indoors/outdoors. Creates/promotes child-oriented atmosphere. Plans/implements/promotes well defined interest/discovery areas. Provides/maintains attractive and stimulating play areas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exceptional</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Comments:

3. CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT
Maintains routines and procedures which help children function positively in a group situation. Cooperates with other teachers. Provides/maintains a balance of activities which meet the needs of individuals as well as the group. Challenges children to be responsible and respectful. Provides positive feedback to reinforce children for appropriate behavior. Positively redirects children experiencing difficulties. Has awareness of the total environment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exceptional</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Comments:

4. CURRICULUM/PROGRAM
Supports a program designed to foster growth in: physical, cognitive, creative, language, social, emotional, and personal development. Prepares/supports/facilitates curriculum that is developmentally appropriate. Takes into account individual and group needs. When assigned, lesson plans and materials for presentation completed on time. Supports and facilitates lesson plans of other teachers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exceptional</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Comments:

5. PARENT/FAMILY RELATIONS
Teacher approaches parents/families regularly in a friendly and respectful manner. Verbal communications are open and supportive. When required, written communications are neat and literate. Encourages the parent’s/family’s interests and participation in the classroom and classroom/center events.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exceptional</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Comments:
6. TEACHER/CHILD INTERACTIONS
Builds trust and rapport with children. Fosters their development of a positive self-concept. Encourages independence. Respectful of the child. Considers the needs of the individual child. Models appropriate behaviors and attitudes. Communicates in an honest and open manner. Provides guidance based on reasonable expectations that follow the center philosophy. Consistent implementation of positive guidance techniques, including positive redirection and positive reinforcement of appropriate behavior.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exceptional</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. COMMITMENT TO CENTER
Establishes positive relationships with the teachers. Works cooperatively with teachers and Master Teachers. Active participant in planning/implementing/facilitating classroom and center functions. Promotes/supports the goals of the center. Endorses the center’s philosophy. Participates beyond individual classroom responsibilities. Follow through: acts promptly on agreed upon changes and/or adjustments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exceptional</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OVERALL APPRAISAL OF PERFORMANCE

**Exceptional** Performance is clearly outstanding in all current responsibilities; consistently meets or exceeds highest job standards.

**Very Good** Performance is clearly above normal job standards; consistently one of the better performers.

**Good** Performance overall meets current requirements for this position. This is the performance typically expected of the majority of employees.

**Fair** Performance approaches requirements for this position; improvement is necessary. May demonstrate ability but shows need for further development.

**Unsatisfactory** Performance clearly does not meet position requirements. Immediate improvement is necessary to avoid termination.

I. PERSONAL DEVELOPMENT
The employees’ skills, experience, and development activities have been considered when completing this section. The Master Teacher’s positive judgments and employee’s thoughts and aspirations are reflected in the following responses.

STRENGTHS

DEVELOPMENT NEEDS FOR PERFORMANCE IMPROVEMENT

ACTION PLANS FOR PERFORMANCE IMPROVEMENT

II. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT, REVIEW, AND APPROVALS
This review should be acknowledged by the employee and signed and approved by the reviewing Master Teacher.

I acknowledge having read and discussed this performance review.

Employee_________________________________________Date_____________
MasterTeacher_____________________________________Date_____________