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ABSTRACT

This study seeks to understand the relationships among managers’ perceptions of the value of training, extent of involvement in corporate university programs, level of organizational commitment, and the accountability of a corporate university program. Program accountability in human resource development (HRD) refers to perceptions among stakeholders about the extent to which an HRD program achieved its stated goals, addressed performance issues of importance in the organization, and made a demonstrable impact to improve the outcomes of the organization. Research has shown that corporate universities require substantial investments in both financial and human resources. Whether organizations are realizing value in return, especially from the perspective of a particular group of stakeholders, business managers, remains uncertain. As a group, managers have the opportunity to participate in programs offered through their corporate universities as well as to decide whether to send their employees to these programs. In addition, managers often serve on advisory committees that help set policy for their corporate university. Hence, it is expected that most managers have had frequent contact with and involvement in their corporate university.

Growing literature has focused on the results of individual HRD programs, such as the return on investment of particular management training programs offered through traditional training departments. However, the literature provides less information when considering the impact of the programs offered through corporate universities, which are strategically different from training departments. This understanding could seemingly be based more on the overall views of stakeholders. Business managers with these views may be affected by their perceptions of the value of training, their extent of involvement in corporate university programs, and their level of organizational commitment.
To explore such relationships, this study was conducted using mixed-methods research methodology, composed of a written survey and individual interviews. The survey was sent to 204 managers in a Chinese public institution that had an established corporate university. The 204 managers were selected according to predetermined criteria from among 205 managers that attended a management competency training program offered by the corporate university in 2015 and 2016. Individual interviews were conducted with seven volunteered managers among 87 who completed the survey effectively. The data were analyzed with the statistical software packages SPSS and qualitative analysis software Nvivo.

Primarily, the quantitative results of this study address the research questions involving the four identified variables and their interrelationships. First: a) the managers’ perceptions about the value of training were largely positive, b) the managers were involved to a limit-to-moderate extent in the training college programs, c) the accountability of the management competency training program was deemed high, and d) the managers committed to their organization to a moderate-to-high extent. Second, the managers’ perceptions about the value of training and the extent of their involvement in the training college programs, as well as the interaction of the two, explained the accountability of the management competency training program. Third, the managers’ level of organizational commitment did not have a moderating or mediating role in the relationship between the value variable and the involvement variable and the program accountability. Fourth, the relationship between the level of organizational commitment of the managers and the program accountability was fully mediated by the extent of the managers’ involvement in the corporate university programs.

Complementarily, the qualitative results of the study provided support for understanding the above survey findings. For instance, the interviews revealed that most of the managers
identified some relationship between their own perceptions of the value of training and how they viewed the accountability of the focused program. Essential quotes from the interviewees coded in themes are included in the results chapters. The interview results provided richer information to mostly support the survey findings.

Three main interpretations conclude this study. First of all, the accountability of the management competency training program was high from the managers’ viewpoints. Second, when the managers’ extent of involvement in their training college programs was low, their more positive perceptions about the value of training would lead to higher rated accountability of the program; conversely, when their extent of involvement in their training college programs was limited or higher-than-limited, their more positive perceptions led to lower rated accountability. Lastly, the managers’ level of organizational commitment predicted their perceptions about the value of training.

In the end, the study provides implications to HRD theory, research, and practice. Each aspect is discussed. Three limitations of the study are also recognized.

*Keywords*: HRD program accountability, corporate university, manager, value of training, China
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CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Many organizations have come to recognize the importance of human resource development (HRD) programs to enhance the competencies and productivity of their employees (Jain & Gulati, 2016). In fact, for many organizations, HRD programs are viewed as being strategic contributors to the business strategy (Kalata, 1999). HRD programs can be classified in three major categories: employee development, organization development, and career development. In general, the purpose of these various programs is to improve the performance of the organization (Swanson & Arnold, 1996).

An emerging context for HRD programs in many is that of a corporate university. From their explosion in the 1980s, it has been suggested that by 1997 there were over 1,000 entities that could be considered as a corporate university (Moore, 1997). The Boston Consulting Group (BCG) found through a survey that there were around 2,000 formal corporate universities in America in 2007 (Company campus, 2015). BCG also reckoned that more than 4,000 companies all over that world have corporate universities by 2015 (Company campus, 2015).

How to define a corporate university, different from simply a functional area in an organization that offers HRD programs to employees, has been problematic (Blass, 2001). Allen (2002) defined a corporate university as “an educational entity that is a strategic tool designed to assist its parent organization in achieving its mission by conducting activities that cultivate individual and organizational learning, knowledge, and wisdom” (p. 9). Allen (2007) purported that the second generation of corporate universities use innovative approaches to develop people and expand organizational capabilities. Several other authors have offered more specific criteria
for identifying a corporate university, such as that it includes learning efforts that exceed the scope of a traditional training department (Li & Alagaraja, 2007, p. 1).

Representing a unique form of HRD delivery (Bober & Bartlett, 2004), corporate universities have been implemented in many large organizations on a global basis. By their nature, corporate universities require the investment of substantial amounts of human and financial resources (Guerci, Bartezzaghi, & Solari, 2010). In fact, it is common for an organization, such as Defense Acquisition and Caterpillar, to involve hundreds of employees (Guerci, Bartezzaghi, & Solari, 2010, p. 189) as managers, designers, trainers, and support staff as part of its corporate university. Even a smaller company of 450 employees, the Enclos, has two corporate university staff (Steffens & Novotne, 2007). Many big corporate universities have their own separate campuses and facilities. Behind the large amount of physical facility and human resource investment is enormous fiscal expenses. According to a 1998 survey, the average budget for a corporate university is $12.8 million a year (Meister, 2000). The average corporate university budget represented 2.2 percent of the payroll of an organization (Meister, 1998).

With substantial investment, corporate universities are designed to serve multiple parties of stakeholders. All HRD-related employees are called HRD stakeholders within an organization (Wognum & Lam, 2000). Overall, stakeholders of a corporate university encompass the audience of the entire value chain including “internal employees, suppliers, and customers” (Meister, 2000, p. 184). Internal stakeholders include senior management of the company and internal customers (Meister, 2000; Guerci, Bartezzaghi, & Solari, 2010). External stakeholders include industry/employers, external learners, suppliers, and central government (Blass, 2001). Stakeholders constitute one among ten building blocks in designing a corporate university.
As corporate universities evolve over time, their original audience are often shifted and their stakeholders are re-evaluated (Meister, 1998). Stakeholders care about HRD activities such as training and development. Stakeholders including training customers view training from both a long and a midterm perspective. Typically, they evaluate not only long-term performances (such as the impact on business results and professional development) but also midterm performances (such as impact on performance and impact on behaviour) (Guerci, Bartezzaghi, & Solari, 2010, p. 304).

On one hand, the core focus of a corporate university is its value and connection to business (Abel, 2011). On the other hand, stakeholders hold corporate universities accountable for their impact. Corporate universities, as well as other organizational function that provides learning, are demanded impact from learning by top management (Meister, Andrews, & Kraack, 2005). The term that depicts the extent to which an actor is accountable to its stakeholders, is accountability.

In HRD practice, it is typically the professional actions or results of activities that are held accountable by stakeholders. As such, it is the professional domain, other than the others such as personal, managerial, or political domains, of accountability that is emphasized. With the professional emphasis, HRD accountability refers to the perceptions among stakeholders about how well an HRD practitioner, program, or entity achieved his/her/its stated goals, addressed performance issues of importance in the organization, and made a demonstrable impact to improve the outcomes of the organization.

HRD accountability in the context of a corporate university can be examined at the entity level, program level, or individual professional level. The accountability of a corporate university can be deconstructed to the accountability of each of its various programs, besides that
of other functional components of the corporate university. HRD program accountability refers to the perceptions among stakeholders about how well a program achieved its stated goals, addressed performance issues of importance in the organization, and made a demonstrable impact to improve the outcomes of the organization.

**Problem Statement**

Many organizations have established corporate universities as a means to meet various workplace learning needs of their employees. Corporate universities often represent a substantial investment for organizations to support the delivery of a diverse array of HRD programs for a range of employees. The term university distinguishes the effort as having a distinct strategic role in the organization. That is, providing space for employees to acquire new information that will help the organization respond to on-going challenges in the global economy. Corporate universities must be accountable to their stakeholders, in order to be commensurate with the substantial investment in them. Accountability of corporate university programs is important for both stakeholders and the corporate university per se.

While many organizations have established corporate universities and have invested substantial amounts of resources to support the mission, few research studies have determined the professional impacts of these entities in their organizations, especially from the perspective of business managers who represent a critical stakeholder group of corporate universities. It has been unclear whether or not corporate university programs are effective to managers, which is essentially what managers hold the programs accountable for.

Business managers interact with their corporate universities about HRD activities. Over half of the corporate universities surveyed by Corporate University Xchange, a consulting firm, received direct funding from business units (Meister, 1998). Business unit leaders are constantly
partnered with corporate universities for providing information about HRD needs assessment and program evaluation (Abel, 2011). Managers, as a group, have the opportunity to take part in the programs offered through their corporate universities (Morin & Renaud, 2004; Gerbman, 2000). They also determine whether or not to send their subordinates to the programs (Lewis, 2002, p. 126; AptarGroup, 2015, 3rd paragraph). Additionally, managers often serve on advisory committees, be it Dean’s Council (Werder & Guldamlasi, 2016), advisory boards (Barley, 2002, p. 52), or a governance structure like a board of directors (Meister, 1998), that help formulate direction for the corporate universities. Thus, it is expected that many managers have had contact with and involvement in their respective corporate universities.

Admittedly, corporate universities have sought ways to demonstrate accountability of their programs to managers. Some corporate universities’ role was experimented as a respect of the role of senior directors or executives, to state to all managers about the significance of HRD activities (Paton, Peters, Storey, & Taylor, 2005). Some corporate universities approach managers more directly for the same purpose. One example is ST University, the corporate university of STMicroelectronics, a global semiconductor company headquartered in Switzerland (STMicroelectronics, 2017). ST University’s virtual ST Learning Campus included data and suggestions to help managers (Nataf & Vigne, 2005). Apart from these approaches, probably the most-commonly-used one is to utilize training program evaluation results, in response to the concerns and demands from upper management (Bober & Bartlett, 2004). In ST University, “Each course has to be measured in terms of people satisfaction, efficiency, and the impact on business or attitudes” (Nataf & Vigne, 2005, p. 90). Where training is being evaluated with the Kirkpatrick model of participant reaction, learning, behavior, and result levels, trainers are very concerned about level three as it is key to satisfying line managers (Paton, 2005). As training
effectiveness has traditionally come low on the list, for organizations were more concerned about making sure training was provided, nowadays some organizations are quite persistent in having return-on-investment for training (Williams, 2005).

Indeed, some evaluation results are positive about the effectiveness of corporate university programs. Empirical analysis of the data from a Canadian financial institution indicated that participation in corporate university training lead to “a relatively small effect on individual job performance” (Morin & Renaud, 2009, p. 295). In the case of BT in the UK, a leading communication services company in the world (BT, n.d.), training successfully targeted on decision-making improvement of managers, making training convincing (Paton, 2005). In addition, there is proof that high-performance learning organizations yielded better revenue and profit growth, in comparison with their competitors and industry peers (Meister, Andrews, & Kraack, 2005).

Exhibited accountability of corporate university programs is not yet satisfying to all. Newell (2013) found that investment in learning and development/training through a corporate university did not improve the net profit and gross revenue for its parent company in the Dow. Training evaluation in the context of corporate universities is more than normally challenging, partly because stakeholders with very differing perspectives and backgrounds meet in corporate university activities (Paton, 2005). A study found out that, merely 17% of the surveyed executives were “very satisfied” with the performance of their training units, while they were less satisfied with the ability of their learning organizations “to communicate the value of learning” (Meister, Andrews, & Kraack, 2005, p. 271).

While corporate universities have been witnessed as relatively declining in the United States (Alagaraja & Li, 2014), they are still important HRD forms in many countries, especially
emerging economies including China. Global Council of Corporate University has members who are corporate university professionals representing six continents; corporate universities in Brazil, Russia, India, and China (BRIC) are all represented (GlobalCCU, 2014). Interests of Russia and Brazil in corporate universities increased (Alagarajia & Li, 2014, p. 1). ArcelorMittal, a steel manufacturing company which has six corporate university campuses, would open three more, two of which in Brazil and Kazakhstan (Company campus, 2015). Two of the existed corporate university campuses of ArcelorMittal were in Ukraine and South Africa, which help the company train local managers in local languages (Company campus, 2015).

Corporate universities grow prosperously in China. Nearly six hundreds of corporate universities participated in “the ranking of the best corporate universities in China” held by Shanghai Jiaotong University for the past six years (The 2016 ranking, 2016). One Chinese corporate university among them, China Merchants Bank University, has won the China “Performance improvement best practice” award for five times since 2013 when the award election was first launched (China Merchants Bank University, 2017, November 3). Corporate universities continue to emerge in China. Dongfeng Nissan Passenger Vehicle Company announced in 2014 the building of their corporate university, investment in which was proof of their commitment to and expectations for their vehicle brand (China Dongfeng, 2014). As relatively little is known about the accountability of HRD programs in corporate universities in China, it is revealed that evaluation and accountability of the programs is inadequate. Corporate universities in China, as with those in Germany, target more primarily on the limited group of management-level employees (Andresen & Lichtenberger, 2007). Similar to their counterparts in the West, corporate universities in China employ various kinds of tools and technologies to track and evaluate their training programs. For instance, the corporate university
of Mitsubishi Electric Automation (China) implemented a talent-management system to “manage, deploy, and track annual training programs and performance evaluations” (Mitsubishi Electric Automation, 2012, p. 1). Qiao (2009) indicated, through interviewing the heads of eleven corporate universities in China, that training evaluation mechanism was lacked among those corporate universities. Though the eleven corporate universities mostly utilized Kirkpatrick’s four-level evaluation framework to measure learning effectiveness, almost all training were evaluated at level one, only technical training programs received level two evaluation. Many of the corporate universities collected routine data, such as employee satisfaction and student days per year, for measuring the impact of corporate universities, whereas widely-recognized holistic measurements were lacked. Furthermore, rarely any research has reported business managers’ reaction to the evaluation results of programs offered through corporate universities in China. Limited research has been between business managers and corporate universities in China, but more scholarly viewpoints can be found on the status of Chinese manager training and voices of managers regarding training programs. Tomas Keller, the past provost of Duke University, said, “There is a true demand to conduct training on operation and management in China” (Zhang, 1996, p. 48). Liu (2000) pointed out four shortcomings of modern manager training in China: 1) the training was not comprehensive, 2) the training ignored the art of management, 3) the training was very general and outdated, and 4) it provided a “fast installation” (p. 41). Sun (2016) reported results of a survey at the reaction level about training effect with corporate project managers and found out that about 32% of the managers felt dissatisfied or just so-so with the job management knowledge training. Chen (2000) stated that the effect of training with project managers in construction enterprises in China was unsatisfactory, due to the root cause of not having clear goals of manager development.
If addressing concerns of different stakeholders, particularly managers, is important for demonstrating the value of corporate universities (Qiao, 2009), and if managers are unsure about the impact of corporate university programs in China, more research is necessary to investigate the accountability of corporate university programs to the managers. Results of the present research will have implication for corporate universities as well as business managers in China about the quality of corporate university practice.

**Research Purpose and Questions**

The purpose of this study is to examine the relationships among the perceptions about the value of training, extent of involvement in corporate university programs, level of organizational commitment, and accountability of a corporate university program as viewed by managers in China. The present research will generate validated instruments on manager’s involvement in corporate university programs and manager-perceived accountability of a corporate university program. The general research question is: What is the relationship between manager-perceived value of training, manager’s involvement in corporate university programs, and manager’s commitment to the organization, and the accountability of a corporate university program? The study seeks to address the following supporting research questions:

1. What are the perceptions of managers about the value of training?
2. To what extent are managers involved in their corporate university programs?
3. How much is the accountability of a program provided through the managers’ corporate university?
4. In what level do the managers commit to their organization?
5. What is the relationship between managers’ perceptions about the value of training and the extent of managers’ involvement in corporate university programs?
6. What is the relationship between managers’ perceptions about the value of training and their views of the accountability of a program provided through their corporate university?

7. What is the relationship between the extent of managers’ involvement in their corporate university programs and the accountability of the corporate university program?

8. What is the relationship between managers’ perceptions of the value of training and the extent of their involvement in corporate university programs together and the accountability of the corporate university program?

9. What is the effect of managers’ commitment level to the organization on the relationship between managers’ perceptions about the value of training, the extent of managers’ involvement in corporate university programs, and the accountability of the corporate university program?

**Research Significance**

This research is significant for HRD theory, research, and practice. It contributes to the conceptualization of accountability in HRD. It expands research about corporate universities worldwide and forms basis for future research on HRD accountability. It implicates the practice of corporate universities and business managers as they relate to corporate university practice in China.

The research will foster the conceptualization of accountability in HRD at the program level. It will contribute to research on HRD accountability in the professional domain. The project will test the appropriateness of the concept of HRD accountability while offering an approach of operationalizing the construct in the context of a corporate university.
This study will contribute to research on corporate universities and that about managers and HRD. Regarding corporate universities, the study touches on the impact of corporate universities by focusing on the critical issue of HRD accountability faced with them. The study extends understanding about corporate universities in China, which very limited research has been undertaken about (Sham, 2007; Bober & Bartlett, 2004). Most corporate university studies were in a western context (Qiao, 2009). Regarding managers in HRD, this study expands understanding about manager perception on the value of training, involvement in HRD programs, organizational commitment, and accountability of an HRD program.

The study will have significant implication for corporate university practice. Corporate universities absolutely have important roles in China where corporations enjoy tremendous economic potential in the context of rapidly developing markets (Sham, 2007). Based on this research, more detailed and accurate criteria can be established to examine the impact of corporate university programs. The study will help managers as participatory stakeholders of corporate universities to better understand the impact of corporate university programs and about how they can be better involved. Many senior business managers just do not understand what a corporate university is and why their company decided to launch one (Meister, 1998). This research is likely to reveal various ways that business managers partner with corporate universities in China, which have implication for colleagues across organizations in this area.

**Definition of Terms**

A program in this study is an extended learning experience with multiple components, provided by a corporate university. Such a program is composed of a group of courses. China means People’s Republic of China including mainland China, Hong Kong, Macao, and Taiwan (Taiwan Affairs Office of the PRC State Council, 2017) geographically. The corporate
university case in this study is located in mainland China.

HRD accountability of a corporate university program to managers in the present study refers to perceptions among the managers about how well the program achieved its stated goals, addressed performance issues of importance in the organization, and made a demonstrable impact to improve the outcomes of the organization.
CHAPTER 2: REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

This chapter is composed of six sections. The first section reviews literature on history and definitions of HRD. The second section reviews literature on corporate universities. The third section reviews literature related to HRD accountability. The fourth section reviews literature on business managers in relationship with HRD. The fifth section reviews literature on organizational commitment. The sixth section presents a conceptual framework constructed by synthesizing information integrated in the preceding sections.

**History and Definitions of HRD**

This section consists of two parts. The first part outlines the history and development of HRD. The second part introduces definitions of HRD. Along with the evolvement of HRD in the history, scholarly understanding of HRD is expanded.

**History and Development of HRD**

The major effect on what would become HRD stemmed from Western thought (Gosney & Hughes, 2016). Philosophy (and philosophical assumptions) impact and guide the progression of HRD theory and practice in both history and our modern era (Gosney & Hughes, 2016). Gosney and Hughes noted that, as far back as 2000 BCE, there was evidence based on the skill-development and compensation methodologies that some phenomena of what later eventually become HRD was indeed occurring. They summarized that, from the period of Ancient Greece, the articulation of various philosophies of Plato and Aristotle stands alone as significant events in HRD history. Gosney and Hughes also outlined how the writings of three of the great thinkers of the Middle Ages—Augustine, Aquinas, and Ockham—on the separation of the church and the state, emerging humanistic philosophy, and empirical inquiry persists to affect HRD theory and practice. They underlined that, today’s HRD has been impacted greatly by the expansion of trade
and exploration that emanated during the Renaissance. They followed to underscore that three
“significant developments in HRD sprung from the Industrial Revolution and its need for a more
specifically skilled worker” (p. 76): the birth of vocational education, the development of
corporation or factory schools, and the competing philosophy. Furthermore, Gosney and Hughes
highlighted that world war II brought many about changes that remain prominent in modern
HRD. “The Training within Industry (TWI) service, the human relations movement, and the
mass entry of women into the industrial workforce are three occurrences specifically noted” (p.
89). Gosney and Hughes marked the 1950s to the 1970s as a fruitful time for the nascent HRD
discipline. Tying to major historical events and the philosophies they reviewed, Gosney and
Hughes considered three key themes as pillars of current HRD practice: “(1) the influence of
scientific management, (2) the influence of the human relations movement, and (3) the influence
of systems theory” (p. 145).

ODonnell, McGuire, and Cross (2006) clearly stated that HRD is distinct from human
resource management (HRM) and that HRD is an independent field of study as it has moved far
beyond the identify-forming stage. Evidence is still lacked to claim HRD as an established
profession (Kahnweiler, 2009). As a global organization for the HRD scholarly community of
researchers and reflective practitioners, the Academy of Human Resource Development (AHRD)
was founded on May 7, 1993, with the vision of “Leading human resource development through
research” (Russ-Eft, Short, & Jacobs, 2014). Gosney and Hughes (2016) indicated that
practitioners outnumber theoreticians greatly in HRD.

HRD has evolved to encompass such branches as strategic HRD, critical HRD, and
international HRD. Torraco and Swanson (1995) suggested the strategic HRD perspective by
making the case that HRD constitutes a major force of shaping business strategy. Critical HRD
has manifested as an emerging interest in HRD study as well (Fenwick, 2005, p. 225).

International HRD examines HRD not just in one country but that across countries.

**Definitions of HRD**

HRD is a domain of both practice and research. In practice, it is a corporate, business function (Gosney & Hughes, 2016). Nadler (1970) purported that HRD practice includes present training, education for future jobs, and individual development to meet future growth. HRD practice and theory are indistinguishable in certain circumstances and are completely disconnected at times (Gosney & Hughes, 2016).

It has been arguable that how big HRD is as an area of research and academic training. Knowles (1998) stated that HRD is broader than adult learning or training. Kuchinke (2001) argued that HRD is not an academic discipline but rather a field with several disciplines at its foundation or root. Nonetheless, Gosney and Hughes (2016) maintained HRD as a discipline, in which organization development (OD) is a subdiscipline. They also recommend to define theoretical HRD clearly as a subdiscipline of HRD.

Definitions for fields like HRD are quite important for their evolvement. There have been many definitions of HRD formulated worldwide. A special issue of *Human Resource Development International* once fostered a discussion about defining HRD. In that issue, despite the refusal of a few scholars (such as Lee, 2001) to define HRD, many others offered their own definitions with different considerations. For example, McLean and McLean (2001) proposed an encompassing initial definition that they believed met the conditions of many countries:

Human resource development is any process or activity that, either initially or over the long term, has the potential to develop adults’ work-based knowledge, expertise,
productivity and satisfaction, whether for personal or group/team gain, or for the benefit of an organization, community, nation or, ultimately, the whole of humanity. (p. 322)

Swanson’s (2001) definition was more specific. He defined HRD as “a process of developing and/or unleashing human expertise through organization development (OD) and personnel training and development (T&D) for the purpose of improving performance” (p. 304). In this definition, he stressed two essential components of HRD: OD and T&D.

This special issue aside, many other definitions continue to emerge. For instance, Jacobs (2014) defined HRD as “the process of improving organizational performance and enhancing individual capacities through the accomplishments that result from employee development, organization development, and career development programs” (p. 34). This definition adds career development (CD) as another crucial component of HRD.

All these representative definitions touch on the purpose, levels, and components of HRD, but their identifications of these are somewhat different from each other due to differing considerations. Hamlin and Stewart’s (2011) review of HRD definitions reveals contradictions, controversies, and confusions on the identity of HRD. One implication remains critical: a definition of HRD depends largely on the context that it is used in. When defining HRD for a country, adequate attention must be paid to the unique contexts in that country. HRD in different countries face different problems (Xie & Huang, 2010; Hamlin & Stewart, 2011). HRD should be defined according to its locale (Lin, 2013). McLean and McLean (2001) believed that a definition of HRD for every single country would be illustrative.

The most common US definitions of HRD have impacted those around the world, while definitions are also affected by the context where they have emerged (McLean & McLean, 2001). Wang and McLean (2007) offered a definition of International HRD as
a field of study and practice that focuses on for-profit, not-for-profit, and/or governmental entities and individuals cooperating in some form across national borders. The purpose of this interaction is systematically to tap existing human potential and intentionally shape work-based, community-based, society-based, culture-based, and politically based expertise through multiple means for the purpose of improving cross-national relationships collaboratively across all involved entities through greater mutual understanding, improved individual and organizational performance, improved standards of living and quality of life, reduced conflict between entities and individuals, and any other criteria that would be deemed useful by the involved entities. International HRD is aspirational rather than realized and serves as a challenge for continuous efforts at improvement. (p. 105)

For facilitating the understanding of HRD in China, an appropriate definition must be based on indigenous phenomena. A temporary definition of Chinese HRD is “systems for improving learning and performance of participating subjects at individual, team, organizational, societal, and state levels, through primarily training and development and secondarily organization development and career development” (Tong, 2017, Nov 24). Chinese HRD is still at the early stage of forming the profession. Training and development is the primary focus of this stage. Chinese universities do not regard HRD as an independent discipline or field; rather, they embed it in many other academic programs (Kuchinke, Fu, & Oh, 2007).

To sum up this section, HRD in the generic term has been in existence for over 4,000 years worldwide, while scholarly understanding and definitions around it continue to mature. The field or discipline of HRD was largely formed from 1950s in the West. With the improvement of learning and/or performance as its purpose, HRD is typically defined to include
T&D, OD, and CD.

Corporate Universities

This section consists of three parts. The first part reviews definitions of a corporate university. The second part reviews history and development of corporate universities. The third part summarizes characteristics of corporate universities.

Definitions of a Corporate University

The term of a corporate university is usually reserved for a special kind of HRD entity in an organization, although a number of scholars used it to refer to the transformation of traditional universities into a status where they are operated like a for-profit corporation (for example, Schultz, 2015; Thornton, 2014). A corporate university has little in common with a traditional university (Walton, 2005). It is contended that the adoption of the term “university” by the corporate world is not quite appropriate because such adoption does not conform well with the original meaning of traditional universities on knowledge diffusion and research and that many differences, though with some similarities too, exist between corporate universities and traditional “public universities” (Blass, 2001). Admittedly, the notion of a corporate university is bound to be misleading in some respects (Paton, Peters, Storey, & Taylor, 2005) or problematic (Shenton, Clist, & Dirks, 2005). Yet, it emphasizes the value of learning by taking the metaphor of a university (Sham, 2007). Some corporate universities such as Barclays University and ING Barings in the Netherlands label their particular corporate university as “business school” (Madden, 2005). Others call their corporate universities by the name “academy” or simply “corporate learning center” and the term university is rarely used in reality (Shenton, Clist, & Dirks, 2005).
While the term “university” cannot be used legally apart from a regulated academic context, the notion of corporate university “is well accepted as a generic term designating a certain institutional concept in the corporate world of training and learning” (Shenton, Clist, & Dirks, 2005, p. 146). Meister (1998) defined that “A corporate university is the strategic umbrella for developing and educating employees, customers, and suppliers in order to meet an organization’s business strategies” (p. 267). Meister (1998) contended that the corporate university model should be considered a process, not necessarily a place. Li and Alagaraja (2007) represented a corporate university as “corporate learning efforts that go beyond the scope of traditional training department” (p. 1), or more specifically, it “focuses on creating and facilitating a corporate learning culture and strategically developing the capability of the organization and its employees to meet current and future demands” (p. 1). Sham (2007) defined a corporate university as “a company-driven initiative that integrates personal and group development processes behind a strategic vision” (p. 257). The present study adopts Allen’s definition of a corporate university as introduced in Chapter One.

**History and Development of Corporate Universities**

Morin and Renaud (2009) stated that the first corporate university appeared to be General Motor Institute in the United States in the 1920s. Some maintained that corporate colleges were set up to fill the gap of cultivating qualified employees for work organizations in the mid-nineteenth century in the United States (Paton, Peters, Storey, & Taylor, 2005). In 1956 (Guthrie, 2013), General Electric (GE) University was implemented in the New York State (Morin & Renaud, 2009), believed by some as the first corporate university in the nation (for example, Guthrie, 2013). In 1955, Walt Disney developed the idea of Disney University which was operationalized in the 1960s (Blass, 2001). Since its foundation in early 1960s (Guthrie, 2013),
McDonald’s Hamburger University has had seven campuses worldwide, of which about 275,000 people have passed through one (Company campus, 2015). The interest in launching a corporate university began to surge in the late 1980s (Meister, 1998). Motorola named its “Motorola University” in 1989 on the basis of its former training and education center (Blass, 2001). Unipart University, the corporate university of Unipart Group, a major provider of manufacturing, logistics, and related services, came to appearance in Britain in 1993 (Blass, 2001). The number of corporate universities grew sharply, in the United States initially and in other areas of the globe subsequently, from 400 in the late 1980s, to over 1,000 by 1998, to even more in 2004 (Meister, 1998; Paton, Peters, Storey, & Taylor, 2005). More examples of corporate universities in the US include Air University, Bank of Montreal Institute for Learning, Cable & Wireless College, Employee Development University, First University (Meister, 1998), Motorola University and its various branches (Shaw, 2005; Abel, 2011; Blass, 2001), JetBlue University (Abel, 2011), MasterCard University (Abel, 2011), the corporate universities of BMW, DaimlerChrysler, Siemens (Madden, 2005), and Shell Open University (Bentley, 2005). By 2005, most corporate universities were still at their genesis, but in essence, increasingly more were established (Madden, 2005). The majority of corporate universities report to the Human Resources department while a growing number report to “chief financial officers, chief information officers and the CEO” (Meister, 1998, p. 271).

The idea of a corporate university was imported from the United States into Europe (Shenton, Clist, & Dirks, 2005; Madden, 2005). There are corporate universities in the United Kingdom (Blass, 2001), China, and many other countries in the globe. The Unilever firm established its first campus in London before 1965, and opened another in Singapore in 2013 (Company campus, 2015). The Coles Myer Institute has developed a success corporate
university model that has been acknowledged outside Australia (Holland & Pyman, 2006, p. 29).

Shaw (2005) provided “tentative support for the proposition that corporate universities of global
corporation can transcend national boundaries whilst at the same time being mediated by the
political, economic and cultural characteristics of the host country” (p. 21). Corporate
universities can play a central role when a firm is attempting to modify its culture (Company
campus, 2015).

The corporate university phenomenon is not a passing fad (Li & Alagaraja, 2007). The
number of corporate universities has been continuously growing (Abel & Li, 2012). The volume
of corporate universities in the United Sates increased from 400 in 1998 to over 2,000 by 2001
(Meister, 2001). The number of corporate universities has steadily increased in developing
countries such as China.

As the number of corporate universities continue to rise, it has been extrapolated that
corporate universities may become a bigger threat to conventional public universities (Blass,
2005; Guthrie, 2013). As more firms have named their own corporate universities, they have
become less willing to financially sponsor their managers to learn at business school (Company
campus, 2015). Moore (1997) put forward that the best of corporate universities challenge the
domain of traditional business school education. Yet, merely a minority of current corporate
universities, particularly in Europe, are seeking degree-awarding powers and compete with
traditional business schools (Paton, Peters, Storey, & Taylor, 2005). Notably, Hamburger
University has been recommended for college credit by the American Council on Education
(Guthrie, 2013).
Corporate universities in China.

As an emerging HRD phenomenon, thousands of corporate universities have been named in China to provide HRD products and services to their organizations and Chinese HRD industry. Motorola University China (Shaw, 2005), founded in 1993, was the first appearance of a corporate university in China (Qiao, 2009). Following it, Siemens Management School and Ericsson China Academy were established in 1997 (Wang, 2006). Other corporate universities in China include HP Business School, Lenovo University, Sinochem Management Institute and Shangri-La Academy (Qiao, 2009). Many additional Chinese firms, such as the New Hope, Yili, and Haier Groups, have also claimed their own corporate universities (Wang, 2006). The rise of corporate universities in China indicates the growing needs of corporations that are not being contemporarily met by training departments or traditional universities (Li & Alagaraja, 2007).

Characteristics of Corporate Universities

This part is composed of two sub-parts. The first sub-part summarizes the common characteristics of all corporate universities. The second sub-part summarizes additional features of some corporate universities.

Key characteristics of all corporate universities.

According to Allen’s definition of a corporate university in 2002, critical attributes of a corporate university distinguish it from other types of HRD entities. These attributes include the educational nature of corporate universities, strategic alignment between corporate universities and their parent organizations, and the scope of activities that a corporate university conducts determined by its strategic pursuit. In addition, there are some other attributes that are true to some but not all corporate universities.
First, a corporate university is an educational entity in HRD practice. That is, a corporate university usually focuses primarily on the training and development aspect of HRD practice. Motorola University was at the core of the training system of Motorola (Buckley, Carter, Clegg, & Tan, 2005). An HRD entity that does not have the educational function would not be considered as a corporate university. For example, an HRD evaluation center that only evaluates HRD activities conducted by business departments but is not in charge of any educational activities would not be considered as a corporate university. The educational function is the most important function of any corporate university. For instance, the China Telecom College manages various forms of online and offline educational programs for developing its core employees (Wu, Tong, Huang, & Xia, 2011).

Second, a corporate university pursues continuing strategic alignment with its parent organization, while organizational strategic priorities vary and continually change (Paton, Peters, Storey, & Taylor, 2005). A corporate university aims to “extend the knowledge base and competitiveness of their respective companies” (Blass, 2001, p. 160). A corporate university is evidently different from a large training department since it relates to its parent organization’s strategy, whereas a training department is a tactic tool (Allen, 2007; Abel & Li, 2012). It is important to understand from the perspective of a corporate university that, learning is strategic and must be managed at the highest level while the entire company is perceived as at least a learning organization to be (Shenton, Clist, & Dirks, 2005).

Because of this, any training entity that reacts only passively to its parent organization’s requests shall not be considered as a corporate university. For example, a few staff in a college works partially for faculty development of this college by following management request of running certain workshops. This function is not a corporate university. In contrast, the Yongyou
University was considered the corporate university of Yongyou because it proactively aligned its HRD activities to the mission, vision, and strategies of the whole company (Tong, 2012).

Third, the strategic role of a corporate university determines that it conducts activities that assist in accomplishing its parent organization’s strategic goals. These activities develop learning, knowledge, and wisdom at individual and organizational levels. This requires that a corporate university carries out many other activities beyond training and it is the other reason a corporate university differs from a traditional training department (Allen, 2007). These activities include executive coaching, succession planning and management (see Schmidt, 2007), culture change, marketing programs externally, knowledge management, and knowledge innovation (Rademakers, 2005; Barreau, 2012). Some organizations adopt corporate universities to ensure the relevance of learning and to assist them become learning organizations (Fulmer & Gibbs, 1998). The China Merchants Bank University manages the knowledge effectively for its employees, business department, and its whole bank (Wu, Tong, & Jacobs, 2015). Motorola University was “a focal point of personnel exchange between affiliates and the headquarters within this firm” (Buckley et al, 2005, p. 60). A training department that is only responsible for the training of its employees would not be considered as a corporate university. Meister (1998) further articulated the reason why a corporate university is different from a training department:

A training department tends to be reactive, decentralized, and serves a wide audience with an array of open enrollment programs. A corporate university, on the other hand, is the centralized umbrella for strategically relevant learning solutions for each job family within the corporation. (p. 267)
Additional features of some corporate universities.

Apart from these common characteristics, some but not all corporate universities have other features. For one thing, most corporate universities belong to large corporations, but not all of them do. A corporate university can be housed by a small or medium enterprise (Steffens & Novotne, 2007), be a department in a non-profit organization (Riegel, 2007), or serve as a government organization (Bruny, 2007).

For another, a lot of corporate universities employ chief learning officers (CLOs) at the executive level as the leaders of the HRD function (Abel & Li, 2012). The reason is that designing, managing, and expanding corporate universities requires specific capabilities, completion of various activities, and ability to handle many responsibilities (Allen, 2002). Yet, not every corporate university has a CLO at the executive level.

Third, some corporate universities have campuses while others do not. Some corporate university facilities are virtual, whereas others have multiple training sites (Madden, 2005). The corporate university of Unilever, a French company that produces various household commodities, has 27 sites (Madden, 2005). The BAe “Virtual University,” the corporate university of BAe, a former largest exporter in the United Kingdom (British Aerospace, 2017), is a virtual framing organization (Blass, 2001). Verifone University is a virtual corporate university that serves a medium size company, Verifone, in the US (Meister, 1998). Roughly half of the fifty corporate universities listed in Meister (1998) did have separate buildings. A number of corporate universities, over time, have come to believe in the significance of founding a physical facility for learning (Meister, 1998).

Fourth, some corporate universities partner with a broad range of educational entities. Partners of corporate universities are comprised of higher education institutions and K-12
Meister found that forty percent of corporate universities expected to start creating accredited degree program in alliance higher education (Meister, 1998). Partnership between Eaton School of Education and Ryerson Polytechnic University as well as between The NEXT STEP and Consortium of 23 Colleges in New England, among others, pioneered in this area (Meister, 1998).

Fifth, some corporate universities engage cutting-edge technology in facilitating learning. Learning management system (LMS) and e-learning are adopted by corporate universities for delivering learning programs (Abel, 2011). In the instance of ST University, fifteen percent of their activities were conducted through e-learning while they had also adopted blended-learning (Nataf & Vigne, 2005). Dell University provided thirty-five to forty-five percent of its training curriculum with web-based tools, with some of them blended with traditional settings like classrooms (Meister, 1998). Xerox Management Institute, the corporate university of Xerox—a fortune 500 technology company (Xerox, 2017), delivered web-based learning in conjunction with on-site classes (Meister, 1998). Oracle University, the corporate university for Oracle Corporation, created a virtual campus with a variety of delivery formats for offering both practical and just-in-time learning (Meister, 1998). Homan and Macpherson (2005) found out that the success of e-learning is significantly limited by context that affects the degree of integration and sophistication of e-learning and its contribution to the learning processes and outcomes of the corporate university.

Lastly, some corporate universities focus mainly on its top level of management. Unilever’s university is one example (Company campus, 2015). Other companies, such as ArcelorMittal, a steelmaker, center on a broader range of manager hierarches (Company campus, 2015).
The review in this section has encompassed definitions, development, and characteristics of corporate universities. A corporate university is different from other types of HRD deliveries per its definition. Having evolved for nearly a century, corporate universities continue to gain increasing attention in many countries including China. Commonly, corporate universities are educational and strategic entities that conduct a range of proactive activities more than training.

HRD Accountability

This section is comprised of three parts. The first part defines HRD accountability by reviewing literature on accountability and existing approaches to accountability in HRD. The second part relates HRD accountability to corporate universities. The third part reviews literature about program-level accountability in HRD.

Defining HRD Accountability

Accountability is a term that has been used in multiple domains. For example, Loozekoot and Dijkstra (2015) evaluated the public and financial accountability of government. Accountability is a persistent trend in organizations around the world (Phillips, 1998, p. 119). HRD’s primary accountability, aside from general ethical responsibilities, is to the system inside which it resides (Knowles, Holton III, & Swanson, 1998).

Swanson and Holton (2009) summarized two approaches to accountability in HRD: evaluation approach and metrics approach. By evaluation approach, they meant the use of evaluation instruments such as Kirkpatrick’s (1998) four-level evaluation framework—reaction, learning, behavior, and results—and Phillips’ (1998) return on investment (ROI) evaluation in assessing the effect of HRD programs; by metrics approach, they referred to the use of a metrics which include HRD function in the whole picture of an organization’s operation. For example, the Association of Talent Development (ATD, renamed from the American Society for Training
and Development) uses metrics to collect all types of data related to HRD in organizations every year (Swanson & Holton, 2009).

In addition to these two approaches, Tong and Jacobs (2016) added another two: systems approach and shared accountability approach, based on additional literature review. The former one refers to employing systematic techniques such as performance analysis and improvement to ensure the solution effectiveness in the process. Assessment center, strongly advocated by Chen (2006) as having strong validity to assess behavior that is important for demonstrating HRD accountability, is an example of the systems approach. Job analysis or competency development drives assessment center (Chen, 2006). One that is similar with assessment center is structured on-the-job training (S-OJT), which is driven by work analysis for developing training modules and train novice employees in real or simulated work environment.

Shared accountability approach stresses the importance of accomplishing HRD goals by involving stakeholders actively. Since HRD collaborates a lot with functional departments for achieving shared goals, HRD function increasingly allocates relevant responsibility to the partners. For example, asking business managers to evaluate the application of knowledge learned in training programs by their subordinates is one way of sharing HRD accountability with stakeholders.

Based upon the review of HRD approaches to accountability, HRD accountability is defined as introduced in Chapter One. The critical difference between the concept of HRD accountability and evaluation methodologies is that it examines the impact of HRD function particularly from stakeholders’ perspectives. Only when the concerned subjects are exactly the same, evaluation becomes an approach to accountability.

Stakeholders are important subject to consider when examining HRD accountability.
Garavan (1995) classified internal and external HRD stakeholders. As he articulated, internal stakeholders consist of “top management, line managers, training and development specialists, personnel managers and individual employees” (p. 17). External stakeholders are comprised of “national training advisers, external training providers, educational establishments and trade unions” (p. 17).

Many HRD practitioners view the concept of performance outcomes and accountability with disdain and avoid it, since they have developmental values and roots (Knowles, Holton III, & Swanson, 1998). Nonetheless, it is as important to gauge the outcomes as to emphasize the process. While training budgets are increasingly scrutinized, all HRD professionals are forced to new levels of accountability (Bober & Bartlett, 2004). The perspective of accountability helps HRD practitioners stay more targeting, effective, and efficient in meeting stakeholders where they are.

**HRD Accountability of a Corporate University**

Accountability is important for corporate universities. Moore (2002) stated that in SunU, the corporate university of Sun Microsystems—a former American provider of computer-related products and services (*Sun Microsystems*, 2017), training managers were held accountable to meet the request of clients. The approaches that corporate universities employ to accountability are mostly evaluation approaches. A corporate university can modify measurement tools such as Kirkpatrick’s four-level evaluation framework to assess their learning environment (Kiely, 2002). As an example, Xerox Management Institute measured the payback of its leadership development program for Xerox at the behavioral and business results levels (Meister, 1998). Jack Phillips’ ROI evaluation was also recommended for a higher-level evaluation (Barney, 2002). Corporate universities need to understand better about accountability and demonstrate
accountability at corporate university, program, and performer levels.

**HRD Accountability at the Program Level**

Program level HRD accountability is applicable to the present study. The aforementioned evaluation approach is dominating ways to accountability of an HRD program. Donovan (2014) reviews the development of training evaluation until its current form which evaluates the transfer of training. A book edited by Brown and Seidner (1998) detailed the models and issues in evaluating corporate training programs. Such models include four-level evaluation, ROI evaluation, and impact evaluation and so on. Literature has also had different definitions of accountability of training. For example, in the review of Burke and Saks (2009), accountability in training transfer mostly refers to holding trainees accountable for the transfer of training. Burke and Saks recommended conducting a training transfer accountability audit and presumed that accountability can improve the transfer of training in organizations.

Though evaluation has been commonly accepted as a way of demonstrating the accountability of an HRD program, it does not equal to accountability itself. While evaluation is the means, accountability is the ends. With evaluation results of an HRD program presented, how would stakeholder understand the accountability of the program is still somewhat uncertain. In literature on evaluation of training programs, there is rarely discussion about a clear definition of accountability of a program, especially from stakeholder viewpoints.

The definition of HRD program accountability has been introduced in Chapter One. According to this definition, HRD program accountability can be operationalized and measured. Three dimensions constitute accountability of an HRD program. The first is the extent to which the program achieved its stated goals. The second is the extent to which the program addressed performance issues of importance in the organization. The third is the extent to which the
program made a demonstrable impact to improve the outcomes of the organization.

In general, HRD accountability is defined based on a review of four approaches to accountability in HRD. Accountability is important for a corporate university since its stakeholders hold it accountable for its HRD work. HRD program accountability focuses on an individual HRD program.

**Business Managers and HRD**

This section consists of four parts. The first part reviews literature about managers in general. The second part reviews literature on managers as they relate to HRD. The third part reviews literature on manager perceptions about the value of training. The fourth part reviews literature on manager involvement in corporate university programs.

**Business Managers**

Business managers are important for an organization as they work for the mission and goals of the organization. A manager is someone who runs and operates “the business organization on behalf and in the interest of one or more private owners of this organization” (Kubr & Abell, 1998, p. 9). A study on hotel general managers in China depicted a profile of them in Guangdong Province (Li, Tse, & Xie, 2007). The findings indicated that: 1) the majority of the general managers “are between ages of 31-51, predominantly males with three-year vocational college educations, and trained in either a hospitality/business-related major or totally non-business-related major” (p. 263), 2) the career trajectories of younger general managers are more similar with their international counterparts, and 3) the unique differences of the general managers in China from international ones is that they spent more years in non-hotel practice.

Cultural differences exist between German expatriate managers and their Chinese subordinates (Domsch & Lichtenberger, 1991). There are cross-national cultural differences
relating to what empowerment by managers actually means to employees (Littrell, 2007). In general, cosmopolitan Chinese managers are encouraged by Chinese culture to increase cultural conservatism, while they appear striving to bringing about change for more autonomy (Ralston, Yu, & Wang, 1996, p. 86). A comparative study found Chinese managers rely more upon rules and procedures than Western managers for handling certain managerial events (Smith, Peterson, & Wang, 1996). Experiential learning plays an important role in manager development (DeGeest, & Brown, 2011).

**Business Managers Relating to HRD**

Line managers have become the key lynchpin through which operational HR delivery occurs (McGuire, McGuire, & Sanderson, 2013). Line managers are vitally important in implementing developmental HR practices (Kuvaas & Dysvik, 2010). Line manager behavior moderates the impact of HR-practices on innovative behaviors of employees (Labrenz, 2014). Power (2009) found out the characteristics of line manager-HR professional relationships as “not homogenous in their categorization; influenced by respective experience and competency levels; cross-functional with associated mixed authority dependence features” (p. iv). A small-scale study showed that line management, along with learning culture, led to the experience of greater career growth and professional development by HR practitioners (Harrison, 2011). Changes to HR structures caused “significant role adjustments for line managers and that line managers often experience considerable difficulty with new responsibilities” (McGuire, McGuire, & Sanderson, 2011, p. 6).

Some managers understand the significance of visibly supporting HRD (Egan, 2011), while HRD interventions did not seem to be essential but a “nice to have” in the becoming of individual managers (Cureton, 2012). Egan (2011, p. 231) highlighted two key intersections
between HRD and management: 1) individual manager development, and 2) the support of organizational operations and management. Expressed concerns of management about the effectiveness of training programs appear to be a continuous impetus for sustaining theory development and research studies on the topic of learning transfer (Jacobs, 2011).

McGuire and Kissack (2015, p. 522) proposed that, line manager HRD roles include: 1) working alongside HR business partners, 2) workforce planning and talent pipelining, 3) coaching and mentoring of subordinates, 4) foster a learning climate, 5) career planning and development, and 6) design, delivery, and evaluation of training programs. An empirical study conducted in UK Hilton hotels (Maxwell & Watson, 2004) showed that, line managers believed that unit managers attached great importance to training and development (p. 897). Yet, line managers face short-term demands and barriers and limitations to their involvement in their staff development (Yarnall, 1998). HRD interventions in relation to training and development have been used for repatriation adjustment of international managers (Osman Gani & Hyder, 2008). HRD practitioners can also help first-time managers successfully transit to management with personal development initiatives and mentoring (Roberts & Rocco, 2008).

When Chinese managers had relied upon training and their personal experience for handling certain managerial events, they evaluated such events more positively than their Western counterparts (Smith, Peterson, & Wang, 1996). China Merchants Bank University (2017) disclosed an investigation of their project that won an award of Outstanding Human Performance Intervention this year. Regarding this Training Efficiency Improvement Project, they found out that managers and employees have different learning needs. On the job, managers pay more attention to strategic planning and performance achievement, while employees attach more importance to performance achievement and problem solving. Because of that, practical purpose
and systematism becomes the focus of manager training. This corporate university adapted their training for managers according to such features.

**Manager Perceptions of the Value of Training**

Perception of training is mostly formed by experience and complemented by studies, as indicated by the research of Conrade, Woods, and Ninemeier (1994). While HRD professionals normally perceive training as an important approach to developing human resources, managers may have varying opinions regarding training. Manager perceptions regarding organizational culture have implications to training and development. Managers who are at different levels of an organization perceive that organization differently, and therefore have somewhat different opinions about the culture of that organization (Keeton & Mengistu, 1992). When providing training to managers, it is better to fit with their perceptions about organizational culture in terms of performance, productivity, and leadership, among others (Keeton & Mengistu, 1992).

Maxwell and Watson (2004) studied the values and perceptions of line managers about training and development. Per their study, line managers value the strategic alignment of training and development (p. 897). The majority of the line managers also believed that training would help them to a great or some extent (p. 899).

Mahfod (2013) invented an instrument for measuring the attitudes of senior managers towards management training and development. This instrument consists of six dimensions: environmental susceptibility to management T&D, extent and flexibility of policy and plans, organizational support and commitment by senior managers to management T&D efforts, appreciation of the value of management T&D and the need to enhance management T&D quality, reactions to the training environment, and reinforcement and follow-up of the newly developed skills. The study examined senior managers in public sectors in Libya and indicated
that most respondents “gave priority to external training, off the job training” (p. 227), among other findings.

Lather, Garg, and Vikas (2014) conducted an empirical study to understand the perception of the top management about training in the tourism industry across India. To do this, they designed and validated an instrument that measures existing training practices, problems confronted by the top management in conducting training-related activities, and top management perception towards T&D. Results suggested that the top management encountered several issues in providing training to their employees. The key problems include industry impediments, cost issues, employee attitude, and managerial myopia.

Based on the research by Lather, Garg, and Vikas (2014), there are three dimensions of manager perception about the value of training. The first one is training need. Originally called “training myopia” (Lather, Garg, & Vikas, 2014, p. 144), it is defined as manager perception about the usefulness of solely product trainings and their view that “behavioral trainings are not relevant to their business” (p. 144). The second one is employee attitude. Lather et al. defined it as whether “employees hardly take training seriously and take it to be an opportunity away from work” (p. 144). The third one is training benefits. Management “acknowledges that training improves work-life, helps in optimum utilization of human resources, increases employee productivity and builds positive perception about the organization” (Lather et al., 2014, p. 144).

Sobaih (2011) showed seven main reasons why managers in the hospitality and tourism industry offered fewer training opportunities to their part-time staff in comparison to their full-time staff. The reasons include: time of training, irregular shift work, low enthusiasm of part-time employees and so on. These obstacles are associated with managers’ perception of part-time staff and their presumption that part-time staff are uninterested in T&D.
It is suggested that, when organizations make efforts to develop their managers, these managers become more committed to the organizations and more likely to develop their employees (Tansky & Cohen, 2001, p. 285). Managers who had positive HRD-related experiences and outlooks suggested that internal HRD professionals added value to their individual development and to the effectiveness of management and performance improvement (Egan, 2011, p. 233). Manager perceptions of employee expectations about the training services provided by an HRD function in an organization setting were significantly related to the extent to which the training program was operationalized to meet employee expectations (Mafi, 2000).

**Manager Involvement in Corporate University Programs**

Literature shows that managers may be involved in the development, delivery, and evaluation of corporate university programs. The following reviews literature on each of the three areas respectively. Manager participation in the second area is further specified in three ways.

Managers may participate in the development of corporate university programs. According to a report by KeyLogic, a Chinese HRD consulting firm, 87.3% of the training plans of Chinese corporate universities come from the summary of need submitted by functional departments (Pang, 2017). This means, department managers provide training need for corporate university programs. A case study of Yongyou University, the corporate university of Yongyou Group, revealed that, the topics of newly-developed courses of this corporate university in 2012 were determined by the group level management (Tong, 2012). That is, senior management played a pivotal role in determining the training program needs for this corporate university. Different levels of managers may also participate in the design and development phases of the programs offered through their corporate university.
Manager participation in corporate university program delivery are in three areas: participate as an attendee, participate as a trainer, and participate as they designate subordinates to attend the programs. Managers may participate in programs for their development (Egan, 2011). Unilever’s university trains its top managers, while ArcelorMittal’s university trains more levels of managers, particularly local managers in emerging economies (Company campus, 2015). GE University offered GE executives general management courses at its launch and more courses now (Guthrie, 2013). Managers in these organizations attend such programs for their professional and career development.

Managers are frequently asked to be trainers for corporate university programs. The study of Qiao (2009) with eleven corporate universities in China revealed that, top leaders in almost all the corporate universities teach in management development programs. A case study of China Merchants’ Bank University showed that, leaders are asked to be learning mentors of the trainees for each of its programs, to ensure the involvement of leaders in the whole process (Tong & Wu, 2011). One principal advocated by this corporate university was that: “Leaders are teachers; teachers are leaders.” Any of the leaders took it as an honor to be a part-time instructor of this corporate university.

Managers often designate their subordinates to corporate university programs. With the Shangri-la Academy, the CEO of the Shangri-la Group required that whether designate participants to the training programs of the Academy is a key performance indicator for the top managers (Qiao, 2009). With China Meteorological Administration Cadre Training College, division-level cadres of this administration designate subordinates to participate in the training programs of this corporate university (J. Hou, personal communication, October 23, 2017). Managers have practical interest in evaluating HRD programs offered through their corporate
university. Only if the value of corporate universities is recognized by all stakeholders, including business unit managers, will corporate universities attain full support company wide (Qiao, 2009). A corporate university needs to collect data from managers for evaluating its programs. Take the Organizational Development Center of the Clark County, Nevada, which seemed an equivalent of a corporate university, as an example. It collected data from supervisor and department head participants of a program it implemented, for program evaluation (Stevens, 1991). Data from managers about their subordinates’ performance change as it relates to the learning from a corporate university program makes strong sense when it comes to evaluate the program at the behavior change level of Kirkpatric’s four-level framework.

To summarize, business managers collaborate closely with HRD to achieve shared goals. Managers have responsibilities for certain HRD activities and have continued concerns about HRD effectiveness. Manager perceptions about whether and how they should support training seems to be varied among themselves and their industries, types of subordinates, and types of training programs. Managers are generally involved in the development, delivery, and evaluation of corporate university programs.

**Organizational Commitment**

This section is composed of two parts. The first part reviews definitions and measurements of organizational commitment. The second part reviews antecedents and consequences of organizational commitment.

**Definitions and Measurements of Organizational Commitment**

Since organizational commitment gained increased interest in 1960s, it has been defined in many different ways. For example, Buchanan (1974) referred organizational commitment as “a partisan, affective attachment to the goals and values of an organization, to one’s role in
relation to goals and values, and to the organization for its own sake, apart from its purely instrumental worth” (p. 533). He even specified organizational identification, job involvement, and organizational loyalty as the three components of organizational commitment. His view, along with similar others, was perceived to examine mainly affective type of commitment; other types include continuance and normative types of commitment (Meyer & Allen, 1991).

Organizational commitment is either an attitude (Mowday, Steers, & Porter, 1979) or behavior (Meyer & Allen, 1991).

Affective commitment is “employees’ emotional attachment to, identification with, and involvement in, the organization” (Allen & Meyer, 1990, p. 1). Continuance commitment is “commitment based on the costs that employees associate with leaving the organization” (Allen & Meyer, 1990, p. 1). Normative commitment is “employees’ feelings of obligation to remain with the organization” (Allen & Meyer, 1990, p. 1).

Meyer and Allen (1991, see also Allen & Meyer, 1990) by synthesizing earlier definitions of organizational commitment, stated that affective commitment, continuance commitment, and normative commitment are the three components rather than types of this construct. Meyer and Allen (1997) presented an array of focus of commitment: organization, top management, unit, unit manager, work team, and team leader (p. 21).

The measurement of organizational commitment has evolved along with its definition. Buchanan II (1974) provided ways of measuring organizational identification, job involvement, and organizational loyalty of commitment. Several other studies in the 1960s and early 1970s employed similar procedures or scales with that of Buchanan II. Mowday, Steers, and Porter (1979) criticized that such studies only reported simple reliability while lacking of other validity and reliability statistics. Mowday et al. devised and validated an organizational commitment
questionnaire that consisted of fifteen items.

Meyer, Allen, and their colleagues developed and revised separate scales of affective commitment, continuance commitment, and normative commitment (Allen & Meyer, 1990; Meyer, Stanley, Herscovitch, & Topolnytsky, 2001). They even compiled the scales to an eighteen-item version for occupational commitment (Meyer, Allen, & Smith, 1993). Meyer et al. (2001) found affective commitment and normative commitment as highly correlated but still distinguishable components of organizational commitment, while the unidimensionality of continuance commitment remained to be explored. The three component model by Meyer and Allen (1991) has been criticized conceptually that the normative and continuance components are regarding too specific forms of behavior (Solinger, van Olffen, & Roe, 2008). Yet, the scales have continued to be adopted by recent studies such as Fu and Deshpande (2013) and van der Voet and Vermeeren (2017).

**Antecedents and Consequences of Organizational Commitment**

Traditional studies identified social interaction with peers and superiors, years of organizational service, hierarchical advancement, and job achievement as determinants of different aspects of commitment (Buchanan, 1974, pp. 544-545). Tannenbaum, Mathieu, Salas, and Cannon-Bowers (1991) found that the extent to which training meets a trainee’s expectations or desires is related to his/her post-training organizational commitment. Fu and Deshpande (2013) found out that job satisfaction and caring climate both directly affect organizational commitment in a Chinese insurance company.

Meyer and Allen (1990) reported employee comfortableness in their roles and self-efficacy on the job as antecedents of affective commitment, alternative opportunities and job investment magnitude as antecedents of continuance commitment (see also Meyer & Allen, 1997,
Meyer and Allen (1997) summarized limited research evidence that early socialization processes are the basis to develop normative commitment (p. 64). Of socialization processes, training is often an important part (Meyer & Allen, 1997, p. 74).

Organizational commitment relates negatively to withdrawal cognition and turnover (Meyer, et al., 2001). Organizational commitment directly impacts job performance (Fu & Deshpande, 2013). Organizational commitment has also been found to, along with job satisfaction, mediate the effect of transformational leadership on employee performance (Toban & Sjahruddin, 2016).

In short, along with the evolvement of definitions of organizational commitment, it has been widely recognized that organizational commitment includes affective commitment, continuance commitment, and normative commitment. Various antecedents of organizational commitment and each of its components have been identified. Organizational commitment relates directly to employee turnover, job performance, and other consequences.

**Conceptual Framework**

This section forms the conceptual framework by relating key constructs of the study. These key constructs include manager’s perceptions of the value of training, manager’s involvement in corporate university programs, manager’s commitment to the organization, and the accountability of a corporate university program. Figure 2.1 below visualizes the conceptual framework about all these constructs.
Figure 2.1: Conceptual model of the variables of the study

The first construct measures manager opinions about training need, employee attitude, and training benefits, which are three dimensions adapted from the originally four of Lather, Garg, and Vikas (2014). The second construct varies in three areas: manager’s participation in corporate university program development, in corporate university program delivery, and in corporate university program evaluation. The third construct includes affective, continuance, and normative commitment of managers to the organization. The fourth construct consists of managers’ perceptions in three dimensions: To what extent did the program achieve its stated
goals? To what extent did the program address performance issues of importance in the organization? To what extent did the program make a demonstrable impact to improve the outcomes of the organization?

Presumably, managers’ perceptions of the value of training affect the accountability of a corporate university program. Managers’ involvement in corporate university programs will also impact the accountability of corporate university program. Managers’ commitment to the organization would affect the relationship between managers’ perceptions of the value of training and managers’ involvement in their corporate university programs and the accountability of a corporate university program. Below are the quantitative hypotheses of the relationships among the constructs:

*Research hypothesis 1*: Managers’ perceptions about the value of training is correlated to the extent of managers’ involvement in corporate university programs.

*Research hypothesis 2*: The more positive managers’ perceptions are about the value of training, the higher the accountability of a corporate university program from the managers’ viewpoints.

*Research hypothesis 3*: The higher extent of managers’ involvement in their corporate university programs, the higher the accountability of the corporate university program from the managers’ viewpoints.

*Research hypothesis 4*: Managers’ perceptions of the value of training and the extent of their involvement in corporate university programs both affect the accountability of the corporate university program.

*Research hypothesis 5*: As the level of managers’ commitment to the organization increases, managers’ perceptions about the value of training and the extent of managers’
involvement in corporate university programs have a stronger relationship with the accountability of the corporate university program.

The above hypotheses correspond to the latter five research questions in Chapter One about the relationships among the variables. This conceptual framework and the hypotheses represent current assumptions about the relationships among the variables based on literature review. Analysis of actual data in the study will likely reveal more or different relationships among the variables. An updated conceptual framework will be presented toward the end of the dissertation.
CHAPTER 3: METHODS

This chapter consists of seven sections. The first section delineates the type of research the present study is. The second section introduces the research setting. The third section describes the research participants. The fourth section introduces instruments of the research. The fifth section describes data collection procedures. The sixth section outlines data analysis procedures. The seventh section establishes reliability and validity of the survey scales.

Type of Research

This study is a mixed methods research. Creswell (1999) defined a mixed methods study as “one in which the researcher incorporates both qualitative and quantitative methods of data collection and analysis in a single study” (p. 455). Greene (2007, p. 13) defined it in a somewhat different way that stresses the importance of mental models in mixed methods social inquiry and the purpose of it for bettering scholars’ understanding in a phenomenon. Despite ongoing questions with mixed methods research, such as whether quantitative and qualitative research paradigms are truly mixable in a single study, mixed methods research methodology as a field has gained much growth.

Creswell (1999) proposed a nine-step model for beginners to conduct a mixed methods study. The first two steps are to determine the necessity and feasibility of applying mixed methods study. In the third step, one should write research questions appropriate for examinations of both quantitative and qualitative data. The fourth and fifth steps consist of subsequent decisions for two types of data collection and assessing relative weight and implementation strategy for each method. Step six is to visualize a model of the methods. Step seven involves determination of data analysis. Step eight assesses ways that the quality of the study will be determined. Finally, step nine specifies a plan for a real study (Creswell, 1999).
These steps were generally followed in designing and planning the current research.

**Necessity of Using Mixed Methods Study**

Creswell, Fetters, and Ivankova (2004) generated three models for designing mixed methods studies in primary care, which are also applicable in social-science inquiries generally: instrument building, triangulation, and data transformation models. The first model usually refers to research that uses qualitative methods as a way of gathering opinions as a basis for creating measurement later. The second one refers to research that uses data from different types of sources to point to a same conclusion (see also Greene, Caracelli, & Graham, 2017). The third refers to research that collects qualitative data first and then codes them into numbers of themes for quantitative analysis.

The triangulation model fits well with the purpose of this study. With this model, quantitative and qualitative methods are employed to answer the same set of questions (Greene, Caracelli, & Graham, 2017). In order to combine the strengths of quantitative and qualitative research methods, and gain both a broader and deeper understanding from research participants about the research questions, it is necessary to use mixed methods.

**Research Questions Appropriate for Both Types of Data Collection**

Research questions displayed in Chapter One can be answered through combined information from mixed methods. A survey questionnaire is useful in getting aggregate data and finding out relationships among the variables. The survey is the major method in this study. Interviews will play a role in getting greater description and deeper understanding about the survey responses to the research questions.

**Research Setting**

This section is composed of two parts. The first part introduces how a large organization
that had established a corporate university in China was chosen as the research setting. The second part provides background information of the organization.

Criteria of Selecting a Corporate University of an Organization

In selecting the research setting, that is, an organization with a corporate university, the corporate university must both fulfill what is defined as a corporate university in the literature and also be internally identified as a corporate university. As summarized in Chapter Two about the core characteristics of corporate universities, a corporate university must be educational, strategic, and comprehensive. To be internally recognized as an official corporate university, the corporate university would have a word such as “college,” “university,” or “development center” in its name.

A large organization in China that has established its corporate university was selected according to the above criteria. The organization is a Chinese public institution. This corporate university is an educational entity, designed with a strategic mission to assist its parent organization and conduct activities more than just training. It conducts various types of training geared toward different levels of employees of this organization and outside customers. Its mission is to comprehensively play the major role of a national-level training institution in developing high-level professionals in its industry, around the overall situation of industry development and the modern construction of this industry. Other than training internal employees, it provides operational guidance to lower-level units, training industry personnel for Asian regions and other developing countries, offers consulting, and conducts related research. The phrase “training college” is in its official name.

Background of the Organization, Corporate University, and the Program for Study

The organization chosen will be called A hereafter in this manuscript. Institution A is
headquartered in a first-tier city in China. It has a history as long as that of China. It was a department directly under the State Council of China prior to the early 1990s. As shown on its official website, it has thirteen internal departments and sixteen units directly belonging to this bureau-level institution. It currently has about 50,000 employees all over the country.

Corporate university A is one of the sixteen units of organization A. Organization A also governs sub-institutions of the same function in every province or province-level administrative area in China. Corporate university A was founded several years ago based on a former training center. It has nearly 300 employees. The corporate university mainly conducts continuing education of medium and high-level management cadres as well as medium and high-level professional technicians. It delivers training on institution-specific business and related high and new technology, training of trainers, distance education, institution-specific training material development and talent development. Within the corporate university, specific departments are responsible for cadre training, professional training, and distance education, respectively. The corporate university constantly provides many different kinds of training programs to internal and external trainees. According to information provided by the corporate university, between late 2012 and late 2017, its training covered 83.1% of new employees of significant operation positions, over 65% of major engineering projects. During this time, 30% of leading cadres and 25% of major operational staff participated in training. With distance training based on modern information technology, it has accomplished distance learning of all employees including staff at over 2000 basic work stations. The corporate university provides training to all leading cadres through a training program series geared towards department-level cadres, division-level cadres, group-level cadres, and party school learners. Training content for these managing personnel including professional technology, policies and laws, financial knowledge,
and occupational ethics. In 2017, the corporate university offered 20 training programs for different groups of leading cadres and leading cadres.

The one program chosen for this study is a management competency training program geared towards division-level youth cadres within this organization. The trainees include outstanding division-level cadres in all the subordinate bureaus in each province (region, city) and all units directly belonging to this organization. The program started in 2015 and trained a total of 205 youth cadres in 2015 and 2016. In 2017, it planned to train 160 cadres across 4 cohorts. Each cohort participates in a 21-day-long training. Two campuses in two provinces undertake this program each year.

The content of this program focused on training the outstanding youth cadres on management competencies that were essential to their present or future jobs. Such management competencies mainly included attitude, knowledge, and skills of management, communism, psychology, and so on. The program also touched on some professional expertise specific to the industry of organization A. Particularly, the program content in 2016 included the scientific development of the profession, competence advancement, theoretical accomplishments, program introduction and socialization, studies on special topics, and examination and program completion report.

The reason for selecting this program instead of another program provided by corporate university A is that it is a management development program and its past trainees are more approachable than other trained cadres. Management development is one focus that is core to many corporate universities, while traditional training departments tend to focus more on lower-level employees. Among scores of management development programs provided by this corporate university, this program is focused on division-level youth cadres who presumably
were the most willing to respond to the survey and participate in interviews for this study. Other management development programs either focus on higher-level cadres or are geared toward more specific groups of cadres such as those from minority ethnic groups. Higher-level cadres were most likely too busy or just less inclined to participate in the study. Programs with a more specific focus of content and trainees seemed less representative than the chosen one for the corporate university and the whole organization.

**Research Participants**

This section is composed of two parts. The first part introduces how the research population was selected. The second part gives out general demographics of the research population.

**Selection of Research Participants**

The criteria of selecting participants for the study were twofold. First, the respondents were managers who had at least five years of experience in the organization. Second, the managers must have attended at least one program provided by corporate university A in the past.

A total of 205 division-level cadres participated in the chosen management competency training program provided by corporate university A in 6 previous cohorts from 2015 to 2016. Among them, 204 cadres had worked in that organization for more than 5 years. The only one who had worked less than 5 years in this organization was excluded. Thus, 204 cadres fit the first criterion. Since they all participated in at least this particular management development program, they all fit the second criterion. Therefore, 204 cadres that fit the two criteria were selected as the potential participants of the study.

**Demographics of Research Population**

This part details demographic information of the 204 cadres that fit the data collection
criteria. Information about gender, age, ethnicity, work years in the organization, Chinese provinces where the cadre work, their type of position, highest diploma, job grade, and whether they pass the specific training program, is provided.

Among the 204 cadres, most of them were male (149, 73%), and few were female (55, 27%), as shown in Table 3.1 below.

Table 3.1: Gender of the research population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>27.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>73.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The cadres’ age was from 29 to 50, with a mean of 38.4 and a standard deviation of 3.6. Most of them were 36, 37, or 39 years old, as shown in Figure 3.1 below.

Figure 3.1: Age distribution of the research population
The cadres were from 10 different Chinese ethnic groups. The most common ethnic groups were Han (汉), Zang (Tibetan, 藏), and Menggu (Mongolian, 蒙古). Han Chinese made up 89.7% of the population.

Table 3.2: Ethnic groups of the research population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity groups</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tong</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhuang</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tu</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weiwuer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Man</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tujia</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hui</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menggu</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zang</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Han</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>89.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Years of work of the cadres in this organization range from 6 to 32, with a mean of 15.7 and a standard deviation of 4.8. Most cadres had worked 15, 11, and 17 years. Figure 3.2 below shows the pattern.
The cadres were located in each of the 31 province-level geographic units of mainland China. As shown in Table 3.3 below, Beijing houses the most—27—cadres. The others were almost evenly distributed in all the other 30 provinces or province-level municipalities. Only Shanghai, Hubei, and Xizang each had 5 cadres. All the other province-level units each had 6 cadres.
Table 3.3: Province distribution of the research population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province/Province-level unit</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beijing</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heilongjiang</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yunnan</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neimenggu</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jilin</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sichuan</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tianjin</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ningxia</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anhui</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shandong</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaanxi</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guangdong</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guangxi</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xinjiang</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jiangsu</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jiangxi</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hebei</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henan</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhejiang</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunan</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gansu</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guizhou</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liaoning</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chongqing</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shanxi</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qinghai</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hainan</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fujian</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shanghai</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hubei</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xizang</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>204</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The cadres were working for over 22 types of positions. The most popular types of positions were Personnel participating in public service (87, 42.6%). For the purpose of protecting the confidentiality of the research population, distribution details of all the types of positions that identify the industry is not reported here.
The highest diplomas the cadres had include bachelor, master, PhD, and associate degrees, as shown in Table 3.4. Respectively, 142, 42, 14, and 4 cadres had a bachelor, master, PhD, or associate degree as their highest diploma. Such information of 2 cadres were unknown.

Table 3.4: Highest diploma of the research population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Diploma</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>69.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>204</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Job grades of the cadres included Division (处级), Associate division (副处级), Group (科级), Associate Group (副科级), and Staff member levels (科员级). As Table 3.5 shows, the majority (147, 72.1%) of the cadres were at the Group level. The other common job grades were Associate division level (36, 17.6%), Associate group level (10, 4.9%), and Division level (1, .5%). One person did not have a job grade. Job grade information of 8 cadres was unknown.

Table 3.5: Job grades of the research population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Grade</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff member level</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate group level</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group level</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>72.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate division level</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division level</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No job grade</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>204</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among the 204 cadres, 203 passed the specific training program. Only 1 cadre failed it. The passing rate was 99.5%.
All the cadre members were contacted by a support staff and her colleagues in this corporate university as well as myself for voluntarily completing a survey. A total of 80-150 effective responses was expected from survey data collection. There was a question at the end of the survey asking whether volunteers would be interested in participating in an individual interview. It was expected that about 6-12 cadre members, or until responses reach saturation, would participate in the interviews.

Research Instruments

This section is composed of four parts. The first part illustrates items for measuring managers’ perceptions of the value of training. The second part introduces items for rating the frequency of managers’ involvement in corporate university programs. The third part introduces items for measuring managers’ perceptions of the accountability of a corporate university program. The fourth part provides items for measuring managers’ commitment to the organization.

Managers’ Perceptions of the Value of Training

Table 3.6 below presents items for each dimension of this construct. Three items with the highest factor loadings for each corresponding dimension were adapted from Lather, Garg, and Vikas (2014, p. 145). Adjustment in wording was made to fit the context of this study. For example, “my company” was changed to “my organization.”
Table 3.6: Items for measuring manager’s perceptions of the value of training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Survey Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Training needs</td>
<td>• My employees do not require much training to do their jobs. (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Training activities for my employees about workplace behaviors are not relevant to the work I am involved in. (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• It is useful to send employees only for training about products. (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee attitudes</td>
<td>• My employees take the time of training as an opportunity to be away from work. (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• My employees hardly take training seriously. (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• My employees tend to leave the organization after acquiring training certification. (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training benefits</td>
<td>• Training activities help in improving the culture of my organization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Training activities help in building positive perceptions of employees about the organization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Training activities help in optimizing the value of human resources.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Managers’ Involvement in Corporate University Programs**

Three dimensions of managers’ involvement in corporate university programs are summarized in Chapter Two and were measured with items in Table 3.7 below. Three inventory items were used for each dimension. A few items in the dimensions of corporate university program development and delivery were inspired by a relevant dissertation in Lin (2006).

Managers could rate their frequency in participating in corporate university programs on a five-point Likert scale.

It is worth explaining a little here about the second dimension of managers’ participation in the delivery of corporate university programs. Though Chapter Two summarized three ways a manager participates in a corporate university program, the target managers in this study rarely participated as trainers for the program under study, or designated their subordinate to participate. Therefore, it was managers’ participation as attendees themselves that were emphasized in the measurement.
Table 3.7: Inventory of manager’s involvement in corporate university programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Survey Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Participation in corporate university program development | • Participated in identifying the needs of my organization for content of the programs to be offered through the training college  
• Participated in designing the programs to be offered through the training college  
• Provided content for the programs to be offered through the training college |
| Participation in corporate university program delivery   | • Prepared myself to participate in the programs offered through the training college, before they were officially offered  
• Participated in the implementation of the programs offered through the training college, during the time when they were officially offered  
• Followed up with the application of the takeaways from the programs offered through the training college, after they were offered |
| Participation in corporate university program evaluation  | • Provided in-paper feedback for evaluating participated programs offered through the training college  
• Provided in-person feedback for evaluating participated programs offered through the training college  
• Used evaluation reports of the programs offered through the training college |

**Accountability of a Corporate University Program**

Three question items measured each of the three components of this variable. The items are listed in Table 3.8. For the first dimension, the three items measured, respectively, how well a program achieved all its stated goals, did not achieve certain goals as well as others, and failed to achieve particular goals of importance. For the second dimension, the items measured, respectively, how well the program addressed well-known performance issues, addressed questions that would help the managers, and addressed performance issues that the managers did not know beforehand. For the third dimension, the items measured, respectively, how well the program improved the outcomes of the entire organization, that of the employees of a manager, and that of the managers themselves.
Table 3.8: Items for measuring the accountability of a corporate university program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Survey Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To what extent did the program achieve its stated goals</td>
<td>• The program achieved all of the goals it stated to its learners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The program achieved some of its stated goals better than others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The program did not achieve certain stated goals of importance to me as a manager. (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent did the program address performance issues of importance in the organization</td>
<td>• The program addressed performance issues that were well known in the organization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The program addressed questions that would help me perform better as a manager.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The program addressed performance issues that I did not know existed beforehand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent did the program make a demonstrable impact to improve the outcomes of the organization</td>
<td>• The program improved the outcomes of the entire organization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The program improved the outcomes of employees in my department.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The program improved my own outcomes as a manager.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Managers’ Commitment to the Organization

Meyer, Allen, and Smith (1993) provided an eighteen-item version of the organizational commitment scales. Each of the affective commitment, continuance commitment, and normative commitment scales had six items, as displayed in Table 3.9. The “R” in the parentheses of some items indicates that the items should be reversely coded in scoring. These scales are seven-point Likert scales.
Table 3.9: Items for measuring managers’ commitment to the organization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Survey Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affective commitment</td>
<td>• I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career with this organization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• I really feel as if this organization’s problems are my own.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• I do not feel a strong sense of “belonging” to my organization. (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• I do not feel “emotionally attached” to this organization. (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• I do not feel like “part of the family” at my organization. (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• This organization has a great deal of personal meaning for me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Right now, staying with my organization is a matter of necessity as much as desire.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• It would be very hard for me to leave my organization right now, even if I wanted to.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Too much in my life would be disrupted if I decided I wanted to leave my organization now.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• I feel that I have too few options to consider leaving this organization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• If I had not already put so much of myself into this organization, I might consider working elsewhere.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• One of the few negative consequences of leaving this organization would be the scarcity of available alternatives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normative commitment</td>
<td>• I do not feel any obligation to remain with my current employer. (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Even if it were to my advantage, I do not feel it would be right to leave my organization now.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• I would feel guilty if I left my organization now.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• This organization deserves my loyalty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• I would not leave my organization right now because I have a sense of obligation to the people in it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• I owe a great deal to my organization.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chen and Francesco (2003) adopted the above scales in their study. Dr. Chen shared the Chinese translation of the items they used with me. I used their translation in my survey for the Chinese managers. In their translation, all the negative statements in the affective commitment scale are reversed. One of my survey reviewers caught that and suggested that I make it consistent. I reserved the Chinese translation of these three items. Reverse coding was used for these Chinese items. Slight revision was made to this translation for customization to my study context. For example, all translations of “organization” to “公司” (gongsi, meaning “company”)
were changed to “单位” (*danwei*, meaning “unit”). Other slight revisions were made to the wording in translation based on the suggestions of my survey testers. For example, two survey testers suggested adding “*zhanye*, meaning career) in the first Chinese item to make it more clear to the survey participants. I followed such suggestions.

All research instruments are attached as appendices. The survey protocol, in both English and Chinese, is in Appendix D. Demographic questions were asked at the beginning of the survey. All items except those of organizational commitment were used in five-point scales.

To validate the survey instruments before formal data collection, I assessed the face validity of the survey scales with the assistance of five bilingual colleagues. I asked those who were proficient in both Chinese and English to test out the survey, check whether the survey instruments assessed the intended constructs in both languages, and whether there was any wording inappropriate or inaccurate. They all replied that the Chinese survey was generally clear, assessing what it intended to assess, and consistent with the English survey overall. They also provided me feedback for improving the clarity of the survey, which were addressed to improve the face validity of the survey.

Along with the survey, the interview protocol is also attached. The bilingual interview protocol is in Appendix F. The interview protocol is developed around the dimensions within each construct and the relationship among the constructs, excluding organizational commitment, which was not appropriate to ask about in the interviews. The Chinese interview protocol was used as the guideline for semi-structured individual interviews during which follow-up questions were asked when necessary.
**Data Collection Procedures**

I first surveyed and then interviewed the sampled managers. I sampled all the 204 qualified managers. The support staff assisted me in contacting the 204 managers for voluntary participation in my survey and interview. No direct compensation was offered to the participants.

**Survey Data Collection**

The survey was hosted on a Chinese website of survey administration, namely *Wenjuanxing*. The survey took about ten minutes to complete. The managers could complete the survey either on a computer or with a smart phone. I offered to share a survey report later to the survey participants who left their email addresses, if they so desired.

The support staff in the corporate university contacted the training administrators in all the provinces, municipalities directly under the central government, and autonomous regions where the 204 managers were located. The training administrators then contacted the corresponding managers in each of the 31 province-level geographical units for filling out the survey. The support staff also contacted the two class managers of the cadres in the 6 cohorts, to ask the managers to distribute the survey to the cadres. I contacted about two thirds of the cadres who left email addresses with the training college by email, to recruit them for the survey. In order to get sufficient responses for the survey, reminders were sent to the cadres multiple times to encourage them to fill out the survey.

**Interview Data Collection**

At the end of the survey, the participants were invited to take part in a voluntary interview. The managers who volunteered to participate in the interview left me contact information so that we were able to arrange a time and space for the individual interviews. The
purpose of the interviews was to obtain greater description of manager responses to the survey and enrich understanding about the managers’ perceptions regarding the study variables. Seven interviews were conducted online. Four of them were done by audio call with the WeChat application and the other three by word conversation in WeChat. Each interview was recorded with permission. To ensure validity of the interviews, member check (Birt, Scott, Cavers, Campbell, & Walter, 2016) was used with the participants before the conclusion of an interview.

**Data Analysis Procedures**

Both quantitative and qualitative data were analyzed for answering each of the research questions introduced in Chapter One. Table 3.10 shows how exactly each of the questions were addressed. While all questions were answered by the survey data, the interview data also answered all but the sixth question.
Table 3.10: Ways each research question was addressed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Research question</th>
<th>Instruments and analysis for addressing this question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>What are the perceptions of managers about the value of training?</td>
<td>• Survey question 6: means, standard deviations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Interview questions 1-3: themes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>What are the levels of managers’ involvement in their corporate university programs?</td>
<td>• Survey question 7: means, standard deviations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Interview questions 4-8: themes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>How is the accountability of a corporate university program?</td>
<td>• Survey question 8: means, standard deviations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Interview questions 9-11: themes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>In what level do the managers commit to their organization?</td>
<td>• Survey question 9: means, standard deviations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>What is the relationship between managers’ perceptions about the value of training and the extent of managers’ involvement in corporate university programs?</td>
<td>• Survey data: Correlation analysis, regression analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Interview question 10: themes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>What is the relationship between managers’ perceptions about the value of training and the accountability of the program provided through their corporate university?</td>
<td>• Survey data: Correlation analysis, regression analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Interview question 11: themes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>What is the relationship between the extent of managers’ involvement in their corporate university programs and the accountability of the corporate university program?</td>
<td>• Survey data: Correlation analysis, regression analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Interview question 12: themes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>What is the relationship between managers’ perceptions of the value of training and the extent of their involvement in corporate university programs together and the accountability of the corporate university program?</td>
<td>• Survey data: regression</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In terms of the trustworthiness of the participant responses, all the valid responses are deemed trustworthy for this study. The whole research population worked in an organization overseen by the Chinese governments. Participants did show concern for participating in the present study administered by a foreign university, which could lead them to disobey any explicit or implicit rules at work. That was an important reason why the study failed to attract more participants. The managers who decided to participate in the survey and the interviews knew well the confidentiality promise of the study, while mostly deeming it a task assigned by their organization. One sign that showed that the managers were generally honest in providing their responses was that, when answering the survey items about organizational commitment, they did provide some low ratings. That is, there was variation among their responses to those questions items. A portion of the participants volunteered for the study because they were grateful to the training college or were just willing to share. Considering all such context, the responses from the research participants were judged as trustworthy overall for the study.

**Survey Data Analysis**

I analyzed the quantitative data from the survey using SPSS 24. In dealing with missing data in the surveys, mean values substituted blank responses, since mean imputation is a dominant method used to replace missing data (Cheema, 2014). There was one non-attentive
survey response. That is, in this response, half scales were given the same answer choices. Because deleting these non-careful responses may introduce bias in descriptive analyses (Anduiza & Galais, 2016) and threatens external validity (Berinsky, Margolis, & Sances, 2016), such a response was kept for the analysis.

Means of the data for each study variable were calculated to show the general pattern. Reliability of the survey scales were analyzed. Exploratory factor analysis (EFA) was conducted to validate the scales of managers’ perceptions about the value of training, managers’ involvement in corporate university programs, and the accountability of the corporate university program from managers’ viewpoint. Because the survey received 87 valid responses, it was not large enough for a confirmative factor analysis (CFA), which usually requires at least 150-200 samples. Therefore, an EFA was also conducted to validate the scale of managers’ commitment to the organization. Where a relational question is asked, correlation and regression analysis were conducted to address it.

**Interview Data Analysis**

Regarding the interview data, firstly the interviews were transcribed into Chinese documents. All the Chinese transcripts were translated into English for data analysis and open access. I used Nvivo for Mac 11 to code the interview data. As intercoder agreement or reliability is a big concern for qualitative data analysis (Campbell, Quincy, Osserman, & Pedersen, 2013), I worked with a peer who is also proficient in both English and Mandarin Chinese to co-code the bilingual transcripts. First, we each coded one interview and compared our coding. I coded the transcript based on emergent themes, while my peer relied more on the framework provided in my interview protocol. With additional recognition that some of our coding nodes were covering different levels of details, we co-developed an initial coding scheme.
that includes parent codes, child codes, and definitions of the codes. With this coding scheme, we recoded that interview transcript together. Then we each coded another two interviews with the coding scheme and met to compare our coding. We discussed and resolved any difference in our coding again and further enhanced the coding scheme. This cycle repeated twice more for the rest four of our interview transcripts. Each time we separately coded, compared, and discussed our coding of two interview transcripts. After we mutually agreed on all coding of the seven interview transcripts, I analyzed the patterns across all the coding nodes.

During data analysis, more weight was given to the findings from the survey data since the survey was the major tool of data collection. As stressed by Greene (2005), it is important to pay attention to divergence of research findings in mixed methods studies, beyond focusing on convergence. I noticed both general trends and differing opinions in the interview responses. It is important to clarify that the unit of analysis of this study is at the program level. Though the research context is a corporate university in a large organization, the research is mainly focused on the accountability of one program provided by the corporate university. Both the survey and the interview provided the chosen management development program as the common referent for the participants to respond. Generally, the data analysis unit is this particular program as well.

**Reliability and Construct Validity of the Survey Scales**

This section is composed of four parts. Each part reports the internal reliability and construct validity of one of the four scales. The results are based on the analysis of 87 valid survey responses. Across the scales of managers’ value of training, managers’ involvement in corporate university programs, managers’ perceptions about the accountability of a corporate university program, and managers’ commitment to the organization, there were about 2% values missing at random. All item choices of “not applicable” in the first three scales were also treated
as missing values, though they were not missing at random. It led to a total of about 7% missing values across the four scales. All the missing values were replaced with series means. After that, internal consistence reliability analysis was conducted, followed by an EFA, for each scale.

**Reliability and Validity of the Scale on Managers’ Perceptions of the Value of Training**

Reliability refers to the stability of measurement over time (Allen & Yen, 1979). Internal consistence reliability, which is based on correlation coefficients of internal items (Trochim & Donnelly, 2007), is widely used to explain the reliability of a scale. Cronbach’s alpha is the parameter of internal consistence reliability. Usually, a Cronbach’s alpha value of greater than .70 means good internal consistence reliability, while a value higher than .9 means quite strong internal consistence reliability (McMillan & Schumacher, 2001).

For the 9-item scale that measured the managers’ value of training, the Cronbach’s alpha is .701. That is, this scale had good internal reliability. Note that the result also showed if item 3 was deleted, Cronbach’s alpha would increase to .737. This item was not deleted for the sake of the present analysis, but it may be reconsidered for future research.

An EFA was conducted for this scale since the scale items were partially selected from the literature. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure of sampling adequacy is .756, which is above .7 and good. Bartlett’s test of sphericity has a significance value of .000, which is extremely significant. These two indicators show that the scale is appropriate for a factor analysis.

An initial principal component analysis showed 3 principal components with eigenvalues larger than 1. Therefore, 3 factors are set for the following EFA. After 5 rotations using the varimax method, 3 factors were extracted. The factor loadings are in Table 3.11. The cut-off point of factor loading coefficients was set at .5.
Table 3.11: Factor loadings of the Value of Training scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My employees do not require much training to do their jobs. (R)</td>
<td>0.855</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training activities for my employees about workplace behaviors are not relevant to the work I am involved in. (R)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.714</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is useful to send employees only for training about products. (R)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My employees take the time of training as an opportunity to be away from work. (R)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My employees hardly take training seriously. (R)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.828</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My employees tend to leave the organization after acquiring training certification. (R)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training activities help in improving the culture of my organization.</td>
<td>0.948</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training activities help in building positive perceptions of employees about the organization.</td>
<td>0.942</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training activities help in optimizing the value of human resources.</td>
<td>0.898</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.
Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.
Rotation converged in 5 iterations.

The above table shows that the 3 extracted factors are very well aligned with the 3 dimensions of the scale that was designed. Therefore, as with the previous names, factor 1 is training benefits, factor 2 is employee attitudes, and factor 3 is training needs. Within the 3-factor variable, the first, second, and third factor explains 48.570%, 34.075%, and 17.355% of the variance of the whole variable, respectively. The factor scores calculated according to item-factor correlation coefficients was saved for further analysis.

**Reliability and Validity of the Scale on Managers’ Extent of Involvement in Corporate University Programs**

The 9-item scale of managers’ involvement in corporate university programs shows a Cronbach’s alpha of .883 and is therefore quite reliable internally. Deleting any item would lead to a lower value of Cronbach’s alpha. Hence, each item in this scale makes an important contribution to the scale.
The KMO measure of this scale is .841, which is larger than .7 and good. The Bartlett’s test shows a significance value of .000, which is extremely significant. These two indicators show that the scale is appropriate for a factor analysis.

A principal component analysis determined two principal components with eigenvalues larger than 2, while the scree plot showed 3 factors are also viable. A 3-factor model of EFA was run and an interpretable model that aligned well with what was intended in the scale design was formed. The factor loadings are shown in Table 3.12.

Table 3.12: Factor loadings of managers’ involvement in corporate university programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participated in identifying the needs of my organization for content of the programs to be offered through the training college</td>
<td></td>
<td>.848</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated in designing the programs to be offered through the training college</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provided content for the programs to be offered through the training college</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepared myself to participate in the programs offered through the training college, before they were officially offered</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated in the implementation of the programs offered through the training college, during the time when they were officially offered</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Followed up with the application of the takeaways from the programs offered through the training college, after they were offered</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provided in-paper feedback for evaluating participated programs offered through the training college</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provided in-person feedback for evaluating participated programs offered through the training college</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used evaluation reports of the programs offered through the training college</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.842</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.
Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.
Rotation converged in 5 iterations.

Referring to the designed dimensions of this scale, the 3 factors are named as managers’ participation in program evaluation, managers’ participation in program implementation, and managers’ participation in program development. The first, second, and third factors explain
67.146%, 20.727%, and 12.127% of the variable variance in the 3-factor model. Factor scores were automatically calculated and saved.

**Reliability and Validity of the Scale on the Accountability of a Corporate University Program**

In running reliability analysis and EFA of the scale that measures managers’ perceptions of the accountability of a corporate university program, item 3 was deleted for two reasons. First, it did not come along with any other items for forming a factor. Second, it lowered the reliability of the whole scale while any other item did not. In addition, item 3 was the only reverse-coding item in the scale. After deletion, the 8-item scale has a Cronbach’s alpha of .908 which reflects strong internal reliability.

For this 8-item scale, the KMO measure is .879. The Bartlett’s test shows a significance value of .000. These two indicators demonstrate that the scale is appropriate for a factor analysis. Two factors were determined in combination of the information from eigenvalues, scree plots, multiple runs of EFA with different extraction and rotation methods, and interpretability of the factors. Item loadings of the 2 factors are shown in Table 3.13.
Table 3.13: Factor loadings of the accountability of a corporate university program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The program achieved all of the goals it stated to its learners.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The program achieved some of its stated goals better than others.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The program addressed performance issues that were well known in the organization.</td>
<td>.679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The program addressed questions that would help me perform better as a manager.</td>
<td>.574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The program addressed performance issues that I did not know existed beforehand.</td>
<td>.556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The program improved the outcomes of the entire organization.</td>
<td>.778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The program improved the outcomes of employees in my department.</td>
<td>.765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The program improved my own outcomes as a manager.</td>
<td>.739</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method: Principal Axis Factoring.
Rotation Method: Oblimin with Kaiser Normalization.
a. Rotation converged in 12 iterations.

These 2 factors totally restructure the three dimensions of the variable that were designed. Based on the content of the 8 items, the first factor is named “Impact to the stakeholder” and the second factor is named “Impact to the organization.” The “Impact to the stakeholder” factor includes 4 items that ask about perceived effectiveness of the program as it primarily relates to an individual manager in terms of achieving training goals, resolving performance problems, and improving work outcomes. The “Impact to the organization” factor includes 4 items that ask about the effectiveness of the program as it primarily relates to organization-level matters in terms of resolving performance problems and improving outcomes. The first and second factor explains 75.379% and 14.776% of the variable variance in the 2-factor model. Factor scores were automatically calculated and saved for further analysis.

**Reliability and Validity of the Scale on Managers’ Commitment to the Organization**

In the process of running reliability and EFA for the scale on managers’ commitment to the organization, it was determined that items 2, 3, 6, 7, and 11 must be deleted for the purpose
of forming valid and interpretable factors. After deletion, the 13-item scale has a Cronbach’s alpha of .874 which indicates great internal reliability.

The 13-item scale shows a KMO measure of .831 and a Bartlett’s test result of .000, which means it is appropriate for a factor analysis. The items converged to 2 interpretable factors. The communality value of each item is larger than .3 and appropriate. The factor loadings of the 2 factors are shown in Table 3.14.

Table 3.14: Factor loadings of the scale on managers’ commitment to the organization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career with this organization.</td>
<td>.625</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not feel “emotionally attached” to this organization. (R)</td>
<td>.822</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not feel like “part of the family” at my organization. (R)</td>
<td>.778</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It would be very hard for me to leave my organization right now, even if I wanted to.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too much in my life would be disrupted if I decided I wanted to leave my organization now.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel that I have too few options to consider leaving this organization.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One of the few negative consequences of leaving this organization would be the scarcity of available alternatives.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not feel any obligation to remain with my current employer. (R)</td>
<td>.844</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Even if it were to my advantage, I do not feel it would be right to leave my organization now.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would feel guilty if I left my organization now.</td>
<td>.617</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This organization deserves my loyalty.</td>
<td>.849</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would not leave my organization right now because I have a sense of obligation to the people in it.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I own a great deal to my organization.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.863</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.
Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.
a. Rotation converged in 3 iterations.

A comparison between the above factor loading and original scale structure reveals that, 3 items under the original dimension of “affective commitment” and 5 items under the original dimension of “normative commitment” loaded together to factor 1 in this study. In factor 2, 4
items from the original dimension of “continuance commitment” loaded together. While there should be no controversy to name factor 2 as “continuance commitment,” factor 1 is named as “affective-normative commitment.” As Bergman (2006) reviewed, affective commitment and normative commitment consistently correlated in empirical literature and did not show great discriminant validity. Jaros (2007) further commented that affective commitment and normative commitment correlated even higher in eastern cultures. Therefore, it is understandable that the items of affective commitment and normative commitment were loaded together in the present study conducted in an eastern country.

In this “affective-normative commitment” and “continuance commitment” model, the first factor explains 70.197% of the variance of the organizational commitment variable and the second factor explains 29.803%. The factor scores were automatically calculated and saved for further analysis.
CHAPTER 4: RESULTS OF RESEARCH QUESTIONS ONE TO FOUR

This chapter is composed of two sections. The first section describes the demographic characteristics of the participants in the survey and interview. The second section reports results of the first four research questions, based on the survey and interview data analysis, about individual study variables.

Demographic Characteristics

This section is composed of two parts. The first part details the demographic characteristics of the survey participants. The second part introduces the demographic characteristics of the interview participants.

Demographics of the Survey Participants

The survey invitation was sent to 204 managers that were qualified for the study, as introduced in Chapter Three, in middle December 2017. After multiple reminders, 88 qualified managers filled out the survey by late January 2018 when the survey was closed. The raw response rate was 43.1%. One of the responses was generally empty, and was therefore deleted for data analysis. This resulted in 87 valid responses and a valid response rate of 42.6%.

Table 4.1 lists the number of valid responses, missing values, means, and modes in gender, age, degree, work years, and job department of the respondents. A few respondents did not indicate such information. As the table shows, a typical survey respondent was a male manager of 31-40 years old, with a master’s or a bachelor’s degree as his highest degree, had worked 11-20 years within this organization, and worked in an operation department.
Table 4.1: Number of valid responses and the average values of demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Work years</th>
<th>Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>Master</td>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>Operation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2 lists the distribution of the respondents in each category of gender, age, highest degree, work years, and the department that he or she was working in. In general, more than two thirds of the participants were male; managers aged between 31-40 made up more than a half of the respondents; the most common highest degrees were bachelor’s and master’s degrees; and most managers had worked 11-15 years in organization A.

In respect to department, the survey had an open-ended question asking in which department each respondent was working. The respondents gave a variety of responses such as finance, personnel, office, and so on. The responses were grouped into Education/Research, Finance, HR, Office administration, and Operation. More than a half of the respondents were working in an operation department; the next most common department was office administration.
Table 4.2: Demographics of survey respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>70.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>29.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>72.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest Degree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>55.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>35.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>43.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-25</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 and above</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education/Research</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office administration</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>51.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regarding locations of the respondents, Table 4.3 shows that the respondents were located in all 31 mainland China provinces, except Hainan, while filling out the survey. The geographic information was collected by the survey-hosting website automatically. Some provinces hosted more respondents, some average, and some fewer respondents.
Table 4.3: Province distribution of the survey respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beijing</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shanxi</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jilin</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chongqing</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shandong</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yunnan</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guizhou</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neimenggu</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heilongjiang</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anhui</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaanxi</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liaoning</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunan</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tianjin</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gansu</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jiangsu</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xinjiang</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhejiang</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guangxi</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hebei</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fujian</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qinghai</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ningxia</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shandong</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shanghai</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jiangxi</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xizang</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hubei</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sichuan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guangdong</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above demographic patterns were similar with that of the 204 managers introduced in Chapter Three in gender, age, work years, and geographic locations. Department information was not available about the population. Further statistical examination was conducted to ensure the sample well represented the population.
Wang, Feng, and Tian (2015) proposed to combine the statistical perspective of relying on probability sampling and a competing one of examining whether some variables have similar distribution in a sample and in its population, to ensure sample representativeness (p. 88). As Wang, et al. introduced, according to the second perspective centered on similar structures, one approach to conduct an ex post assessment is to calculate the test coefficient of mean representativeness for each possible variable (p. 90). The test coefficient of mean representativeness is defined as:

$$\text{Mean representativeness} = \frac{\mu - \bar{X}}{\mu} \times 100\% \text{ (p. 91).}$$

It is commonly required for such coefficients to be controlled within ±2% or ±3% (Li, 2006, p. 157). According to the introduced formula, such coefficients were calculated for gender, age, degree, and work years of the 87 survey participants compared to the 204 managers in the population, as shown in Table 4.4.

**Table 4.4: Survey sample representativeness**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample mean ($\mu$)</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Work years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 (Male)</td>
<td>3 (31-40 years old)</td>
<td>2.51 (Master)</td>
<td>4 (16-20 years)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population mean ($\bar{X}$)</td>
<td>1 (Male)</td>
<td>3 (31-40 years old)</td>
<td>2.31 (Bachelor)</td>
<td>4 (16-20 years)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean representativeness</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>7.97%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As Table 4.4 displays, the sample representativeness is nearly perfect in gender, age, and work years of the managers. In terms of a highest degree, the sample did not represent the population too well given that an average sampled manager was more likely to hold a master’s degree, while an average manager in the population was more likely to hold a bachelor’s. Thus, it seems the managers who filled out the survey were the ones who had lightly higher degrees in the population. Overall, since the sample represented the population quite well in three out of the four demographic indicators, it was considered that the sample represented the population well.

It is worth mentioning here that it was not applicable to use another statistical approach, that is, t-tests, for examining the survey sample representativeness in the current study. To
employ a t-test, two groups of data must fit with several assumptions. For one thing, a single-sample t-test requires the two groups of data to be collected from exactly a same sample. For another, an independent-sample t-test requires the two groups of data to be collected from two totally different samples. In the present study, the surveyed managers were a sample from the whole population, which did not qualify either of these two requirements. Therefore, it was inappropriate to use a t-test to compare means between the sample and the population.

**Demographics of the Interview Participants**

Table 4.5 lists the gender, job grade, and province of each of the interviewees. Among the 87 effective survey respondents, 7 participated in individual interviews. Among the 7 interviewees, only 1 was female; the other 6 were male. Only 1 was an associate-division-level cadre, the other 6 were all group-level cadres. They were from seven different provinces.

Table 4.5: Demographics of interviewees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewee</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Job Grade</th>
<th>Province</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Group level</td>
<td>Heilongjiang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Associate division level</td>
<td>Shandong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Group level</td>
<td>Neimenggu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Group level</td>
<td>Xinjiang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Group level</td>
<td>Shanxi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Group level</td>
<td>Yunnan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Group level</td>
<td>Liaoning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At least five of the seven interviewees stated that they attended the program in 2015. In terms of the background of participating in the program, as one of the interviewees mentioned, she was arranged by her unit to attend this training class for the purpose of transferring her into the province bureau. After she returned upon finishing the training she moved to the province bureau as a higher-level cadre. A few other interviewees mentioned about similar backgrounds for participating in this training program.
In summary, the survey participant demographics well represented that of the population. The interviewee demographics represented that of the survey participants to an acceptable extent. The survey demographic indicators were coded as dummy variables for regression analysis with the four core variables of the study to answer the relational research questions.

**Results of Research Questions One to Four**

This section is composed of four parts. The first part reports results relating to research question one on managers’ perceptions about the value of training. The second part reports results related to research question two about managers’ extent of involvement in the corporate university programs. The third part reports results related to research question three on the accountability of the corporate university program. The fourth part reports results related to research question four about managers’ level of organizational commitment.

**Research Question One: Perceptions of Managers about the Value of Training**

The first research question of the study is: What are the perceptions of managers about the value of training? As shown in Chapter Three, the managers’ perceptions about the value of training are divided on three factors: training benefits, employee attitudes, and training needs. The following presents the survey and interview findings around each of the factors.

**Survey findings.**

Answering the first question requires seeing the patterns of response values across these three factors. Table 4.6 below displays the means and standard deviations across the three factors. The values in the table are calculated by simply averaging the response values.
Table 4.6: Managers’ perceptions about the value of training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Training needs</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>3.571</td>
<td>.771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee attitudes</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>3.785</td>
<td>.677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training benefits</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>4.113</td>
<td>.775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Value of training</strong></td>
<td>87</td>
<td>3.823</td>
<td>.501</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In general, the managers valued training to a great extent. Among the three components, the managers appreciated training benefits the most, believed their subordinates had positive attitudes towards training overall, and believed their subordinates had a moderate-to-high level of training needs. There was some variance about the value of training across the managers.

**Interview findings.**

The individual interviews provided more details about the managers’ perceptions about their subordinates’ training needs, training attitudes, and the benefits of training. Their perceived training needs of their subordinates were composed of two aspects: needs of work-task-related training and needs of comprehensive competency training. Their perceived attitudes of their subordinates toward training varied among positive, neutral, and negative ways. Their perceived benefits of training, if any, were embodied at the individual subordinate level and the manager’s work-unit level.

**Managers’ perceptions about their subordinates’ training needs.** Six among seven interviewees mentioned training needs of their subordinates for work-task-related content. All the seven interviewees stressed the importance of receiving comprehensive competency training by their subordinates, although this aspect of training came secondarily compared to the need of work-task-related training.

Regarding training needs of work-task-related content, the first interviewee said, “Talking about the group members who are my subordinates, they in fact, depending on the
nature of our work, our job positions are quite…um… they should need skills training in our positions more.” He further elaborated, “because of myself, the primary responsibility of our administrative office is, is for maintenance. Maybe our personnel are more in need of [training on] some of such knowledge and operational types, these basic skills.”

Similarly, the second interviewee said, “well, regarding this in our industrial departments, it may be that different positions require different training.” The third interviewee shared, “What the Finance and Accounting Group I belong to needs the most is training on the finances and management aspects, such as budget management, final account management, asset management, government procurement, and the usage of the accounting work system.”

The fourth interviewee mentioned, “The department I was in before, mainly use technology materials to provide services for various cities and districts. Therefore, it is mainly about professional work. We may relatively need training about our own professional work and computer-related content.”

The fifth and sixth interviewees shared very similar opinions. That is, overall, all these six managers believed it was very important for their subordinates to receive training related to how to conduct their work in practice.

Regarding the needs of comprehensive competency training, the first interviewee said that comprehensive competency training was “also needed, is needed. It may have not demonstrated to be, that is, like skills side, that is to say, as much needed as for the skills.” The second interviewee elaborated more about why comprehensive competency training is also necessary:

Because when the worker was in school, what he learned mostly was expertise, so these comprehensive competencies include the ability of writing, the ability of analysis, that is,
to view comprehensively the relation of your industrial work on the society and at the strategic level of the nation. That is the theoretical knowledge in this area, or some basic understanding aspects. Well, additionally, that is, some other comprehensive competencies. For example, the social, ah, or the ability to resist setbacks, ah, and the ability to get along with others. These areas of abilities, ah, are also quite important in a group.

The third interviewee also stressed that, “As government employees, these skills are indispensable qualities that we need to improve.” He explained, “I was trained in these respects while I was in the comprehensive literacy training program, therefore, I think such aspects of training are really good and quite necessary.”

The fourth interviewee advocated for training on comprehensive competencies for his subordinates as well, but emphasized that this kind of training would only be provided to people doing some managerial work in practice. He stated:

I think it was like so, that is, there was such a demand. But for a department like ours, ah, it is definitely that this kind of training would only come to whom that may need to do some managerial work. If, um, the professional workers are mainly doing professional work, perhaps they have relatively less access to such training. However, I have actually considered this issue seriously. In my opinion, training of this kind is also quite needed. But from the point of the unit, because you also know that training requires a number of people and funds, so such training for normal professionals will be quite little.

The fifth interviewee believed that “The need of promoting comprehensive competencies depends on the person. It is very much needed by management personnel.” The sixth interviewee asserted that some training on management ideas, styles, and tips would be needed for his
subordinates, which may be similar to what he had in the management competency training program. The seventh interviewee underscored, “The most important training is about executive capability. In addition, professional ethics and career literacy should also be the focus of training.”

Managers’ perceptions about their subordinates’ attitudes towards training. In the seven managers’ narratives, most of their subordinates’ attitudes towards training were positive. A few managers mentioned subordinates’ neutral attitudes. Even a few mentioned negative attitudes.

Six of the seven managers commented on their subordinates’ positive attitudes towards training. The first interviewee thought highly about his subordinates’ attitudes and motivation of participation in training. He said, “Hum, very positive. They are all, if there is a training opportunity, they all very much want to participate in that training, like that.” At normal times, his subordinates “would also propose some of their own ideas and that, they want, that is to say, they would express the kind of willingness that they want to attend some training. There were indeed such situations.” In terms of his subordinates’ pure interest in learning, he explained:

They want more to upgrade themselves. I…my administrative office, the people in my administrative office, I know them very well. And the nature of our work is like that as well. They really want to promote ourselves. In fact, it is not just about skills, that is, they also need to improve and upgrade themselves very much. About this point I think, just to enhance oneself, that is, how to say it, I may not express my meaning very…Or the words I used were not very appropriate. They would also think that our training is a personal enhancement to him. He would not be like what we think, say that he would take the training opportunity to go out, that kind of. It will not be like this.
The second interviewee stressed that his subordinates would all welcome training of comprehensive literacies or the kind:

Well, because they have too few chances of receiving training, so to speak. Among my subordinates as general staff, one worker may not get one chance of this kind of training on comprehensive literacies within ten some years. If he is purely working on professional work, ah, within the last three to five years, because we have a lot of new professional work, he would have access to some purely professional-work-related, or specific-task training. That is, training about maintenance of a certain automatic station, or on a certain communication technology. For this comprehensive literacy training, they basically cannot get. So, because I participated in this training, I feel, ah, in a new environment, then I had contact with some new classmates and some new knowledge. Although it was closed study for every day, but for myself, it was like a change of environment, like a vacation. So I feel like if our subordinates, ah, if he had such a chance, mostly he would welcome it. He should be like this. It should be so, that it is also welfare for the unit to give them this. I think it should be good, and they should welcome it.

Specifically, about professional-tasks-related training, the third and seventh interviewee both stressed that their subordinates were very interested in such training. The seventh interviewee said, “my subordinates treat seriously the training that enhances their capabilities or relates to their work.” In the same vein, according to the third interviewee:

They are eager to have sufficient time to participate in training about financial management aspects beyond completing their own work, and if they do have such
opportunities, they would cherish such opportunities a lot, in order to improve their levels of financial management.

The second and fourth interviewee both brought up an interesting point that, for training about professional work, in general, younger subordinates welcome it more while older generations seemed more resisting. The second interviewee explained the reason that, “It should be that, young comrades would relatively, I personally feel that, he should welcome it relatively more, because he likes new knowledge relatively more.” The fourth interviewee supported this point with more background assumption:

Well, I think like this, which may not necessarily be correct, that new hires may be more positive towards training. It does not matter whether they were prepared for long-term or short-term, then they needed to enrich themselves more, and needed to, that is, perhaps, after all they just arrived in a new organization, there was a big gap between what they had learned before and utilized in practice, perhaps they would feel such training was more needed for them. Then their attitudes would be better, that is, more positive.

The fifth interviewee expressed that his subordinates “hold a welcoming and positive attitude towards training,” but also complemented that the subordinates had different kinds of positive attitudes, specifically:

My subordinates have more positive attitude toward national-level face-to-face training; toward province-level training, half of them have positive attitude and the other half negative; regarding training at the prefecture or city level, it varies according to the pertinence and practicality of the content.
Both the fourth and sixth interviewee revealed that neutral attitudes existed among her and his subordinates. That is, many subordinates were neither positive nor negative towards training. The fourth interviewee detailed:

Then for people who had stayed longer, because they may have undergone a variety of training sessions and meetings, then he may, maybe, would not have that great passion towards longer-term training, such as that more than a month, because after all there were bonds from his peripherals, family members, and even parents and children. Then for training in these aspects they would find it too long. Then additionally, depending on how much the training improves his quality in the course of his own professional work, he may choose such training more positively.

The sixth interviewee interpreted his subordinates’ attitudes as that, if the superiors arrange them to attend the training programs, the subordinates would participate, yet, the subordinates would not actively look for training chances on their own.

Regarding negative attitudes, as previously mentioned, the second interviewee thought older subordinates had somewhat negative attitudes towards training than younger subordinates. He further explained that actually for subordinates of 50 or older, their attitudes were more towards negative. He offered his understanding about this:

If for the 50-year-old and above comrades to attend such training, he feels, I personally feel that it is more difficult. I personally feel that, because there may be some conflicting emotions. Additionally, in units like our grassroots, especially the county bureaus, there are very few people. Therefore, if a certain comrade goes out for training, the other comrades would need to work overtime, and need to do more work. Well, the comrades
going out should learn actively, and should also go for the training actively. Well, but in short, the contradiction between the supply and the demand still exist.

Apart from the above work-conflict reason, the second interviewee provided reasons also from the aspect of growth and educational background of the subordinates:

After a certain age, especially for us here, ah, about this, the people who started working in the seventies and eighties are all the kind of who have relatively low academic qualifications, he would have difficulties in accepting such training. This may have certain problems.

The seventh interviewee was more outspoken by commenting that, “Most of the training is arranged by the superiors and meaningless for practice.”

**Managers’ perceptions about training benefits.** Most of the interviewees recognized benefits of training at either the individual trainee level or at the work unit level. Six interviewees talked about benefits at the individual level. Four interviewees mentioned benefits at the work-unit level. One interviewee claimed no benefits at all.

Regarding benefits at the individual level, the first interviewee mentioned that the comprehensive literacy training program was very much a promotion for him. The second interviewee acknowledged that training in general provided gradual positive stimulation for his subordinates. He described what would happen for his subordinates in terms of participating in training:

After they went there, there would be a touch at that time. That is, it was at least guiding this comrade, ah, to be ideologically positive. But this thing, it does not happen overnight, nor is it effective for a very long time after attending such training. It should be an ongoing thing that would repeat after three or five years, or after training for three or five
times, or repeat every two years or so. Or like this, if such training can be continued for all the staff, it would be quite good. It should be a positive stimulus.

The third interviewee stated that his subordinates had much training opportunities, most of which was remotely conducted and covered different aspects of financial management. Regarding benefits, he said, “the first thing is the enhancement of management quality of individuals.” The fifth interviewee also talked about general benefits from training that “It provides greater benefits in enhancing personal technical and working capabilities.”

The fourth interviewee had a lot to say regarding the benefits of training for herself. Firstly, she gave an example of an English training program she participated in Beijing in a recent year. She described her experiences in and feelings about this training:

I feel that, I am particularly grateful for this class, because after I arrived at the training location, that is, what word can I use to describe it? First of all, regarding English, I need this aspect of training. In particular, it was not quite the same as my original anticipation, but when I went there, I would find, it would make you realize a different training method from what you used to have at college or during work. Firstly, you would become very interested from the beginning, and then because of the interest, you would spend a lot of effort and then work very hard to accept the training. Then the other thing is that, my training mates were probably from different provinces and cities of the country, because there was one quota for one province, and Beijing may have more quotas. So because we all came from different locations, we were very happy to have such opportunity to get together. That is, we would all talk about some, that is, share some learning methods and learning experience and mood. Sometimes the training mates would also talk about some things in our local bureaus, which broadened our viewpoints.
Not only in English, but also in ways and issues of perceiving things, there may be some differences.

Since this training program was such a great learning experience for her, she expressed strong enjoyment and appreciation for such an opportunity:

Then, I enjoyed this period of life very much. Although I was not young anymore, well, I cannot say that, perhaps for people, because after all I already had my family, leaving my own home for three months is perhaps quite a long time, but very, very special. That is, this training made me feel it quite enjoyable. I almost did not have time to think, ah, this, this training is quite meaningless and I want to go home very much. This kind of time was very rare. So I said, these three months provided me such, this training made me very touched.

Following this case, this interviewee elaborated on her experience in the management competency training program as well:

Then I’ll talk about a long-term training before this one, probably the training class you talked about, and that was in 2015. I also enjoyed that training and I felt it was particularly good. Why? Because the training we received formerly was mostly focusing on professional work, such as training about a particular technology, computer related training, and even some training about some software or systems that we frequently used. Yet, that training course really brought me different enjoyment. It trained from the point of view about how you communicate with your subordinates, then assign tasks, and then with your superiors, to report or convey some situations. Also, what was particularly interesting was that there were some lessons teaching you how to deal with media questions. How to work with some other departments, because of our industry, it may
cooperate with some other professional departments, to meet and discuss about topics. This training program would mention some such content. Further, we would think beforehand that politics may sound boring, then in my class, I was pretty impressed that, a professor was hired from the Hunan University. He taught that lesson in a super vivid and interesting way. Thus, it also made me feel that month flew so fast.

She realized the similarity between this management competency training program and that English training program in terms of how they allowed her great learning experiences:

In my impression, that training class was also like the English-training class I just told you about, that it chose only one person from each region including Xinjiang and Beijing, with a total of two dozen trainees. Then, um, it made up that a training class. Then it was also that people from every province brought you different feelings and information. So that class was also, we still have contact sometimes although we have been separated for more than two years. Then we would talk about our current situation.

She went on to talk about the special content she had learned from this management competency training program:

So I think that class was really not the same as the others, even different from the current English class. Because you know, what we have learned in school has always been English, math, chemistry, and something like this, or after you go to college, you learn some professional courses, and then you go to a graduate school and you will become more, that the expertise you can receive is deeper and deeper, but in fact your scope of knowledge is getting increasingly narrower. However, the training of this program is to train you what you were not capable of; what you needed but would not train yourself
about, or similarly how you deal with people, similarly how you face the media, and how
to speak in public places, and so on. That was pretty good.

The sixth interviewee also talked about the benefits he got from the management competency training program:

Primarily because it is a comprehensive literacy training program, there was much stuff you could have access to, including something on management. You could understand something, and then understand and learn it more deeply later on. This was the best. Because what you were interested in including some national policies and so on. You may consciously get to understand such stuff after coming back. It was definitely helpful to enhance personal aspects, but it seemed nothing for the organization.

With such recognized, the sixth interviewee asserted that training “only benefited us individually.”

Regarding benefits at the manager’s work unit level, four interviewees responded to a follow-up interview question that asked about the benefits of training for their work units or at an even-higher level. Three of them acknowledged some sort of training benefits for their work-units. For example, the first interviewee said:

That is, it made me feel more cohesive power, ah. That is, from my own aspect, which is about technology, let alone myself, all the people in our administrative office are the same. It is enhancement in terms of technology training. Then in fact the training we have now is for us to be able to better, be able to complete the work we are responsible for, and for that in the future we will be given more work projects and work tasks. Well, that is to say, it can bring us some, how to say it, because we mainly do some equipment maintenance, there may be some new equipment coming in, we will have some training
in advance. We are very much, that we have a strong desire to participate in this work. Why? Because only if we understand these things in advance, and then to understand some operation of its professional work in the future, the usage requirements, ah, the methods of maintenance management, ah, and these procedures, ah, to understand it in advance, will our future work be carried out more smoothly. More smoothly carrying out the work should be a kind of enhancement. It should be regarded as one. To complement about this aspect, that is to say, this type of training will bring great convenience to our work, or that the future development of the work will be more smooth…

This interviewee stressed that training benefits to his work unit is only slowly reflected. He illustrated his point with a case of training that he was attending when accepting the interview:

It is that such training makes us grasp, that is, grasp this more profoundly. Then some of the other training, including the fact that I come to Chengdu currently, we are having a seminar, which is a training session. It is equivalent to an understanding and discussion about the future trends of our industry. The content also covers knowledge expansion. Then in fact, it is also for conducting our future work, which is equivalent to laying the foundation for it. That’s it. If you say about how much revenue or whatever it manifests, this can only be slowly reflected. This is not to say that it can be effective immediately. I see this, can you understand? It is not the kind of thing that would be immediately effective. It takes a long time to manifest the effect.

The third interviewee said that training “accelerates the development of the overall cause. After all, the cause can’t develop without the improvement of people.” He also commented that, for sure, training “enhances the management levels of people” and “it improves their personal
abilities, which forms a basis for personal development. It also allows people to learn some advanced experience and knowledge about management.”

The fifth interviewee also recognized training benefits for his work unit but differentiated the benefits according to cases. According to him:

If the training is targeting professional work of generalization, then it promoted the administrative office quite well; if it is just technological training, then the effect on the administrative office depended on the management competence of the person in charge of the administrative office.

Contrary to the above three interviewees, the sixth interviewee clearly claimed that “Training has not benefited our organization.” What’s more interesting, the seventh interviewee stated, overall of training, “The benefits are not apparent, because systematic training is too rare.”

Generally, the managers valued training greatly. They valued training benefits the most. The interviewed managers elaborated different types of training needs of their employees and employee attitudes towards training, as well as training benefits at different levels.

Research Question Two: The Extent of Managers’ Involvement in Their Corporate University Programs

The second research question is: To what extent are managers involved in their corporate university programs? The survey responses suggested between-limited-to-average level of involvement of the managers in their training college programs. The interviews revealed more details about in which aspects the managers participated more and how.

Survey findings.

Table 4.7 presents the extent of the managers’ involvement in the training college programs. Specifically, it shows the extent of managers’ involvement in the program
development, implementation, evaluation, and overall. The managers’ involvement in the program implementation was the highest, close to an average extent. The next was their involvement in the program evaluation, and lastly in the program development.

Table 4.7: Managers’ involvement in the training college programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Involvement in program development</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Involvement in program implementation</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>2.724</td>
<td>1.047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement in program evaluation</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>2.669</td>
<td>1.104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement in training college programs</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>2.497</td>
<td>.840</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Interview findings.**

The interviews revealed the seven managers’ participation in the program development, program implementation, and program evaluation of their corporate university. Their participation in the program development included participation in submitting training needs and participation in training content development. Their participation in the program implementation included participation as a trainee in the training college programs and participation as a trainer in the training college programs. Their participation in the program evaluation included survey feedback submission, other written evaluation submission, in-person meeting involvement, other oral feedback provision, and use of the program evaluation reports.

**Managers’ participation in program development.** Three interviewees shared that they participated in submitting training needs. One interviewee participated in developing training content. While two interviewees rarely participated in developing training content, the two other interviewees said they never participated in such development.

The second, third, and fourth interviewees were the ones who had experience of submitting training needs to their training college. The second interviewee elaborated:
Well, about the development, because we are the trainees, we may be asked for opinions by them before a program is started. Sometimes there are “Three Aspects of Bringing”, such as what problems we’d like to resolve. But those problems may all have some universality. So, as far as that, they would solicit our opinions during this process. That is, about what are the views on this lesson, ah, I think that the trainees can make some suggestions. Still there are such opportunities to express our views, and we are able to participate. However, about the final design of the course, I think it should still be, from the actual point of view of the industrial work, overall designed by the upper levels. Our grassroots participation should still be limited.

The third interviewee also said:

The thing that we, the grassroots, could do was to provide our own training need to the training center of our local bureau, and then attend on time every kind of training, including training conducted remotely or in a centralized manner, etc.

The fourth interviewee remembered that she submitted training needs once. In her memory, “There seemed to be once, I did once, and it was also something like a questionnaire. There was only once in my impression. The others I should have been involved very limitedly.” She followed with more details:

At most, they may send out some questionnaires and then ask you about your need aspects. Then what kind of needs or how much needs, and then what kind of training can be provided. Mostly this kind of questionnaires and things like that. I may have done it once in my impression.
The sixth interviewee was the one who participated in developing training content once for the training college. He said, “I participated in one before. That was, I helped them with video recording of a training program that they did. It was us we made it.”

The fourth interviewee thought he was rarely involved in the program development. As she recalled, “Yes, I was less involved with things like what you just said. The planning of the entire training, and things like this, I was less involved. There was a dedicated department and staff to do this thing.” The seventh interviewee thought he almost never participated in the program development. As he stated, “There is one time every year the training college asks for opinions on the training plan, yet, we don’t take it seriously.”

The first and fifth interviewees were even more sure that they were never involved in program development. The first interviewee said, “I have not been involved” and “I am not belonging to the training college. Not in this area, I did not participate.” The fifth interviewee narrated similarly.

**Managers’ participation in program implementation.** Six interviewees shared about their participation in the training college programs as a trainee. One interviewee even participated as a trainer as well.

All the interviewees participated as a trainee in the training college programs, at least the management competency training program. Many of them had participated in multiple training programs offered by the training college. The first interviewee described the kind of training programs offered through the training college in which she participated:

Of the training college, I was involved always as a participant. Of course, in addition to the management literacy training, there were some other training which was once held in the training college.
They also belonged to some… Um, some were about skills, some were about management competencies. Some were, what categories did they belong to? That is, there was a kind of industrial training. The industry that we belong to, well, is rather special, right? There were some, some training that was specifically geared towards our industrial departments, which was some… Maybe you… For example, my major is engineering. I may get to know about the area of industrial expertise. That knowledge, after all, should be integrated. Some knowledge cannot be learnt by us in school.

The second interviewee had only participated in this one program, that is, the management competency training program, through the training college. He talked about how he was involved in the learning from the program:

Then about this implementation of it that you are talking about, because we are a training session, it was certainly spoken about and listened to. So it’s just that our listening should still be dominantly passive. As far as, in the regard of, some such interactive teaching there, situational teaching, interactive teaching, for those we all participated as required. Only like this.

He mentioned how rare and valuable for cadres like him to have had the opportunity to attend such a training program:

Because this training college, ah, that is, it had training in rotation once for the county heads of the bureaus, at the levels of our administration. Possibly it trained the county heads of the bureaus across the country in rotation for twice, but it targeted the county heads of the bureaus at the grassroots. For us at the municipal level, these middle-level cadres, there was no class in this area. It was a coincidence for me to just have such a comprehensive literacy training class.
The third interviewee commented that his participation in training development and implementation of the training college was very limited, since he mostly participated in the training classes of the training college.

The fourth interviewee repeated about her participation mainly in the management competency training program and the English training program she mentioned earlier, among other shorter-term programs she attended. She complemented some information about how the training college managed various programs in different venues:

Because the bureau also established several branch colleges in addition to the training college headquartered in Beijing, all such training was overall planned by the bureau, and for specific development, each branch college will report some demands. The training college in Beijing will arrange all the training depending on both aspects. It’s only that the training venues may be different. That is, some places may think this is better to be arranged by the bureau, to mainly host the training. The first cohort of comprehensive literacy training was in Hunan. That was the case, all were organized by the training college.

The fifth and the sixth interviewees also talked about their participation as trainees. Most of the participation of the fifth interviewee occurred before 2011, while he participated less in recent years. The sixth interviewee gave an example of the science popularization base training, apart from the comprehensive literacy training program in which he had participated.

The fifth interviewee was also the only one that had participated as a trainer of the training college programs. As he recalled, “I sometimes gave a speech for training about technology aspects in my unit.”
I followed up with two of the interviewees, that is, the second and the sixth, as the interview context allowed, about whether they had any other participation in the program implementation other than as a trainee, and both of them denied. The second interviewee clarified that:

Well, yes, because we were just trainees. Right, we would not have, and there should be no other identities for us, to participate. Because of that, because we cannot decide what course he is going to provide, or we cannot just change their teaching plan. Because of your teachers and other aspects are all subject to some aspects of constraints. That or if you say that which teacher is good, and we invite him or her, that is that, not realistic. Therefore, we should still be relying mainly on the college. We still follow their teaching plans, and actively participate in the lesson interaction or situational teaching, to propose something for us. The reason was that, it seemed if we were too active, because in terms of their teaching resources, whatever resources were available for them to use, or among our courses, they also invited some leaders from the Bureau at the central government level to lecture, or invited some professors from the local Party Schools to lecture, in this respect, they mastered the resources. On our side, we should still mainly be accepting it passively.

He explained why he had never assigned his subordinates to the training college programs:

Well, our department is an administrative department, so those were rare. It could actually be seen often on the internet, including direct registration, and also distance teaching. These all had nothing to do with our jobs, so we had not assigned our subordinates to attend.
Managers’ participation in program evaluation. All seven interviewees mentioned they once submitted survey feedback for the training college programs. Two interviewees submitted other written evaluations about the training college programs. Two interviewees mentioned about involvement in in-person meetings where they provided feedback. One interviewee provided another kind of oral feedback for the programs. One interviewee talked about his search for evaluation reports of the programs.

Regarding submitting survey feedback, the first interviewee said:

First of all, perhaps, usually at the end of a course, there would be some evaluation forms to be filled out. In addition, perhaps also, that is, after the end of our training class, within one year or two years, there might also be some, some of the forms sent by the training college to us, or the survey form, ah, that we needed to fill out. All those count. I participated in all of that. After all we participated in the training, so I filled in all what they needed to know.

The second interviewee shared a similar perception, “Regarding evaluation, it should be said that there were still questionnaires. Hum, yes, yes, for conducting some evaluation on the lessons.” The third interviewee also “gave feedback of advice or suggestions occasionally, in ways such as survey questionnaires.” The fourth to seventh interviewees all shared very similar information in this regard.

The third and sixth interviewees mentioned that they submitted additional types of written evaluation of the training college programs. The third interviewee said he reported “feelings and experiences” after participation in the training. The sixth interviewee said, “after the training program was over, after I came back, I reported about it to my unit.” It was “A work report. A summary.”
The second and fourth interviewees had experiences of being involved in in-person meetings in which they provided feedback about the management competency training program. The second interviewee detailed:

About this, the teacher also talked with us. Hum, I remember the last time, my teacher specifically came to us for a discussion, letting us provide comments and suggestions on this teaching outline. Well, for this class we had, it should be admitted that the college and the teachers did quite sufficient work in seeking the views of the trainees. It was quite adequate.

This class of us, like just said, for us the trainees, there are several times it asked us for comments, including lastly the college leaders talked with us. Because it was a new class, our cohort was the third of the management competency class, with two cohorts before us.

The fourth interviewee provided similar information:

The management competency training did provide such a chance in my impression. Because the training in Beijing was carried out by a university in Beijing, that is, we were put in the university, and the training was implemented by the university, we may have no chance to share the feedback face to face. At the end of the management competency training, we did have that a chance in my impression. Since, after all, we were the first cohort, then the provincial branch college at that time paid high attention to this matter, then they often host some, particular, um, conducted many activities. In those activities, they also came to ask us the feelings about these courses, or whether to make some temporary adjustment, and things like these.
Only the first interviewee had experience of providing another type of oral feedback about training. He said:

For example, the training I am attending right now, it would have a definite content or a theme. And for this theme, it might, for me, whether it has reached their, whether the theme reached its effect. This may be my understanding. For example, let’s say with an analogy. That is, if I went to school and was involved in some skills training professional tasks category, then after I came to the training, if I accepted the course of him very well, I would talk to him directly. If I didn’t think the course reached the way I understood it should do, or maybe what I wanted to learn about, was not demonstrated there, perhaps I wanted to learn about ten skills but it only gave me eight; perhaps in comparison to my expectations, it did not [accomplish what I wanted.] This may be a problem that I personally understood. If it was like this, I would also propose to them in person and make suggestions to them. I would say that, please see, next time you may want to add some content. Because from my personal point of view, I needed to understand this aspect of content, and they would listen respectfully and remember it. In this way, some of the suggestions could be reflected in the next time of training indeed, and they also really added the content, huh…

I followed up only with the first and third interviewees about whether they had used any evaluation reports of the training programs provided by the training college. While the third interviewee responded with a firm no, the first one said he did once search for such evaluation reports online, but did not go any further than just reading them. Regarding the reports, he said:
It would not be to us personally. It would be open on that website, or that content on the results and comments, in that report. This kind of report can be found on our intranet. But they would not, say, send this report to every learner.

Generally, the managers participated in the training college programs to a limited-to-average extent. They participated the most in the implementation of the programs. The interviewed managers elaborated mostly how they participated in the program implementation primarily as trainees, participated in the program evaluation primarily through submitting survey feedback, and participated in the program development mostly through submitting training needs.

**Research Question Three: The Accountability of the Corporate University Program**

The third research question is: How is the accountability of a program provided through the managers’ corporate university? The survey findings indicate that the managers gave relatively high ratings overall about the accountability of the program of study. The interviews revealed more details about how the managers evaluated, specifically, to what extent the program achieved its stated goals, resolved performance issues, and demonstrated impact on outputs.

**Survey findings.**

Table 4.8 shows the means and standard deviations of the ratings given by the survey respondents about the extent to which the management competency training program achieved its stated goals, resolved performance problems, and demonstrated impact on outputs. The highest rating is about the extent of achieving its stated goals. The other two dimensions received similar ratings. The variance among such dimensions were not too large, meaning the respondents had similar opinions about the program.
Table 4.8: The accountability of the management competency training program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extent of achieving stated goals</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>3.849</td>
<td>.632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of resolving performance problems</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>3.655</td>
<td>.646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of demonstrating impact on outputs</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>3.684</td>
<td>.591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accountability of the program</strong></td>
<td>87</td>
<td>3.730</td>
<td>.534</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Interview findings.**

The interviews revealed that most interviewees thought the management competency training program achieved its stated goals to a high extent, it helped with resolving some performance problems, and it had demonstrated certain impact on improving outcomes. In terms of achieving its stated goals by the program, the interviewees shared what they thought the program goals were, how well and why they thought the program had accomplished its goals, and how the program could be further improved. In terms of resolving performance issues, they shared about whether the program had helped with resolving such issues at job-performer level or work-unit level. Regarding demonstrating impact on improving outcomes, they talked about possible impact at individual, work-unit, and the whole organization level.

**Extent of achieving its stated goals by the management competency training program.**

The first and second interviewees shared their perceptions about the goals of the management competency training program. The first interviewee said, “It was mainly to cultivate the management competencies of some talents inside our Bureau, some outstanding people in various areas. It mainly, it did not mention any skills. In fact, its content was rather extensive.” As he thought of the program as “a kind of cadre management training,” he introduced some of the content:
There was management kind of, and some expansion kind of [content]. Still other content belonged to how to communicate. Additionally, there might have been some content including how a person should do if his/her position was promoted later. Mostly such content.

The second interviewee perceived the program as “a shift for cadres at the group-level to the division level” and believed “Therefore, its training goal should be higher than that for the group-level cadres.” In details:

That is, those who went for that training were basically group-level cadres. Um, most of all those went back for work, there were many of them, that they might have been promoted to division levels. Therefore, its cultivation goal was different from the group-level cadres, which was at a higher level.

As he recalled, after the program, “there were also many classmates who were promoted to a higher position.”

All seven interviewees clearly stated that they believed the management competency training program had largely achieved its stated goals. The first interviewee elaborated:

Well, I think it achieved its goals to a large extent. In fact, in my own understanding, I understood what the training aimed for. Then when I was in the class, including after class, including some time after our training, there would be some contact and communication, well, among us, the learners. I personally feel the training this time, as far as the training I attended, in fact, to a large extent, it should be to a large extent, that it achieved its goals. I think it achieved. And to speak from our learner viewpoints, I personally, others may [disagree]—I did not discuss these ideas with them. I benefited a lot, greatly.
The second interviewee had similar thoughts:

I think at least, I felt that above eighty percent, we should say it achieved its stated goals. It should be counted as it achieved quite well. Hum, we were the third cohort, and they had been constantly modifying the teaching materials with the teacher, since the earlier cohorts, it constantly adjusted the instructors and teaching approaches, while also adjusting the content of teaching. Then, about this, during the teaching, they also deepened the connections among the students through the construction of WeChat groups and such ways. So, in our class, most were young, while I was considered older. That later on, in our WeChat group, there have often been classmates speaking, and exchanging. In our respective jobs, we still maintain the kind of feeling of learning, all the time. A lot is still going on. Therefore, for this, many of the classmates also felt great gain after this class. So I felt that, its teaching purposes, ah, were reached at least 80% and above, which should be quite high.

The third interviewee thought the program was very effective in achieving its goals:

Actually, the management competency training class was a training program targeting the youth cadres in different regions in nature, and it was also cultivating a batch of division-level reserved cadres for each region. Among those who participated in the training in every place, many got promoted to key positions. Of course, this also depended on the numbers of leader positions in different regions. Overall, the program was very effective. It was very meaningful for thoroughly implementing and executing the strategies and policies of the Bureau of the country.

The fourth interviewee thought “that training achieved its intended goals very well” and shared her personal feelings further:
This management competency training was different from all our previous training. It did not train your professional capabilities. It may focus on some management competencies you need in a leading position. Particularly something that, I was impressed, you know that for example, when cadres are facing media, it seemed that, that is, there were some problems in Zhejiang, the media said something, then the bureau realized at once that, in public, [speaking should be more professional.]

Then specifically focusing on this aspect, the class replayed that event, and then gave us some professional exposition. Then additionally, we had something similar to a role simulation. What deeply impressed everyone was the simulation. That is, they asked us to prepare something similar to role simulation, or they also hosted a simulative press briefing. So for problems like these, problems on such aspects, we usually may not have access to all kinds of training. Because, for example, we would mainly have a general direction of our training. Normally in terms of training, such as that, for example, training targeting on specific professional work, possibly they would say it is training about GIS, or MAS system training. Therefore, the kind of training such as this management competency training, it mainly targets on your comprehensive competencies. As I just said, it taught you about how you can better decompose this thing after it was arranged to your department, and then, let your departmental colleagues to finish the work better, and then how you can play a connecting role better. Then, how to communicate with the outside, even that, how to, with your parallel departments, that is, other departments of the system, how should you all work together to complete the tasks. Then, I felt it was really great. Anyway, I have only participated in such a management competency training for just one time in so many years.
The fifth interviewee reflected:

For me, this was quite systematic training on management competencies, especially in organizational management aspect. This training made me transform from previously experiential management to relatively standardized, normalized, and systematic management thought approaches. After the training class, when comparing the problems in work existed before, it is quite clear now to find out the reasons that caused the problems, and I also pay attention to avoid in work any contradiction and problems occurred because of management. Compared to before, I can view the social life and some problems that exist in the work of the organization at a more macroscopic level. Now I also pay quite some attention to learning some knowledge about organizational management. It was truly and hugely beneficial for me to participate in the training offered by the training college.

The sixth interviewee thought the program “about 80%” achieved its stated goals. The seven interviewee elaborated a little more:

This is a very meaningful training. It has certain effect on improving theoretical knowledge and practicing capabilities of execution and overall planning. Moreover, I got to know a group of colleagues with similar qualifications and of similar ages. It should be counted as having attained 90% of its stated goals.

Only the sixth and the seven interviewees talked about space for improvement of the program regarding goal achievement. As the sixth interviewee stated, regarding potential improvement:
The first is the training period. I felt the training time was still too short. Moreover, the competence of the instructors they hired from outside was fine, yet, the competence of the instructors inside the training college was a little bit worse.

In his opinion, “The instructors hired from outside prepared more sufficiently; the internal instructors did not prepare as sufficiently.”

The seventh interviewee thought, for the program, “Its deficiency is that its schedule was too tight to allow the audience to gain in-depth knowledge.”

**Extent of resolving performance problems by the CL program.** Some of the interviewees thought the management competency training program had helped resolving performance problems at the individual job-performer level or the work-unit level. There were also a few interviewees who thought the program did not help with performance problem resolution for the work units or at any level at all.

The second, third, fifth, and sixth interviewees were the ones who were able to observe resolution of performance problems at the individual-level, resulting from the management competency training program. The second interviewee firstly stressed that the influence of the program was not immediate:

It should be said that it would not solve some problems immediately. It is because that, after all it only cultivated me, that is, there was only me who attended this training class. I could only apply what I learned into my own work. In addition, some of them would only cause some association or some touch. Then you, how much you can directly, uh, this will not be getting effect instantly, though for sure promotion would be there. But sometimes the kind of habits of a person, ah, it would also restrict some of you, your play. You learned a new thing.
He then admitted that the things he learnt from the program might have affected his cognitive aspects of the mind, and indirectly led him to think about some of the performance problems related to his personal work. He gave a case in this respect:

To give you an example, this one, because among these curriculum, they invited a vice mayor to teach us a class. He then told us his experience in politics, that is, how to improve the methods and capabilities of leadership, such things. It should be said that the students enjoyed very much listening to it. With this, after we went back, it was very helpful for us to think about how to improve leadership skills. They also invited a teacher in the psychology domain, to teach us the knowledge of psychology. It should be said that we also felt it very novel. It was quite good to have something like using some phenomena of psychology, to see some of our own cognitive areas where there were some blind spots, or something. As for the others, there was also teaching of the history of the Communist Party of China, the history of the party. We now talk about some of the policies in the economy. Knowledge of this category, in the past, usually would not be taught within our own unit so systematically. So, they invited the Party school teachers or experts in this field to give an overview of it, about the history of the development of our party and our country’s economic reform and opening up. It should be very helpful for everybody to correctly understand about it. So, that is, this curriculum had quite much content. I felt it had quite a lot of content.

The third interviewee realized that a lot of the learning content of the management competency training program could be applied at his new position. He reflected, “For example, the aspects of communication and so on that you mentioned before could be applied.”
The fifth interviewee evaluated that, “For me, it was significant improvement for my management competence.” The sixth interviewee gave similar comments in terms of improvement on his management aspects:

Maybe the training program slightly improved my own aspects. In terms of my thoughts of management. Just like what I mentioned, after you came back from the training, you might go understanding much new knowledge about management. Some new management methods. You might want to understand that. Perhaps there was more in this regard.

He also thought this would make him adjust in some ways later on, in terms of his communication approaches and other aspects.

The first, second, and fourth interviewees were able to recognize work-unit-level performance problem resolution resulted from the management competency training program.

The first interviewee said:

There is quite apparent improvement. That is, for me personally, that is formerly, let me say, let me say my personal feeling. Let’s say it in straightforward language. Previously, it may be a feeling that, our administrative office was already running, like in track. That is to say, from when I took over this administrative office to when some professional work of this administrative office operates, many of its work was stipulated, as if they were prescribed actions. Then, we were already very much in processes and modeled. No matter whether I was on a business trip or at home, the operation of our administrative office would not encounter any obstacle. It was already like, um, we had thought of all that can be thought of. Then after the training, I discovered a lot of that, the processes we originally designed, including that, that is to say, some things we did during the time
when I was in the training, possibly some solutions, were not very reasonable. After I returned, we also made some adjustments.

For example, possible… Take a drawn flow chart that I saw as an example. Maybe I saw it at that time and felt it was very well drawn. However, after I finished the training, I had a deeper understanding. Then if I relook at the flow that we drew about, I felt that many of the processes were not connected. It did not constitute the kind of loop that we anticipated. In other words, if it was a machinery, then at the time before my training, I would think that all the gears and occlusion, ah, or the use, of the machine I designed, was quite reasonable. Then when I looked back, maybe this stuff I designed had many places easy to get stuck. There were many unreasonable places. In fact, after we made the adjustment, it was a great facilitation to our work. The personnel in our administrative office could also feel it. In the past few years since 2015, in the few years, not only our processes, but also some of our flow, and also the operation of our professional work, have been much more smooth than before. And no matter whether our work increased, or whatever, that is to say, in our big one, this is equivalent to this process, or this kind of track. In this environment, no matter what task was assigned to our administrative office, we can always complete it very effectively and very fast.

The second interviewee stressed again that the program influence on work-unit level performance issue resolution had been a sustaining effect:

Maybe that old thing would still dominate, but you got to know something new. But there would be some distance from how you apply it, ah. So about its effect on the unit performance, I think it would be, just like this training, still a sustained play. It is constantly possible that, there may be change in a particular aspect this time, a certain
small aspect, or the perception about learning, or that of co-worker relationship. Maybe everyone’s feeling would be different. As for the performance you said, this thing is quite big, and also quite obvious, or what. Well, I do not think it would have such a significant effect. It should be said that anything, like this kind of training, would not have such a significant effect, unless it is a discussion of a problem or a reform targeting the teaching method, or a reform of the work methods, in which I would have only this one problem, and then we discuss it, and oh, there is a relatively good way you can get it back, and you can go to copy and apply it. This kind of comprehensive literacy training, it is training people, and to change everyone’s thinking and cognition, or to increase knowledge of a certain aspect. This is not the kind of thing that would get an effect immediately.

The fourth interviewee thought, “If you are talking about the performance of work, I think the training program was quite useful for it.” She gave more information about performance management in her unit:

There is a detailed management model for this performance aspect in the Bureau. Then I, after I finished this comprehensive literacy training, also, each of our departments would specify and allocate the performance goals to every member at the beginning of the year.

The sixth interviewee though, did not think the management competency training program helped with performance problem resolution at his work unit. He simply said, “Hum, none of that. It didn’t relate to that.”

Even more so, the seventh interviewee did not think there was any significant resolution of performance problems at any levels as a result of this program. He said, “It hasn’t shown apparent effect so far.”
Extent of demonstrating impact on improving outputs by the management competency training program. Four interviewees recognized a demonstrated impact of the management competency training program on improving outcomes at the work-unit level. One recognized the impact at the whole organization level. Three did not think there was any such impact at any level.

The first, second, third, and seventh interviewees recognized work-unit-level impact of the program on output improvement. The first interviewee shared:

What I can say may just be our administrative office, right? Well, indeed. That is, apart from our administrative office, for our entire unit, um, how to say it? Because our administrative office is also an indispensable part of the unit. And inside our unit, it can be considered a key administrative office. After all, we are the—if you understand about that industry, much of it relies on the devices. Devices need to collect data. Then we are engaged in device maintenance. Only if the maintenance of our side is implemented better, its precision is improved, will its data be reliable, right? And that, for data update now, we also rely on the data, and we will also rely on this kind of big data for work in the future. Of course, in our part, that is to say, we can ensure that the devices can operate safely and stably. We can maintain these devices fast, faster and or more smoothly, and adjust the device deviation well.

Regarding this, in fact, in recent years, our administrative office, I feel the amount of our contribution to this unit is also gradually improved. I can personally feel it as well, because when I wrote the work summary each year, every year I would refer to what I did in the last year too. Take the summary I wrote in 2017 as an example. I would take a look at it: What did we expect in 2016 for 2017, right? To what extent did we expect to
accomplish the goals? What can I accomplish? This would improve every year. About this point, it can be apparently seen in this administrative office where I am in. This is actually inseparable from this training. It does not mean that I rely on my work, one year after another. In fact, if you say that, before taking this training, perhaps my job was equivalent to that, that is, repeating, repeating and repeating. It was such work. Whether I did good or bad work may not have apparent manifestation. Yes, I may have some expectations for the next year, then, the extent of expectation would not be like that. That is, I found some shortcomings of myself. Once I made up of them, I found this new process I made, or this and that flow. There is a method or a means of dealing with things. Then whether or not this procedure is more reasonable, or it has some higher expectations. In this way, we are actually moving toward a better direction gradually.

He further clarified that, reflected in his work, the efficiency of equipment maintenance and the efficiency of problem solving was both improved apparently, because of the management competency training program. He added:

There was apparent improvement. Maybe this of my training was not directly related to the technical capabilities. Yet, some ideas it gave me, including some that I saw, perhaps some that I saw, and perhaps some other knowledge that I absorbed, can melt well in the work. There was great improvement. That is true.

The second interviewee shared:

About this, because the outputs of our unit, taking the positions of our office as an example, are to further improve our abilities to comprehensively coordinate, handle problems, and provide services. For these, I think the program was very helpful. Well, this, because it was training and improvement of management competencies. So, in
addition to the position responsibilities, there were some methods of work and some of the knowledge which could be directly applied to our work, still helpful. But it is difficult to quantify it. Because for jobs like ours which are administrative, such performance problems can hardly be quantified. You cannot quantify it, but just say that you feel it helpful and it is facilitating your work.

The third interviewee reflected:

There were two aspects of the influence on improving output, mostly on updating management ideas. One aspect was infused by the design of the curriculum listed by the training program per se. The other aspect was the result of communication among the learners from different provinces. The other was the change of management approaches, which could change some previous management approaches which could be considered as solidified. Overall, it really made tremendous improvement for the financial management of the unit.

In sum, all the management approaches should be on the same page with the policies and strategic deployment of superior departments. For example, in the directions of project application and the directions of finance management, there was a different extent of issues of being disjointed.

The seventh interviewee briefly commented that the program “sheds light in some aspect of technology innovation.”

Only the first interviewee was able to identify organization-level impact on outputs led by the management competency training program. He said, “For our entire Bureau, not only our unit, but even the departments of our entire Bureau, the smooth flow of this kind of data of work and the smooth collection will both be greatly improved.”
The fourth, fifth, and sixth interviewees were quite sure that there was no significant demonstrated impact on outcome improvement caused by this program. The fourth interviewee said:

I think it may, what you said about the output aspect, I cannot specifically say what it is. According to my understanding, this training targeted on teaching you how to better work in your position as well as to manage. Then, the performance appraisal of output may be more of that, in accordance with the overall tasks assigned by the national bureau, then you follow such overall appraisal objectives to accomplish them. If you say there is any extra work, then it is according to your unit situation. Anyway, I feel the relationship between these two is not particularly strong.

He did clarify that if there was any impact, it should be indirect, that is, it indirectly affected some approaches of managing subordinates, such as management efficiency.

The fifth interviewee believed that “The key of changing the unit is on the person who is in the main charge of it.” The sixth interviewee said, “I don’t think there was anything about this, given that this was a training program for individuals, which was talent training. It did not connect to the organization in that way.”

Generally, the managers rated the accountability of the management competency training program high. They rated the extent of the program achieving its stated goals the highest. The interviewed managers acknowledged that the program helped with resolving some performance issues and demonstrated impact on improving outcomes in the organization as well.

**Research Question Four: Level of Managers’ Commitment to the Organization**

The fourth research question is: In what level do managers commit to their organization? This question is only answered by the survey data, given that it was inappropriate to be asked in
the interviews. The survey analysis results show that the managers were committed to their organization to a moderate-to-high level.

**Survey findings.**

Table 4.9 displays the level of affective commitment, continuance commitment, normative commitment, and overall commitment of the managers to their organization. In general, the managers committed to a medium-to-high level to their organization. While the managers’ normative commitment was the highest, their affective commitment and continuance commitment were close to each other. There was medium-to-large variance among the managers’ commitments.

Table 4.9: Managers’ commitment to their organization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commitment Type</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affective Commitment</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>5.109</td>
<td>.980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuance Commitment</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>5.090</td>
<td>1.098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normative Commitment</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>5.329</td>
<td>.939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizational Commitment</strong></td>
<td>87</td>
<td>5.176</td>
<td>.766</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In general, this section has shown both quantitative and qualitative findings that the managers valued training greatly, they had limited-to-average participation in the training college programs, they thought of the management competency training program with high accountability, and they were moderately-to-highly committed to their organization.

This chapter has presented about the demographics characteristics of the research participants as well as the results of the first four research questions. While the survey participants were mostly male, with a bachelor’s or master’s degree, represented cadres from all the provinces of mainland China, the interviewees represented the survey participants to a certain
extent as well. In general, the research participants rated each of the four study variables highly or moderately.
CHAPTER 5: RESULTS OF RESEARCH QUESTIONS FIVE TO NINE

This chapter is divided into two sections. The first section reports results of the fifth to seventh research questions, which are about the relationships between every two study variables. The second section reports results of the eighth and ninth research questions that are about the relationships among three or four variables, as well as that from additional analysis.

Results of Research Questions Five to Seven

This section is composed of three parts. The first part reports results related to research question five. The second part reports results related to research question six. The third part reports results related to research question seven.

Research Question Five: Relationship between Managers’ Perceptions about the Value of Training and the Extent of Managers’ Involvement in Corporate University Programs

The fifth research question is: What is the relationship between managers’ perceptions about the value of training and the extent of managers’ involvement in corporate university programs? Both the survey and interview data answered this question. It is found through the survey data that the individual components of the extent of managers’ participation in the training college programs seem to be able to predict the managers’ perceptions of the value of training. Through the interviews, it is found that most interviewees identified a strong or certain relationship between their perceptions about the values of training and their extent of involvement in the training college programs.

Survey findings.

Correlation and regression analysis was done based on the factors of managers’ perceptions about the value of training and the factors of managers’ involvement in the training college programs, as well as their factor scores and variable scores, as reported in Chapter Three.
The Pearson’s correlation coefficient between the manager’s perceptions of the value of training and the managers’ extent of involvement in the training college programs is .185, which is insignificant (p = .086) in a two-tailed test. Of course, a regression analysis result between these two variables is insignificant, as well (t = 1.735, p = .086).

A further regression is run with managers’ extent of involvement in the training college programs as the dependent variable, and the individual factors of managers’ perceptions about the value of training as the independent variables. No significant relationship is found either, as shown in Table 5.1.

Table 5.1: Regression between managers’ extent of involvement in the training college programs and the individual factors of managers’ perceptions of the value of training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>-4.762E-16</td>
<td>.076</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training benefits</td>
<td>.097</td>
<td>.077</td>
<td>.136</td>
<td>1.263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee attitudes</td>
<td>.089</td>
<td>.077</td>
<td>.124</td>
<td>1.154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training needs</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>.077</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>.310</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dependent Variable: Involvement

Table 5.2 displays the results of the second regression, in which managers’ extent of involvement in the training college programs is the dependent variable, and the three individual factors of the managers’ perceptions about the value of training are the independent variables. This model is found to be significant at .05 level (F = 3.210, p = .027). Specifically, managers’ participation in program implementation is significantly related to their perceptions about the value of training.
Table 5.2: Regression between managers’ perceptions about the value of training and the individual factors of managers’ involvement in the training college programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>1.468E-16</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in program evaluation</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>.140</td>
<td>1.350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in program implementation</td>
<td>.160</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>.259</td>
<td>2.492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in program development</td>
<td>-.081</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>-.131</td>
<td>-1.264</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dependent Variable: Value

Three pairs of correlation analysis were done to examine which factor/factors of the managers’ perceptions of the value of training is significantly correlated with the managers’ participation in program implementation. It is found that only the factor of employee attitudes is significantly correlated with the managers’ participation in program implementation (N= 87, r = .215, p = .045, alpha = .05, 2-tailed).

**Interview findings.**

During the interviews, two interviewees identified a strong relationship between their perceptions about the value of training and their involvement in the training college programs. Three interviewees identified certain relationships between these two. One interviewee believed there was no relationship between the two.

**Strong relationship between managers’ perceptions about the value of training and the extent of their involvement in the training college programs.** The first and fourth interviewees identified a strong relationship between their perceptions about the value of training and their extent of involvement in the training college programs. The first interviewee agreed that since he was a very studious and very positive person, his perceptions toward training were also that he
valued it very much. He thought that it was quite good for him and his colleagues. So overall, he viewed each training program and opportunity quite positively. He paid attention to things in various aspects actively, including studying such training classes earnestly, including paying attention to its result report occasionally, things of such kind.

The fourth interviewee said:

I think they should be relevant, because a good training will produce great trust for future training. Particularly for, um, no matter if one works long or short time, I think it is so always. If you participated in a good training, and if the training is particularly good, then you will have a lot of confidence in the future training, regardless of similar or not similar training. Yet, like some training, for example very short, which lasts about three or four days, after you go to the training, when you feel you don’t have any gain, for training like this, that you have to leave your job, and we or you have a bunch of things around for you to do, you may not have too strong desire to participate in such training in the future. However, I felt good about the comprehensive literacy training. It made me like training a lot.

Certain relationship between managers’ perceptions about the value of training and their extent of involvement in the training college programs. The second, sixth, and seventh interviewees were able to identify a certain relationship between their perceptions about the value of training and their extent of involvement in the training college programs. The second interviewee explained that there existed a difference among the trainees of the comprehensive literacy training program in terms of their value of training and their extent of involvement in the training, but he clarified:
I will not say that, the deviation is so big. Because this class was a training class for youth cadres. Among so many classmates, ah, I would say regarding age, many were younger than me. Then for them, such states of being active and aspirant of them, since they were still at that certain age period, were quite adequate, and quite full of energy. It should be said that, the majority was still the case. It may be that once you reach a certain age, or faced with certain opportunities and threats, your cognition about training may not be like that. There would be people like that, but no, the number would not be too large.

The sixth interviewee said “There should be” a relationship between these two variables. The relationship is, “if there is such a need, if the training college needs me to provide something, such as some materials, or some feelings that I have from training, I would possibly provide to them.” He personally valued training quite much, since training “is a kind of improvement after all.” The seventh interviewee said, “If the training is closely connected to our professional work, I can resonate with it better.”

**No relationship between managers’ perceptions about the value of training and their extent of involvement in the training college programs.** The fifth interviewee thought that “Basically no relationship” existed between these two variables, “for the reason that I was not involved in the design of the training programs.” He added:

Personally I value training quite much. However, how much we participated in the training programs were mainly determined by the leader of the unit. Some leaders take training as a benefit or grace to the employees. Currently, the superior departments take participation in training as an indicator of performance appraisal.

Generally, there was no significant correlation at variable level between the managers’ perceptions about the value of training and their extent of involvement in the training college
programs. At the variable factor level, only the managers’ involvement in the implementation of the training college programs and their perceptions about their employees’ attitudes towards training were significantly correlated. Most of the interviewees talked about their participation in the programs primarily as trainees, and identified certain relationships between such participation and their perceptions about the value of training.

**Research Question Six: Relationship between Managers’ Perceptions about the Value of Training and the Accountability of the Corporate University Program**

The sixth research question is: What is the relationship between managers’ perceptions about the value of training and the accountability of a program provided through their corporate university? It is found through the survey that the managers’ perceptions of the value of training is highly significantly correlated with the accountability of the management competency training program. Through the interviews, it is supplemented that more than half of the interviewees articulated a certain relationship between these two.

**Survey findings.**

Correlation analysis found that the managers’ perceptions about the value of training is moderately correlated with the accountability of the management competency training program (r = .502, p = .000, N = 87, 2-tailed). Of course, simple regression analysis between these two variables, with the accountability of the management competency training program as the dependent variable and the managers’ perceptions about the value of training as the independent variable, found the relationship significant too (F = 28.566, p = .000). In the regression, the value variable is significantly predicting the accountability variable (t = 5.345, p = .000).

A further regression was conducted to examine which of the individual factors of the managers’ perceptions of the value of training predicted the accountability of the management
competency training program exactly. Table 5.3 demonstrates that employee attitudes and training benefits significantly predicted the program accountability. The second research hypothesis is supported.

Table 5.3: Regression between the accountability of the management competency program and the individual factors of the managers’ perceptions about the value of training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>-1.456E-17</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training benefits</td>
<td>.200</td>
<td>.074</td>
<td>.243</td>
<td>2.718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee attitudes</td>
<td>.430</td>
<td>.074</td>
<td>.521</td>
<td>5.826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training needs</td>
<td>.070</td>
<td>.074</td>
<td>.084</td>
<td>.944</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dependent Variable: Accountability

Another regression was done to see whether the individual factors of the program accountability significantly predicted the managers’ perceptions of the value of training. Table 5.4 presents that the program impact to the stakeholders statistically significantly predicts the managers’ perceptions about the value of training.

Table 5.4: Regression between the program accountability and the individual factors of the managers’ perceptions about the value of training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>2.255E-16</td>
<td>.058</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact to the stakeholder</td>
<td>.344</td>
<td>.098</td>
<td>.526</td>
<td>3.516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact to the organization</td>
<td>-.017</td>
<td>.098</td>
<td>-.025</td>
<td>-.170</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dependent Variable: Value
Interview findings.

During the interviews, four interviewees identified certain relationship between their perceptions about the value of training and the accountability of the management competency training program. Three interviewees thought there was no clear relationship between these two.

Certain relationship between the managers’ perceptions about the value of training and the accountability of the management competency training program. The second, third, fourth, and sixth interviewees were able to identify some relationship between their perceptions about the value of training and the accountability of the management competency training program in their opinion. The second interviewee shared:

Because that, I think that training is a continuous process, and then it cannot be said to be a process that would have immediate effect, so I attended the training, and even if my subordinates went to attend this class, and after he came back, I do not hold too much hope about how much his performance can improve, because it is a very slow process. Some people say that it takes ten years to grow a tree and a hundred years to bring up a generation of good people. There would not be immediate result of improvement after he took part in one training session. Neither should we nor is it necessary to hold such huge expectation. Because there is a daily routine, in fact, this training was only a concentrated education of his mind. Then more education may be in the daily work, then you, have this change. But these two are mutually promoting.

The third interviewee said it is “possible” for these two variables to be related, since “it is in nature that, personal attitudes are determined by personal needs.” The fourth interviewee was quite sure:
I think there definitely is a relationship. The reason is that although I may have taken part in many training courses since I was employed, there is one kind of training, similar to that of the management competency training class, which I may not forget for a long time. That is, it has these effects on me. It led me to [rethink] some problems in my work. The methods of dealing with such problems would affect me for a very long time. So I think there may be a lot of trainings after induction that I have forgotten that I participated in these trainings, and I may have forgotten about people in these training courses, but I may not forget the training of this management competency training class for a long time.

She affirmed her own point that there was a mutually reinforcing relationship between the two variables.

The sixth interviewee recognized the value of training quite well. So he definitely would like training to bring him quite a high value. Therefore, he treated training connotation and training quality with an admirable attitude. This would influence how he viewed the management competency training program. He added, “Anyway, there is a certain gap between the demand and the expectation, and the practice. I felt.”

*No clear relationship between the managers’ perceptions about the value of training and the accountability of the management competency training program.* The first, fifth, and seventh interviewees responded that there was no clear relationship between their perceptions about the value of training and the accountability of the management competency training program from their viewpoints. The first interviewee said:

Objectively speaking, for me personally, this training class actually affected more than just myself. It really affected my management of the entire administrative office, including how to cooperate better with the leaders. Then to be able to make a highlight of
some of our existing work, some of the routine work. It was indeed greatly helpful with this. This is, objectively speaking, not some of my subjective ideas, but that it was already shown.

He stressed again that he viewed the program mainly based on its outcomes, “This kind of results was already manifested.”

The fifth interviewee also evaluated the management competency training program mainly based on his gain from the program, not upon how much he valued training in general, as he said, “The management competency training program really helped a lot with promoting my management competencies, and I feel like it opened a door for promoting my capabilities.”

The seventh interviewee said “I can hardly comment on the other training” and it is interpreted as he could not see any relationship between his perceptions on the value of training and the accountability of the management competency training program.

Overall, the managers’ perceptions of the value of training correlated to the accountability of the management competency training program significantly. The quantitative results suggested that the managers’ perceptions about their employees’ attitudes towards training and their employees’ training needs predicted the program accountability significantly. On the other side, it seemed also that the program impact to the stakeholders predicted the managers’ perceptions about the value of training. Over half of the interviewed managers recognized some relationships between these two variables.
Research Question Seven: Relationship between the Extent of Managers’ Involvement in Their Corporate University Programs and the Accountability of the Corporate University Program

The seventh research question is: What is the relationship between the extent of managers’ involvement in their corporate university programs and the accountability of the corporate university program? The survey findings show that the extent of the managers’ involvement in their corporate university programs and the accountability of the management competency training program is significantly correlated. The interview findings demonstrate that more than half of the interviewees identified certain relationships between these two variables.

Survey findings.

The Pearson correlation coefficient between the managers’ involvement in the corporate university programs and the accountability of the management competency training program is .372 (p = .000, N = 87, 2-tailed), which means the two variables are significantly moderately correlated. A regression between these two variables, with the program accountability as the dependent variable and the managers’ extent of involvement in the corporate university programs as the independent variable, is found to be statistically significant too (F = 13.687, p = .000). The managers’ involvement in the training college programs significantly predicts the program accountability (t = 3.700, p = .000).

A further regression was run to examine the relationship between the individual factors of the managers’ involvement in the training college programs and the program accountability. Table 5.5 displays that both the managers’ participation in the implementation of the training college programs and their participation in the evaluation of the training college programs statistically significantly predicted the program accountability, conditioned on their participation
in the training college program development ($F = 6.424, p = .001$). The third research hypothesis is accepted.

Table 5.5: Regression between the program accountability and the individual factors of the managers’ involvement in the training college programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>1.135E-16</td>
<td>.081</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in program evaluation</td>
<td>.236</td>
<td>.082</td>
<td>2.889</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in program implementation</td>
<td>.265</td>
<td>.082</td>
<td>3.252</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in program development</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>.082</td>
<td>.590</td>
<td>.557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent Variable: Accountability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Another regression was conducted to examine whether the individual factors of the program accountability predicts the managers’ involvement in the training college programs. The model itself is significant ($F = 6.800, p = .002$), yet, as Table 5.6 shows, neither the impact to the stakeholder nor the impact to the organization significantly predicts the managers’ involvement in the training college programs at .05 level.

Table 5.6: Regression between the managers’ involvement in the training college programs and the individual factors of the program accountability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>-4.713E-16</td>
<td>.072</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact to the stakeholder</td>
<td>.217</td>
<td>.121</td>
<td>.287</td>
<td>1.786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact to the organization</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td>.122</td>
<td>.103</td>
<td>.641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent Variable: Involvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Interview findings.

The interviews revealed two different findings regarding the relationship between the managers’ involvement in the training college programs and the accountability of the management competency training program. Four interviewees identified certain relationships between these two. Two interviewees identified no relationship. One interviewee’s opinion depended on the type of training.

Certain relationship between the manager’s involvement in the training college programs and the accountability of the management competency training program. The second and fourth interviewees were the ones that identified some relationships between their involvement in the training college programs and the accountability of the management competency training program. The seventh interviewee had a similar opinion depending on context. Specifically, the second interviewee suggested that, to a certain point, the more a trainee participated in the training programs, the more positive he/she might be in viewing the management competency training program. He said:

The relationship should be there. That is, indeed, the more participation from such trainees, the more motivated the students would be. It may also have an extreme value. You let him participate too much, and he feels very tired, he would have a resistant mood about participation, and it may start to cause a reaction. So, proper participation, or appropriately increasing the extent of participation of the students, for example, making suggestions to the teacher, proposing ideas of improvement for the class, I think is helpful for the teaching.

The fourth interviewee believed that “Sure, there will be a relationship” and articulated that greater accountability of one training program provided by the training college would
motivate her to participate more actively in other training programs offered by this unit in the future. Here is what she said:

Regarding the training of the training college, if it is me, I am also in this training part, you see that it provides pretty good training for one time, then after that, I will trust the training offered by the department to a great deal. Then I will be very proactive and willing to participate in the training here.

The same with the other way around. She agreed that it is because that her participation in these training programs was very positive, she was more involved in the learning process, then in the end, naturally, her overall view of the management competency training program was more positive. She articulated:

Well, I think this is really very important and I may be like this. Because from my own perspective, there may be some people—I will not take the example of management competency training class, but use the training at the university in Beijing–there may be some people who felt that such training lasted a bit long and may have felt somewhat tired during their stay in the training, and may be a little tired of what the teacher taught. But for me, since I had a very good mental state at the very start, I enjoyed the whole process very much and felt good about its output. It’s almost like this. So I think a very optimistic mental state, and then that you believe this institute can bring you value [is very important]. Primarily that you must, especially from the very beginning, you must have a kind of feeling, that it gave you a very good–what is the word–very good, that it gave you a very good sense of treatment and gift to you in the first meeting at the very beginning, you will really like this training.
The seventh interviewee said “If the training is coherently related to my professional work, there is certain relationship.” He did not articulate it further.

No clear relationship between the manager’s involvement in the training college programs and the accountability of the management competency training program. The first, third, fifth, and sixth interviewees did not think there was a clear relationship between their involvement in the training college programs and the accountability of the management competency training program. The seventh interviewee had a similar view depending on the content of training.

The first interviewee said:

Well, about this I think, if it’s about attitude, it may have more to do with subjective things, right? After all, the training lasted only twenty some days. Yet, it was actually very compact. I would not say that, because I have more energy put into this, then it would definitely affect my normal professional work. I do not think I am like this.

My personal study is like this. Because I have the attitude of learning to study, just like that, I want to apply what I learn. I would firstly have that, for example I have expectation. That is, when I read the theme of this training class is I would certainly have expectation. That is what I would get if I am here. It may, it would definitely offer some set up of the course. Then I would think about what I will get from each course. I would also consider ahead of time what this would bring to me and myself, including the work of my unit. I would consider it in advance. In the process of learning, I will communicate about what I want with the instructors. I would have some exchange with the classmates as well.
Well, that is to say, I can say it like this, personally I feel, this training class that I attended is the most worthwhile for learning, perhaps during more than ten years since I worked. Because it was not just training provided by a teacher who gave you the training content. More is because some reasons that, the training participants were some colleagues in other departments from various provinces. Then among more than thirty learners of this training class, not many were engaged in the same class of work. Perhaps I was engaged in device security, there may be some doing office work, personnel work, and some from other professional departments. Perhaps all were not the same. In respect of such difference, in the past, when I worked in my unit, I might know better about what my unit was in charge of while I may not communicate with other departments horizontally too much. Well, in those twenty some days, we actually communicated with each other horizontally more among the thirty some classmates. Not only did I get to understand the other departments or the other administrative offices, and their work status, and some of the things that they were more inclined to do. So in fact, there was communication between provinces. When we talked together, we would understand about something in each other’s province. There was particularly lot of such communication.

This actually for me personally, why did I say it means significant improvement for my job? It may be because of that, my view was relatively limited in the past, only limited to our place, for example where I worked. Then later on, I found out that in addition to some things in the class, the results from some exchange also facilitated the work greatly. Many things that were comprehended by analogy. Perhaps my area of security, or with development, or with other professional departments, maybe for me personally in the practice, it does not have, um, direct connection. But after
communicating with everyone, you would find that some thoughts and some ideas of them can be brought to your own job totally. In fact, I feel what this training brought to me, and it is indeed the most valuable training I have participated in so many years.

Later, whether I will have more valuable training, I do not know. But at least for the moment, my personal feeling is indeed this case.

To sum up the first interviewee’s point, he meant that his involvement in the training college programs did not affected his overall view of the management competency training program, which was primarily based on his observation of the outcomes and personal benefits from the program.

The third interviewee just repeated that he valued training a lot and benefited from it quite a bit but did not identify any relationship between his involvement in the training college programs and the accountability of the management competency training program. He said:

From my point of view, training elevates personal abilities and provides a platform for people to demonstrate their own values. If there are more people like this, then it will definitely improve the management level of the entire unit. This was the way I participated and benefited, and I hope that there are more people in my unit who have the same thoughts.

With a similar meaning, the fifth interviewee said “I was just executing certain training of my unit” and implied he could not comment on the relationship between these two things. The sixth interviewee firmly said, “I don’t think there is a relationship.” That is, no matter which training program it is, the extent of his involvement in it would be pretty much the same. The seventh interviewee said that, for training that does not coherently relate to his professional work “there is no big influence.”
Overall, the managers’ involvement in the training college programs correlated with the accountability of the management competency training program. The managers’ participation in the implementation and evaluation of the training college programs predicted the accountability of the management competency training program. Among over half of the interviewed managers who identified certain relationships between these two variables, mostly, the more the managers participated in the programs, the more positive they would perceive the management competency training program.

To sum up, this section has presented findings about the relationships between three pairs of variables. Each relationship was examined independently. It was found that employee attitudes significantly relate to the managers’ participation in the implementation of the training college programs. The managers’ perceptions of the value of training significantly relate to the accountability of the management competency training program. The managers’ participation in the implementation of the training college programs and their participation in the evaluation of the training college programs significantly predict the accountability of the management competency training program.

**Results of Research Questions Eight and Nine**

This section is composed of three parts. The first part reports results relating to research question eight. The second part reports results relating to research question nine. The third part reports findings from additional analysis not corresponding to a proposed research question.
Research Question Eight: Relationship between Managers’ Perceptions of the Value of Training and the Extent of Their Involvement in Corporate University Programs Together and the Accountability of the Corporate University Program

The eighth research question is: What is the relationship between managers’ perceptions of the value of training and the extent of their involvement in corporate university programs together and the accountability of the corporate university program? Only the survey data answered this question. Table 5.7 displays that the regression model including the value variable and the involvement variable as well as their interaction explains the program accountability the best compared to the two other models. In the best model, Model 3, the managers’ perceptions about the value of training, and their extent of involvement in the training college programs, and the interaction of these two variables, all significantly predicted the accountability of the management competency training program. That is, the fourth research hypothesis, as introduced in Chapter Two, is accepted.
Table 5.7: Regression between the program accountability and the managers’ perceptions about the value of training and their involvement in the training college programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>F of Regression</th>
<th>Sig. of Regression</th>
<th>Sig. F Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>.502</td>
<td>5.345</td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>.448</td>
<td>4.939</td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Involvement</td>
<td>.290</td>
<td>3.192</td>
<td></td>
<td>.002</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>.540</td>
<td>6.240</td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Involvement</td>
<td>.349</td>
<td>4.117</td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Value*Involvement</td>
<td>-.351</td>
<td>-4.024</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dependent Variable: Accountability

Research Question Nine: Effect of the Level of Managers’ Commitment to the Organization on the Relationship between Managers’ Perceptions about the Value of Training and the Extent of Managers’ Involvement in Corporate University Programs, and the Accountability of the Corporate University Program

The last research question is: What is the effect of managers’ commitment level to the organization on the relationship between managers’ perceptions about the value of training and the extent of managers’ involvement in corporate university programs, and the accountability of the corporate university program? Table 5.8 presents the multiple regression results between the program accountability and the other four variables. There is no significant F Change from the first to the second or from the second to the third, or from the third to the fourth model. In addition, only the value variable, the involvement variable, and their interaction significantly predict the program accountability. Therefore, the first model depicts the best relationship between the program accountability and its two independent and one moderating variables.
Organizational commitment did not moderate the relationship between the two independent variables and the dependent variables. The fifth research hypothesis is rejected. The level of organizational commitment did not have a main effect in explaining the program accountability either, as shown in the Model 2.

The results of Model 1 in Table 5.8 can be summarized in a function. Accountability = .721 Value + .404 Involvement – .631 Value * Involvement + residue. The value variable was the main explanatory variable. That is, Accountability = (.721 – .631 Involvement) * Value + (.404 Involvement + residue).
Table 5.8: Moderated regression between the program accountability and four variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>95.0% Confidence Interval for B</th>
<th>Tolerance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td>t</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>.068</td>
<td></td>
<td>.743</td>
<td>.460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>.721</td>
<td>.116</td>
<td>.540</td>
<td>6.240</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Involvement</td>
<td>.404</td>
<td>.098</td>
<td>.349</td>
<td>4.117</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Value*Involvement</td>
<td>-.631</td>
<td>.157</td>
<td>-.351</td>
<td>-4.024</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>.069</td>
<td></td>
<td>.740</td>
<td>.461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>.723</td>
<td>.125</td>
<td>.542</td>
<td>5.802</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Involvement</td>
<td>.404</td>
<td>.099</td>
<td>.349</td>
<td>4.090</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Value*Involvement</td>
<td>-.633</td>
<td>.162</td>
<td>-.352</td>
<td>-3.914</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>-.005</td>
<td>.097</td>
<td>-.005</td>
<td>-0.054</td>
<td>.957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td>.071</td>
<td></td>
<td>.435</td>
<td>.665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>.716</td>
<td>.125</td>
<td>.537</td>
<td>5.750</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Involvement</td>
<td>.423</td>
<td>.100</td>
<td>.365</td>
<td>4.231</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Value*Involvement</td>
<td>-.677</td>
<td>.166</td>
<td>-.376</td>
<td>-4.082</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>-.014</td>
<td>.097</td>
<td>-.013</td>
<td>-0.147</td>
<td>.883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Value*Commitment</td>
<td>.158</td>
<td>.137</td>
<td>.099</td>
<td>1.154</td>
<td>.252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>.071</td>
<td></td>
<td>.415</td>
<td>.679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>.749</td>
<td>.131</td>
<td>.561</td>
<td>5.715</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Involvement</td>
<td>.405</td>
<td>.102</td>
<td>.350</td>
<td>3.959</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Value*Involvement</td>
<td>-.696</td>
<td>.168</td>
<td>-.387</td>
<td>-4.147</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>-.051</td>
<td>.107</td>
<td>-.047</td>
<td>-0.479</td>
<td>.633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Value*Commitment</td>
<td>.151</td>
<td>.137</td>
<td>.095</td>
<td>1.101</td>
<td>.274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Involvement*Commitment</td>
<td>.104</td>
<td>.127</td>
<td>.077</td>
<td>.817</td>
<td>.416</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dependent Variable: Accountability

In addition to the above, mediated regression was conducted to examine whether it is at all possible for organizational commitment to be a mediator between the program accountability and the value variable and the involvement variable as well as their interaction. Two simple regressions and one multiple regression was run, in addition to the aforementioned results, for this purpose. The bi-variate regression found organizational commitment significantly predicts the program accountability (Beta = .229, t=2.167, p= .033). The other simple regression found
the value variable, the involvement variable, and their interaction together significantly predict organizational commitment, as specified in Table 5.9 below (F= 4.766, p= .004).

Table 5.9: Regression between organizational commitment and two independent variables and their interaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>95.0% Confidence Interval for B</th>
<th>Tolerance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lower Bound</td>
<td>Upper Bound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td>.379</td>
<td>.706</td>
<td>-.126</td>
<td>.185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value</td>
<td>.466</td>
<td>.132</td>
<td>.378</td>
<td>3.534</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>.112</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>.454</td>
<td>.651</td>
<td>-.172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value*Involvement</td>
<td>-.368</td>
<td>.179</td>
<td>-.221</td>
<td>-2.052</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>-.724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent Variable: Commitment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Yet, the multiple regression that examined the difference between having or not having the organizational commitment in the regression model shows that organizational commitment does not play a mediator role. Table 5.10 presents that, in the second model, the level of organizational commitment does not have a significant explanatory role. The three significant items in the first model are still significant in the second model where their effects are slightly stronger. Together, they mean that the level of organizational commitment does not mediate the relationship between the value variable, the involvement variable, and their interaction, and the program accountability.
Table 5.10: Multiple regression on the mediating effect of organizational commitment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>95.0% Confidence Interval for B</th>
<th>Tolerance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lower Bound</td>
<td>Upper Bound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>.068</td>
<td>.743</td>
<td>.460</td>
<td>-.085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>.721</td>
<td>.116</td>
<td>.540</td>
<td>6.240</td>
<td>.491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Involvement</td>
<td>.404</td>
<td>.098</td>
<td>.349</td>
<td>4.117</td>
<td>.209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Value*Involvement</td>
<td>-.631</td>
<td>.157</td>
<td>-.351</td>
<td>-4.024</td>
<td>-9.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>.069</td>
<td>.740</td>
<td>.461</td>
<td>-.086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>.723</td>
<td>.125</td>
<td>.542</td>
<td>5.802</td>
<td>.475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Involvement</td>
<td>.404</td>
<td>.099</td>
<td>.349</td>
<td>4.090</td>
<td>.208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Value*Involvement</td>
<td>-.633</td>
<td>.162</td>
<td>-.352</td>
<td>-3.914</td>
<td>-9.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>-.005</td>
<td>.097</td>
<td>-.005</td>
<td>-.054</td>
<td>.957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dependent Variable: Accountability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Additional Analysis**

This part reports quantitative analysis results beyond the scope of what is asked by the research questions. The additional analysis includes: a) whether the level of organizational commitment has a main effect together with the two independent variables, without considering the interaction of the two independent variables, on the program accountability; b) whether the level of organizational commitment is an antecedent to the value variable; c) whether the level of organizational commitment is an antecedent to the involvement variable; d) whether controlling variables predict the program accountability; and e) whether the controlling variables add anything to the aforementioned best model in explaining the program accountability.

Table 5.11 demonstrates the result of the regression that examines the main effect of the level of organizational commitment on the program accountability, on top of the effect of the value variable and the involvement variable. No significant effect of organizational commitment level is found in predicting the program accountability, aside from that of the value and the
involvement variables.

Table 5.11: Regression between the program accountability and three independent variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>95.0% Confidence Interval for B</th>
<th>Tolerance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>1.133E-16</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td>.146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value</td>
<td>.567</td>
<td>.128</td>
<td>.425</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.313</td>
<td>.821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement</td>
<td>.334</td>
<td>.105</td>
<td>.289</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.125</td>
<td>.543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td>.102</td>
<td>.072</td>
<td>.447</td>
<td></td>
<td>.281</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dependent Variable: Accountability

Since the correlation between organizational commitment level and the managers’ perceptions of the value of training is found to be significant \( r = .322, p = .001, 1\)-tailed, it was interesting to examine whether it is possible for the organizational commitment level to be an antecedent of the managers’ perceptions about the value of training. A regression was conducted to examine the mediating role of the value of training between organizational commitment level and the program accountability. The simple regression between organizational commitment level and the value of training, with organizational commitment level as the independent variable, is significant \( F = 9.819, p = .002 \). Organizational commitment level significantly predicts the perceptions of the value of training (standardized beta = .322, \( t = 3.314, p = .002 \), tolerance = 1.000). As previously mentioned, the value of training itself significantly predicts the program accountability. A simple regression also found that organizational commitment level significantly predicts the program accountability \( F = 4.697, p = .033; t = 2.167, p = .033, \) tolerance = 1.000). On such a basis, Table 5.12 shows that the value variable fully mediates the relationship between organizational commitment level and the program accountability, since after adding the value variable to the model, the significant effect of organizational commitment
level in the first model became insignificant in the second model.

Table 5.12: Multiple regression on the mediating role of the value of training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>95.0% Confidence Interval for B</th>
<th>Tolerance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lower Bound</td>
<td>Upper Bound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>1.203E-16</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-.172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>.248</td>
<td>.114</td>
<td>2.167</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>-4.964E-17</td>
<td>.077</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-.153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>.081</td>
<td>.107</td>
<td>.757</td>
<td>.451</td>
<td>-.132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>.637</td>
<td>.133</td>
<td>.477</td>
<td>4.804</td>
<td>.373</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It also triggered my interest in seeing whether the level of organizational commitment was an antecedent to the managers’ involvement in the training college programs. Yet, the correlation between these two variables was insignificant (r = .069, p = .262, 1-tailed). So there is no point to test it further.

The rest of the analysis deals with controlling variables in relation to the program accountability. The controlling variables include gender, age, degree, work years in the organization, department, and province. Since these are categorical variables, the few missing values in most of the controlling variables were replaced by the mode in each of the variables. As for the department variable, there were 7 missing values which were coded as 0 instead of replacing it with mean or mode; the rest were coded as the dummy variables shown in Appendix H. Regarding the province variable, a north-south dummy-coding was used. Sixteen of the province-level regions were categorized into north and the other eighteen were categorized into south, mainly based on whether they are located in the north or south of the geographic line of Qinling Mountain-Huaihe River, which is a commonly used standard of division.

Then regression was run between each of the controlling variables and the program
accountability. No significance was found. That is, gender does not predict the program accountability significantly (t = .352, p = .726); age does not predict program accountability significantly (t = 1.322, p = .190); degree does not predict program accountability significantly (t = -.746, p = .458); work years does not predict program accountability significantly (t = 1.159, p = .253). Department does not predict the program accountability (t = -.153, p = .879). The north-south classification does not predict the program accountability significantly (t = 1.422, p = .159). An east versus middle west classification of the provinces was tried too, with the assumption that the east is more economically developed than the middle west. No significant effect of this classification of the province was found in predicting the program accountability either.

The last thing was to examine whether the six controlling variables had any effect on by-far the best model that explains the program accountability. Table 5.13 shows that, with all the six demographic variables controlled, the managers’ perceptions about the value of training, their involvement in the training college programs, and the interaction between these two variables still predict the program accountability significantly. The adjusted R square in the second model is .421, while the significance of the F change from the first to the second model is .000. The second model has an F of 7.955 and a p value of .000.
Table 5.13: Multiple regression with controlling variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>95.0% Confidence Interval for B</th>
<th>Toler ance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lower Bound</td>
<td>Upper Bound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant) - .710</td>
<td>.782</td>
<td>-.908</td>
<td>.366</td>
<td>-.2.265</td>
<td>.845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>North/south .286</td>
<td>.190</td>
<td>.169</td>
<td>1.503</td>
<td>.137</td>
<td>-.093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gender .090</td>
<td>.201</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>.449</td>
<td>.655</td>
<td>-.310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age .179</td>
<td>.259</td>
<td>.101</td>
<td>.691</td>
<td>.491</td>
<td>-.337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Degree -.078</td>
<td>.146</td>
<td>-.063</td>
<td>.534</td>
<td>.595</td>
<td>-.369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Work years .046</td>
<td>.116</td>
<td>.060</td>
<td>.398</td>
<td>.692</td>
<td>-.185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Department -.022</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>-.047</td>
<td>.416</td>
<td>.679</td>
<td>-.128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>(Constant) .198</td>
<td>.607</td>
<td>-.326</td>
<td>.745</td>
<td>-1.011</td>
<td>1.407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>North/south .291</td>
<td>.147</td>
<td>.172</td>
<td>1.976</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>-.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gender -.020</td>
<td>.154</td>
<td>-.011</td>
<td>-.130</td>
<td>.897</td>
<td>-.326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age .029</td>
<td>.197</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>.148</td>
<td>.882</td>
<td>-.363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Degree -.132</td>
<td>.115</td>
<td>-.106</td>
<td>-.1.148</td>
<td>.254</td>
<td>-.360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Work years .019</td>
<td>.089</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>.217</td>
<td>.829</td>
<td>-.1.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Department -.038</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>-.081</td>
<td>-.904</td>
<td>.369</td>
<td>-.122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Value .669</td>
<td>.120</td>
<td>.501</td>
<td>5.590</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Involvement .447</td>
<td>.102</td>
<td>.386</td>
<td>4.392</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Value*Involvement -.706</td>
<td>.167</td>
<td>-.392</td>
<td>-.4.226</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-.1.039</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dependent Variable: Accountability

The results of the additional analysis can be summarized overall. First, the level of organizational commitment did not have an additional main effect in explaining the program accountability, on top of that of the managers’ perceptions about the value of training and their involvement in the training college programs. Second, the level of organizational commitment was an antecedent of the managers’ perceptions about the value of training. Moreover, the value variable fully mediated the relationship between the managers’ level of organizational commitment and the program accountability. Third, the level of organizational commitment was not antecedent of the involvement variable. Fourthly, the demographic or controlling variables did not predict the program accountability in any way. Lastly, the controlling variables did not
add substantially into the model of the two independent variables and their interaction in explaining the program accountability.

In a nutshell, this chapter has presented both quantitative and qualitative findings around the research questions five through nine as well as for additional purposes. Through various comparisons of the different models about the relationships among the variables, it is finally determined that the value variable, the involvement variable and their interaction, predict the program accountability together. Further, the value variable fully mediates the relationship between the level of organizational commitment and the program accountability. The interview findings provide more detailed information for understanding such relationships.
CHAPTER 6: SUMMARY, DISCUSSION, AND IMPLICATIONS

This Chapter is composed of four sections. The first section summarizes the results of the study. The second section discusses the results. The third section provides implications of the study. A final section presents my overall remarks on the study.

Summary of the Results

The study has answered each of the nine research questions and generated additional results. The research results can be summarized as the following:

- The managers valued training very much. They attached the most value to training benefits. Most of the managers’ subordinates had positive attitudes towards training. The managers believed their subordinates needed training primarily related to their work tasks, and secondarily of management competencies. They thought training benefited the individual trainees, their immediate work units, and the whole organization.

- The managers had limited-to-moderate involvement in the training college programs. They were mostly involved in the delivery of the programs, primarily as trainees. They participated in evaluating the programs mostly through submitting survey feedback. When they were involved in developing the programs, they suggested training needs.

- In the managers’ opinions, the accountability of the management competency training program was high. They were the most satisfied with the extent the program achieved its stated goals. Some of the interviewed managers identified ways that the program helped them resolve performance issues at the individual-performer and work-unit levels. Some of them also identified ways the program improved outcomes in the organization.
• The managers committed to their organization at a medium-to-high level. Their three sub-commitments from high-to-low in their ratings were: normative commitment, affective commitment, and continuance commitment.

• The managers’ perceptions about the value of training did not correlate significantly with the extent of their involvement in the corporate university programs at the variable level. Only the managers’ extent of involvement in the delivery of the training college programs correlated significantly with their perceptions about their employees’ attitudes toward training, at the variable factor level. Most interviewed managers shared about how their involvement in the programs as trainees related with their perceptions about the value of training.

• The managers’ perceptions about the value of training and the accountability of the management competency training program seemed to have a bi-directional predictive relationship. While the managers’ perceptions about training benefits and their subordinates’ attitudes towards training seemed to predict the program accountability, the program impact to the stakeholders seemed to predict the managers’ perceptions about the value of training as well. The interviews also provided two-way explanations.

• The managers’ level of involvement in the training college programs, specifically, their involvement in the delivery and evaluation of the programs, predicted significantly the accountability of the management competency training program. The more they participated in the programs, the higher they rated the accountability of the investigated program.

• The managers’ perceptions about the value of training, their extent of involvement in the training college programs, and the negative interaction between these two
variables, all significantly predicted the accountability of the management competency training program together. The final model is \( \text{Accountability} = (.721 - .631 \text{ Involvement}) \times \text{Value} + (.404 \text{ Involvement} + \text{residue}) \).

To explain this model, when the value of Involvement was lower than 1.143, that is, when the managers had only low involvement in the training college programs, the value variable predicted the accountability variable positively. When the managers had limited, some, frequent, or high involvement in the training college programs, the negative interactive effect between the involvement variable and the value variable became larger than the direct main effect of the value variable, on the dependent variable. In other words, when the managers had limited or more-than-limited involvement in the programs, the value variable predicted the accountability variable negatively.

- The managers’ level of organizational commitment did not moderate the relationship between their perceptions about the value of training and the extent of their involvement in the corporate university programs, and the accountability of the management competency training program.

- The managers’ level of organizational commitment predicted their perceptions’ of the value of training, which fully mediated the relationship between the organizational commitment variable and the accountability variable.

**Discussion of the Results**

Five discussion points emerge from reviewing the results, which are discussed below. The discussion covers the accountability of the management competency training program and its relationship with the other variables, among others.
First of all, the overall accountability of the management competency training program was deemed high. The managers were generally quite satisfied with the program and gained a lot from the program for themselves as well as for their work units and the organization. Three of the interviewed managers actively recommended the program for others and more employees. For example, the second interviewee said, “making it [the program] a training program for all the employees, and let everyone have such a chance, would be the best.” He even made specific suggestions about how to manage the time of the program for different level of employees. The fifth interviewee claimed that “Management competency training should be included into routine training to employees or learning content of students. Lots of us lack learning in this aspect.” The sixth interviewee suggested to include more learners in each management competency training class, since he thought that one person per province to attend the program was too limited. Along this line, the quota limit for attending such programs was brought up as an issue by the fourth interviewee, “If you are very willing and interested, but there may be a lot of people in the middle, that is, there will be a process of screening. You may not be selected, which can also be a problem.”

The result of the accountability of the management competency training program shows the possibility and effectiveness of measuring the accountability of an HRD program. As Phillips (2012) argued, accountability has been an important trend in HRD (p. xi). The way the present study conceptualized and measured the accountability of a training program adds to existing approaches of demonstrating program accountability in HRD. Many research studies have shown “the impact of training when other variables remain fairly constant” (Phillips, 2012, p. 4). The accountability results of this study have also demonstrated the quite positive impact of the management competency training program, from the manager trainees’ perspectives.
Second, the ratings of the extent of the management competency training program on improving outcomes of the organization and resolving important performance issues were relatively lower than that in achieving its stated goals. The main reason is probably that there were many other variables than the program and the trainees themselves that could result in performance issue resolution or organization outcome improvement from the program. The fifth interviewee gave a twofold explanation. The major aspect is that the key of performance and outcome improvement was on the top leaders of the basic levels. As he put it, “A general without capability only leads soldiers on the verge of death.” Moreover, the middle-low level leaders in the organization did not have adequate competences to resolve important performance issues better than before, nor improve the outcomes of the organization. He said, the “normal cadres at the lowest levels are actually a rough group of people” who were “at the very bottom of the pyramid and the weakest in the political ecological chains and the managers nearest to the populace” and “seldom experience special training in management aspect that fits with their job characteristics.”

Third, the significant correlation between the managers’ perceptions about their subordinates’ attitudes towards training and the managers’ extent of involvement in the delivery of the training college programs may be due to the projection of the managers’ own attitudes towards training on their employees. The managers perceived their employees’ attitudes toward training to a moderate-positive extent. This probably reflects their own moderate-positive attitudes towards training. The managers’ involvement in the delivery of the training college programs was to a limited-moderate extent. Although they had almost positive attitudes towards training, they may not be able to attend too many training programs through the training college due to objective limits such as time and energy. The third interviewee expressed that there was
time conflict between training and work for his subordinates. This was probably also true for the managers. Some managers, such as the first and the third interviewees, did participate in multiple training programs offered by the training college.

Fourth, the best regression model reveals the main positive effects of the managers’ perceptions about the value of training and their extent of involvement in the training college programs, as well as the negative interactive effect between these two, on predicting the accountability of the studied program. The managers had positive views about training overall. The second, third, fourth, and fifth interviewees each shared specific statements about how positively they perceived training. For example, the third interviewee said, “training, on the one hand, can enhance the value of a person in a unit,” and “on the other hand, through the fulfillment of one’s own values, it can advance the level [of professional work] of the whole region, and bring along the impact of the unit in the whole municipality.” The fourth interviewee thought “different training classes bring you different benefits, and it’s only a problem of more or less, or whether it targets your needs.” The managers had quite positive views about the accountability of the comprehensive literacy training programs as well. Thus, these two were very positively related. The managers’ extent of involvement in the training college programs was positively related to the accountability of the program too. Yet, the two positive main effects were somewhat offset by their negative interaction on predicting the program accountability.

It is straightforward to interpret that, when the managers’ involvement in the training programs was low, the more positive their perceptions about the value of training were, the higher they rated the accountability of the studied program. Yet, it is not as intuitive to understand that, when the managers’ involvement in the training college programs surpassed a low extent, the more positive their perceptions about the value of training were, the lower they
rated the accountability of the studied program. There appears no literature to directly explain this negative interaction. Indirectly, in Nickols’ (2005) endorsement of a stakeholder approach to evaluating training, he stated, “stakeholders must perceive value in the exchange” (p. 127) of participation in training. That is, “From the stakeholders’ perspective, what they receive is of equal or greater value to them than what they contribute” (p. 127). It is reasonable that, when a manager participated in the training college programs to a limited or more-than-limited extent, his expected gain from the studied program would go higher than those who participated to a low extent. Also, the positive effect of a managers’ perceptions of the value of training on the program accountability has a turning point, affected by his expected gain from the program too. In such a case, the higher the manager valued training, the more easily he became less satisfied with his gain from the program. Therefore, the manager would consider the program as less accountable, than if he participated less. A quote cited from the second interviewee in the Chapter Five (p. 133) also gave a point that if the extent of the managers’ involvement in the training college programs exceeded a certain point, it may have a negative effect on how they view the studied program overall.

Lastly, the mediating model reveals the relationships among the managers’ level of organizational commitment, their perceptions about the value of training, and the accountability of the studied program from the managers’ viewpoints. That is, the managers’ level of commitment to their organization had an indirect positive effect on the program accountability, which only manifested through their perceptions about the value of training. While the connection between managers’ perceptions about the value of training and the accountability of the studied program has been explained, the connection between the managers’ level of organizational commitment and their perceptions about the value of training is partially
supported by literature. Bartlett (2001), in his empirical study in the health care field, found that “perceptive benefits of training are positively related to organizational commitment” (p. 335). Perceived benefits of training was the major category of the managers’ perceptions about the value of training in the present study. Therefore, it seems reasonable for the level of organizational commitment to be an antecedent of the perceptions of the value of training.

**Implications of the Study**

This section provides implications of the study in two parts, based on the understanding of the research results. The first part presents a revised conceptual framework of the study and its implications for HRD theory and research. The second part presents implications to HRD practice.

**Implications for HRD Theory and Research**

Figure 6.1 below presents the revised conceptual framework of the study. This framework has summarized all the research results. Each of the four boxes in the figure demonstrates the finalized variables and their factors. The arrows between and among the variables demonstrate the relationships among the variables. The revised conceptual framework represents three final conclusion points of the study:

- From the managers’ viewpoints, the accountability of the management competency training program was high.
- When the managers’ involvement in the training college programs was to a low extent, the more positive their perceptions about the value of training was, the higher they rated the accountability of the management competency training program.
Managers’ commitment to the organization
- Affective-normative commitment
- Continuance commitment

Managers’ perceptions of the value of training
- Training benefits
- Employee attitudes
- Training needs

Managers’ involvement in corporate university programs
- Participation in corporate university program delivery
- Participation in corporate university program evaluation
- Participation in corporate university program development

Accountability of a corporate university program
- Impact to the stakeholder
- Impact to the organization

Figure 6.1: Revised conceptual model of the variables of the study
When the managers’ involvement in the training college programs was to a limited or higher extent, the more positive their perceptions about the value of training were, the lower they rated the accountability of the management competency training program.

- The causal relationship between the managers’ level of commitment to their organization and the accountability of the management competency training programs was fully mediated by the managers’ perceptions about the value of training.

As promised in Chapter One, this study has implications for HRD theory and research. It contributes to conceptualizing accountability in HRD. It adds to existing research on corporate universities and paves the way for future studies on HRD accountability.

The study has formed the basis for conceptualizing and theorizing accountability in HRD at the program level. The professionalism of HRD requires more examination of the accountability of HRD initiatives. The definition and scales of measuring HRD program accountability established in this study can be used for future relevant research. While the construct of HRD program accountability was used in the context of a corporate university in the present study, it is surely worth exploring and expanding the term to other contexts of HRD entities. The two antecedents of the program accountability revealed through this study provide a starting point to further explore more antecedents, consequences, and mechanism of HRD program accountability.

The study has implications for research on corporate universities and that on managers and HRD. First, the study has shown the impact of a corporate university program on manager trainees by examining the issue through the lens of accountability. While there has been very limited research on the impact of programs provided through corporate universities, in the future such studies can refer to the current one for experience. Second, the study adds understanding
about a corporate university in China, specifically, about one of its programs and its trainees, which informs future research on corporate universities. Furthermore, this study expands understanding about four manager-related variables and their relationships, which can be very helpful for future research on the interactions between business managers and HRD. For instance, this research can be replicated to verify whether managers’ perceptions about the value of training and their involvement in HRD programs, as well as their interaction, predict the accountability of an HRD program together as well in different settings.

Implications for HRD Practice

The study has important implications for corporate university practice. The implications are in four aspects for leaders running corporate universities. The study helps such leaders understand the importance of accountability of their programs, how managers are involved in the programs, and direct and indirect contributing factors to the accountability of the programs.

First, corporate university leaders would understand the importance of demonstrating accountability, in particular, high accountability, of their corporate university programs, with the assistance of the current study. The leaders would understand that, accountability means that their programs are accountable to their stakeholders, that is, the stakeholders gain real impact from the programs. Showing high accountability of such programs is not only important for the stakeholders, but also important for the corporate universities themselves. For the stakeholders, it is to understand how much value they receive from the programs. For the corporate universities themselves, it is to articulate how much value they create for their organizations.

Corporate universities can measure the accountability of their programs by using the tools developed in this study. They can do so with the help of external professionals or on their own. By adapting the accountability scale and interview questions from this research, appropriate tools
can be developed for each corporate university to examine the accountability of each of their programs. They can also expand the tools for other levels of HRD contribution, such as individual-performer level or a whole-entity level (Tong & Jacobs, 2016). While the accountability tools were merely used with the trained managers in the current study, corporate universities should feel free to expand its utilization to other groups of stakeholders, such as senior management and the supervisors of trainees (Nickols, 2005).

Second, the study helps corporate university leaders understand the ways and extent that business managers get involved in corporate university programs. The study has revealed that, in the studied organization, the business managers mostly participated in the delivery, evaluation, and development of their corporate university programs. Other than primarily participating as trainees, a few of the managers also took the role of trainers for the corporate university. They used different ways of submitting program feedback while usually provided needs of training to the training college. For other corporate universities interested in expanding collaboration with business managers in their programs, these are the basic ways they can refer to. In the studied organization, the managers were involved to a limited-to-moderate extent in their corporate university programs, while rating the program accountability high. Leaders of corporate universities shall feel relieved seeing this. The message is, how much the business managers appreciate the value of a corporate university program is not entirely dependent on how much they are involved or contribute to the program, but how helpful the program itself is.

Corporate universities can use the tools developed in this study to measure the extent of involvement of business managers, or other groups of stakeholders in their organization, in their programs. Stakeholders are so important for corporate universities, since training “would cease to exist if it did not have the support of its key” stakeholders (Nickols, 2016, p. 126). In order to
serve the stakeholders well, it is important to know them well and precisely. Tools like that in the current study can help corporate universities meet the needs of the stakeholders exactly where they are. The measurement tools help revealing whether it is at an appropriate extent that the stakeholders are involved, and whether any adjustment needs to be made.

Third, and most importantly, corporate university leaders would understand the two key factors contributing to their program accountability: trainees’ perceptions about the value of training and trainees’ level of involvement in their programs. These two variables are very important to consider about if they are to explain or improve their program accountability, apart from building high-quality programs, per se. To improve program accountability from trainees’ perspectives, corporate universities can work on the two contributing variables depending on the level of involvement of trainees in their programs.

If the level of trainees’ involvement is low, for example, if the trainees only participate in a few of the corporate university programs in general, no need to worry about getting the managers more involved, but stay selected in getting them to participate. It is totally acceptable if a trainee only participates in a few programs of the corporate university, especially high-quality ones. It is essential to try to make the trainees value training as much as possible. A possible way of doing so is including the value education content in corporate university programs.

If the level of trainees’ involvement is to a limited or higher extent, that is great too. What the corporate universities must consider still is how much the trainees value training. Have the trainees gotten involved too much so that the over involvement might have rendered them to perceive training as less valuable? If no, and if the trainees just don’t value training too much, try to provide a great program that would convince them about the value of training, for which they would appreciate the accountability of the program. If yes, try to reduce the trainees’ level of
involvement, and be more selective and targeted in providing them the service.

Fourth, the study helps corporate university leaders understand the effect of trainees’ level of commitment to their organizations on the accountability of corporate university programs. This effect is indirect, and is exerted through trainees’ perceptions about the value of training. A corporate university would need to first consider the effects of the aforementioned two key variables, as well as the interaction of them, on program accountability, before considering working around its trainees’ level of organizational commitment. If such considered effects show that the trainees’ perceptions about the value of training impact program accountability positively, then it’s better to try increasing the trainees’ level of organizational commitment. This way would help lifting the accountability of a program further higher, and vice versa.

**Final Comments**

To conclude this dissertation, limitations of the present study are to be exposed, along with my own remarks on the research. The study has three limitations which concern its sample size, the use of a term in the data collection, and about the generalizability of the findings restricted by the only setting of data collection. The study has allowed me to understand what happened around a corporate university program from the managers’ perspectives, as well as develop instruments for future deeper exploration.

The first limitation of the study deals with the sample size of the survey. Because the sample size is not very large, it limited the use and power of relevant quantitative analysis, specifically, factor analysis. Some scholars argued that “EFA is a ‘large-sample’ procedure” (Costello & Osborne, 2005, p. 5) and a subject-to-item ratio of less than 2:1 is considered too low for EFA (Costello & Osborne, 2005). Some others even asserted that, a study should keep a
ratio of subjects to variables at 4:1 or higher (MacCallum, Widaman, Preacher, & Hong, 2001). For factor analysis, each survey item is considered as a variable (O’Rourke & Hatcher, 2013, p. 9). The subject-to-item/variable ratio in the present study was 1.9, lower than the proposed standards. Therefore, the EFA results may not be entirely reliable, which limits the credibility of some of the research findings based on such factor analysis.

The second limitation concerns the use of the word “performance” in my data collection. It turned out some of the research participants might have been confused about what “performance” means in my study. In designing my survey and interview protocols, the word “performance” did not show much as a problem. Yet, in my interviews, two managers asked for my clarification about the meaning of it. The first interviewee said “this is actually a very vague concept for me.” I explained to him that performance generally related to the outcomes of work and that the increase of the level of his equipment maintenance is counted as performance. Still he felt “This is very hard to understand.” Then I gave him more examples about what would be considered as performance related to his workplace, and that helped him understand. The third interviewee also had a misconception about performance that I helped clarify. Such clarification experience made me realize that there might have been other research participants who were confused about the term “performance” when they filled out the survey. Inaccurate understanding of the term may have led them to choose incorrect choices of a few scale items in the survey. Though this does not appear to affect the overall credibility of the data to any large extent, it is indeed a helpful lesson to learn. Future studies can hopefully use more-popularly-understandable language to replace what is meant by performance or other similar terms.

The third limitation of the research is that it only studied one training program provided by one corporate university in China, which limits the generalizability of the research findings to
a broader scope. Although the research participants represented different provinces of the country, after all, they were from the same organization and in the same industry. Managers from different organizations and even different industries in the country may report different results if involved in a similar study. Therefore, it is unsafe to generalize the research findings outside the organization investigated. Hopefully, this study will be replicated in more organizations across industries, so as to find patterns within and across industries in China and make interesting findings generalizable to even broader contexts.

With such limitations recognized, the study has still proffered me understanding on the managers’ perceptions about and involvement in the programs of the focused corporate university. It was interesting and meaningful to know that the managers thought highly about the selected training program and hear them recall highlights of it. It was exciting to see the quantitative result supporting the research hypothesis that both the value and involvement variables significantly predicted the program accountability. The negative interaction between the value and involvement variables in predicting the program accountability was surprising and somehow difficult to interpret at first glance, but after deeper consideration, was an inevitable result in reality. There usually has to be a limit for any independent variable, among multiple ones, to predict a dependent variable, in social science practice. Therefore, the two independent variables offset each other’s explanatory effect after a certain turning point. The finding of the commitment variable being an antecedent of the value variable was an additional surprise that emerged from the study, triggering more relevant literature review and empirical research on such relationships.

The development of the instruments that measure the four variables in the study has paved a way for me to continue the line of research in the future. After the study, I noticed that
there might be existing instruments for measuring managers’ attitudes towards training directly. Hence, the value variable can be likely revised in terms of the dimensions and question items in the future, as long as research focus allows. Ideally, the four instruments should all be slightly revised and reused in a different setting, to collect data from a sample of at least 200 participants, for conducting a CFA to validate the instruments solidly. Additional replication studies are expected to accumulate more evidence about the variable relationships across contexts, for instance, with different kinds of training programs and different types of HRD initiatives. The line of the study is expected to expand as well for encompassing a more comprehensive framework of related variables.
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APPENDIX B: SURVEY PARTICIPANT RECRUITMENT LETTER

Dear leader,

I hope you will kindly consider participating in a survey that I conduct for my dissertation research on organizational training in China. I am a PhD candidate in human resource development in the College of Education, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, in the United States. I previously graduated from Peking University and Beijing Normal University for my master’s and bachelor’s degrees respectively. This research is mainly about the programs provided by your training college. If you kindly agree to participate in this about 10-minute survey online, your identifying information will be kept confidential. All the information you provided will only be used for my research. If any information is used in my dissertation, it will be anonymous.

If you ever decided to participate in this survey, please go to the survey through this link (https://www.wjx.cn/jq/19307114.aspx). I will provide you a report of my dissertation results after my dissertation is entirely completed, if you would like. If you have any questions, please don’t hesitate to contact me at x tong6@illinois.edu, or my responsible project investigator, Professor Ronald L. Jacobs, at rl jacobs@illinois.edu. Hope you will be interested in participating in the survey, which would be very helpful for both my research and facilitating the training college practice for your benefits.

Best regards,

Xiaoping Tong

PhD Candidate in University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

December 2017
尊敬的领导：

希望您能善意地考虑参与我博士论文研究中的一个问卷调研。我研究的是中国的组织培训问题。我是美国伊利诺伊大学香槟分校教育学院人力资源开发专业的博士候选人。我之前分别从北京师范大学和北京大学获得本科和硕士学位。本研究主要考察的是您单位的培训学院的项目。如果您善意地同意参与这个耗时约 10 分钟的在线问卷调研的话，您的所有信息都将被保持隐密。您提供的信息只供我的研究使用。如果我在论文中引用您提及的任何信息，它们都会是匿名的。

如果您决定参与我的问卷调研，请点此链接（https://www.wjx.cn/jq/19307114.aspx）进入问卷。如果您需要，在我的博士论文成稿之后，我将给您提供一份研究结果报告。如果您有任何问题，欢迎随时给我（xtong6@illinois.edu）发送邮件咨询。您也可以给我的研究导师罗纳德•雅格布斯（Ronald L. Jacobs）教授发邮件（rljacobs@illinois.edu）咨询。希望您有兴趣填写我的问卷。这份问卷不论是对我的研究，还是对于推动您培训学院的实践，都会有所帮助。

祝好！

童小平

伊利诺伊大学香槟分校博士候选人

2017 年 12 月
APPENDIX C: SURVEY CONSENT LETTER

Dear leader,

Thanks very much for your interest in participating in the survey of my dissertation research. This note serves to affirm you the following information. 1) This is an anonymous survey. 2) Faculty, students, and staff who may see your information will maintain confidentiality to the extent of laws and university polices. Personal identifiers will not be published or presented. 3) All information you provide in the survey will only be used for my research. 4) If I use any information from the survey in my dissertation, it will be anonymous. Your decision to participate or decline participation in this study is completely voluntary and you have the right to terminate your participation at any time without penalty. You may skip any questions you do not wish to answer.

If you have any question about your participation in this survey, apart from contacting me, Xiaoping Tong, at xtong6@illinois.edu, or my principal investigator, Professor Ronald Jacobs, at rljacobs@illinois.edu, you can also contact a liaison in China. He is Dr. Zinan Zhang, an instructor in Zhejiang University of Finance and Economics. You can reach him at zinanzh@gmail.com.

If you have any questions about your rights as a participant in this study or any concerns or complaints, please contact the University of Illinois Office for the Protection of Research Subjects at (+1) 217-333-2670 or via email at irb@illinois.edu.

Please print a copy of this consent form for your records, if you so desire.
I have read and understand the above consent form. I certify that I am 18 years old or older and, by clicking the button to enter the survey, I indicate my willingness to voluntarily take part in the study.

SUBMIT

问卷知情同意书

尊敬的领导：

非常感谢您有兴趣参与我的博士论文问卷调研。本同意书旨在告知您下面几点。1）这是一份匿名调研。2）所有可能看到您信息的教师、学生和员工会按法律和学校政策规定的程度保密。我们不会发表或报告您的个人身份信息。3）您在问卷中提供的信息将只被用于我的研究。4）如果我在博士论文中使用您问卷中提供的任何信息，它都将是匿名的。

您参与这项研究与否的决定是完全自愿的。您有权在任何时候终止参与，并不受惩罚。您可以跳过任何您不想回答的问题。

如果您对于填写此问卷有任何疑问的话，除了可以联系我（xtong6@illinois.edu）或我的研究主持人罗纳德•雅格布斯教授（rljacobs@illionois.edu）之外，您也可以联系一位在中国的联系人。他是张子楠博士，浙江财经大学的一位讲师。您可以给他写邮件到zinanzh@gmail.com。

如果您对于您作为此研究的参与者的权利有任何疑问、顾虑或投诉请求，请联系伊利诺伊大学研究对象保护办公室。电话：(+1) 217-333-2670；邮箱:irb@illinois.edu。如果您希望，请打印一份知情同意书以作记录。
我已阅读并理解以上知情同意书内容。我证实我已年满 18 周岁。通过点击按钮进入问卷，我表明我自愿参与此研究。

提交
APPENDIX D: SURVEY PROTOCOL

Questionnaire on Perceptions of Cadres about a Program Provided by the Training College and Others

1. You are in ________________ department of your organization.

2. Your gender is (  ).
   A. male  B. female  C. Other, please specify__________

3. Your age is (  ).
   A. 20 or below  B. 21-30  C. 31-40  D. 41-50  E. 51-60  F. 61-70

4. Your highest degree is a/an (  ) degree.
   A. PhD  B. master  C. bachelor  D. associate  E. high school graduate
   F. Other, please specify__________

5. You have been working in this organization for (  ) years.
   A. 6-10  B. 11-15  C. 16-20  D. 21-25  E. 26-30
   F. More than 30

6. Please use “\" to fill the scale below about your opinions regarding the value of training.
   For each statement on the left, please choose a point from 1-5 on the right to specify the extent you agree with the statement, with 1 indicating “Strongly disagree” and 5 indicating “Strongly agree.” You can also choose N/A (not applicable) if you believe that item statement does not apply to your situation.
Table D.1: Value of training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1 Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>2 Disagree</th>
<th>3 Neutral</th>
<th>4 Agree</th>
<th>5 Strongly agree</th>
<th>N/A (Not applicable)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My employees do not require much training to do their jobs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training activities for my employees about workplace behaviors are not relevant to the work I am involved in.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is useful to send employees only for training about products.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My employees take the time of training as an opportunity to be away from work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My employees hardly take training seriously.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My employees tend to leave the organization after acquiring training certification.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training activities help in improving the culture of my organization.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training activities help in building positive perceptions of employees about the organization.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training activities help in optimizing the value of human resources.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Please use “√” to fill the scale below about your involvement in the programs provided by the training college of your organization. The programs mentioned in this question item refer to all the programs you know that are provided by your training college. For each statement on the left, please choose a point from 1-5 on the right to specify the extent of your involvement in the activity, with 1 indicating “Low involvement” and 5 indicating “High involvement.” You can also choose N/A (not applicable) if you believe that activity does not apply to your situation.
Table D.2: Involvement in the training college programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Involvement activities</th>
<th>1 Low involvement</th>
<th>2 Limited involvement</th>
<th>3 Some involvement</th>
<th>4 Frequent involvement</th>
<th>5 High involvement</th>
<th>N/A (Not applicable)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participated in identifying the needs of my organization for content of the programs to be offered through the training college</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated in designing the programs to be offered through the training college</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provided content for the programs to be offered through the training college</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepared myself to participate in the programs offered through the training college, before they were officially offered</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated in the implementation of the programs offered through the training college, during the time when they were officially offered</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Followed up with the application of the takeaways from the programs offered through the training college, after they were offered</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provided in-paper feedback for evaluating participated programs offered through the training college</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provided in-person feedback for evaluating participated programs offered through the training college</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used evaluation reports of the programs offered through the training college</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. Now think only about the “Comprehensive literacy training class of division-level youth cadres” program provided by your training college, that you participated as a learner in the past few years. Please use “\(\checkmark\)” to fill the scale below about your opinions regarding the extent that the program is accountable. For each statement on the left, please choose a point from 1-5 on the right to specify the extent you agree with it, with 1 indicating “Strongly disagree” and 5 indicating “Strongly agree.” You can also choose N/A (not applicable) if you believe that item statement does not apply to your situation.

Table D.3: Accountability of the training program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1 Strongly disagree</th>
<th>2 Disagree</th>
<th>3 Neutral</th>
<th>4 Agree</th>
<th>5 Strongly agree</th>
<th>N/A (Not applicable)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The program achieved all of the goals it stated to its learners.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The program achieved some of its stated goals better than others.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The program did not achieve certain stated goals of importance to me as a manager.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The program addressed performance issues that were well known in the organization.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The program addressed questions that would help me perform better as a manager.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The program addressed performance issues that I did not know existed beforehand.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The program improved the outcomes of the entire organization.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table D.3 (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1 Strongly disagree</th>
<th>2 Disagree</th>
<th>3 Neutral</th>
<th>4 Agree</th>
<th>5 Strongly agree</th>
<th>N/A (Not applicable)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The program improved the outcomes of employees in my department.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The program improved my own outcomes as a manager.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Please use “√” to fill the scale below about your opinions regarding organizational commitment. For each statement on the left, please choose a point from 1-7 on the right to specify the extent you agree with the statement, with 1 indicating “Strongly disagree” and 7 indicating “Strongly agree.”

Table D.4: Organizational commitment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1 Strongly disagree</th>
<th>2 Quite disagree</th>
<th>3 Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>4 Undetermined</th>
<th>5 Somewhat agree</th>
<th>6 Quite agree</th>
<th>7 Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career with this organization.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I really feel as if this organization’s problems are my own.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not feel a strong sense of “belonging” to my organization.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not feel “emotionally attached” to this organization.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not feel like “part of the family” at my organization.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This organization has a great deal of personal meaning for me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right now, staying with my organization is a matter of necessity as much as desire.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It would be very hard for me to leave my organization right now, even if I wanted to.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table D.4 (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1 Strongly disagree</th>
<th>2 Quite disagree</th>
<th>3 Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>4 Undetermined</th>
<th>5 Somewhat agree</th>
<th>6 Quite agree</th>
<th>7 Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Too much in my life would be disrupted if I decided I wanted to leave my organization now.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel that I have too few options to consider leaving this organization.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If I had not already put so much of myself into this organization, I might consider working elsewhere.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One of the few negative consequences of leaving this organization would be the scarcity of available alternatives.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not feel any obligation to remain with my current employer. (R)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Even if it were to my advantage, I do not feel it would be right to leave my organization now.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would feel guilty if I left my organization now.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This organization deserves my loyalty.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would not leave my organization right now because I have a sense of obligation to the people in it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I owe a great deal to my organization.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. If you have any complementary information about the content examined in this survey, please supply them below.

____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________

Thanks for your participation in this survey again. If you would like to receive a report of my survey results later, please provide your email address here: ____________________.
In order to better understand your responses in this survey, I would like to conduct an individual interview with you for about half an hour. If you are interested in participating in this interview, please leave your email address ____________________ and your phone number ____________________. Alternatively, you can send me an email at xtong6@illinois.edu, or contact me through phone at 13426488472. We can schedule a time at your convenience for this interview. I will probably interview you online through WeChat or international phone call.

The interview will be private and safe. Your identity information will be kept confidential. All the information you provided will only be used for my research. If any information is used in my dissertation, it will be anonymous.

I can provide you a report of my dissertation results after my dissertation is entirely done, if you so desire. If you have any questions, please don’t hesitate to contact me, or my responsible project investigator, Professor Ronald L. Jacobs, at rljacobs@illinois.edu. Hope you will be interested in participating in my interview.

Wish you all the best with your work!

Xiaoping Tong
PhD Candidate in University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
December 2017

领导干部关于培训学院的一个项目及其它问题的看法调查问卷

1. 您在单位中所处的部门是：__________________________。

2. 您的性别是（ ）

   A. 男       B. 女       C. 其他，请注明___________
3. 您（ ）周岁了。
   A. 20 或以下    B. 21-30    C. 31-40
   D. 41-50        E. 51-60    F. 61-70

4. 您的最高学位是（ ）
   A. 博士    B. 硕士    C. 学士    D. 专科    E. 高中毕业
   F. 其它，请注明__________

5. 您在此单位已经工作（ ）年了。
   A. 6-10       B. 11-15     C. 16-20     D. 21-25     E. 26-30
   F. 30 年以上

6. 请使用对号（√）填写以下关于您所认为的培训活动价值的量表。对于量表左边的每个陈述项，请从右边的 1—5 这 5 个数字中选择一个来表明您同意该项陈述的程度：1 表示“强烈不同意”，5 表示“强烈同意”。如果您认为该题项不适合您的情况，您也可以选择“不适用”。
表 D.1: 培训活动的价值

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>陈述</th>
<th>1 强烈不同意</th>
<th>2 不同意</th>
<th>3 一般</th>
<th>4 同意</th>
<th>5 强烈同意</th>
<th>不适用</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>我的下属对于教他们开展工作的培训，需求不大。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>面向我下属的职场行为培训，与我涉及的工作无关。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>只有让员工参加产品方面的培训才有作用。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>我的员工把参加培训的时间当作离开工作的机会。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>我的员工很少认真对待培训。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>我的员工在获得培训认证后倾向于离开本单位。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>培训活动有助于提升我们单位的组织文化。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>培训活动有助于树立员工们对单位的正面看法。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>培训活动有助于最大程度地发挥人力资源的价值。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. 请使用对号（√）填写下面这个量表。该量表测量的是您在您单位的培训学院所提供的项目中的参与程度。本题中的项目包括所有您知道的由您培训学院所提供的项目。对于量表左边的每项活动，请从右边的 1—5 这 5 个数字中选择一个来表明您参与该项活动的程度：1 表示“低度参与”，5 表示“高度参与”。如果您认为该题项不适合您的情况，您也可以选择“不适用”。
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表 D.2: 培训学院项目参与度

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>活动</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>不适用</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>参与确定了本单位对培训学院项目内容的需求</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>参与设计了培训学院提供的项目</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>为培训学院的项目提供了内容</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>在培训学院的项目正式开始之前，为参与项目做好准备</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>在培训学院的项目进行过程当中，参与项目的具体实施</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>在培训学院项目结束之后，跟进应用从中习得的内容</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>提供过书面形式的反馈，以评价所参加的培训学院项目</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>当面提供过反馈，以评价所参加的培训学院项目</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>使用过培训学院项目评价报告</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. 现在请只考虑您在去年或前年参加过的由您培训学院开设的『青年科级干部综合素质培训班』。请使用对号（√）填写下面这个量表。此量表是关于该项目的可解释程度的。

对于量表左边的每个陈述项，请从右边的 1—5 这 5 个数字中选择一个来表明您对该项目陈述的认可程度：1 表示“强烈不同意”，5 表示“强烈同意”。如果您认为该题项不适合您的情况，您也可以选择“不适用”。
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表 D.3: 培训项目的可解释性

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>陈述</th>
<th>1 强烈不同意</th>
<th>2 不同意</th>
<th>3 一般</th>
<th>4 同意</th>
<th>5 强烈同意</th>
<th>不适用</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>该项目达成了其所有向学员介绍过的目标。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>该项目的某些既定目标完成得比其它的既定目标好。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>该项目没能达成我作为干部而言认为重要的某些既定目标。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>该项目解决了一些为本单位人所熟知的绩效问题。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>该项目解答了一些能帮助我做好领导管理工作的问题。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>该项目解决了一些我之前不知道的绩效问题。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>该项目增进了整个单位的产出。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>该项目增进了我部门员工的产出。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>该项目增进了我自己作为一名干部的产出。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. 请使用对号（✓）填写下面这个关于组织承诺的量表。对于量表左边的每个陈述项，请从右边的 1—7 这 7 个数字中选择一个来表明您对该项陈述的认可程度：1 表示“非常不同意”，7 表示“非常同意”。
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>陈述</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>我很乐意在这家单位度过余下的职业生涯。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>我实在觉得这家单位所面临的问题也是我自己的问题。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>我没有很强的属于“这家单位的人”的感觉。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>我没有感到“感情上依恋”于这家单位。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>我在单位中没有那种“大家庭的一员”的感觉。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>对我来说，这家单位有许多个人的意义。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>现在留在我所在的单位工作是必要的事情。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>即使现在我想离开我的单位，实际上也很难做到。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>如果我决定现在离开我的单位，我生活上很多东西将受到损害。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>如果我要离开这家单位的话，我觉得没有多少其它选择。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>如果我没有在此单位投入太多的话，我可能会考虑到其它单位工作。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>离开这家单位的不良后果之一是可供选择的机会很少。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>我没有感觉任何责任应留在这家单位工作。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>即使现在离开这家单位对我有利，但我会觉得这样做是不对的。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>如果我现在离开这家单位，我会感到内疚。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>这家单位值得我忠诚以待。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>由于我对这里的人有责任感，所以我现在不会离开这家单位。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>我十分感激我所在的单位。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10. 如果您对本问卷调研的内容有任何补充意见，请在下面提供：

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

再次感谢您参与填写此问卷。如果您希望在我的问卷调研完成之后收到一份本次调研的总体报告，请留下您的邮箱地址：________________________。

为了更好地理解您在问卷中的反馈，我希望能对您进行为期约半小时的单独访谈。如果您有兴趣参与这个访谈，请在此留下您的邮箱地址________________________和电话________________________。或者，您也可以给我的邮箱 xtong6@illinois.edu 发信，或联系我的电话号码 13426488472。我们可以约定一个您方便的访谈时间。我很可能会在网上通过微信或国际长途电话对您进行访谈。

访谈将会是私密的和安全的。您提供的信息只供我的研究使用。如果我在论文中引用您提及的任何信息，您的身份都将是匿名的。

如果您需要，在我的博士论文完成之后，我可以给您提供一份研究结果报告。若您有任何问题，欢迎随时给我发送邮件咨询。您也可以给我的研究主持人罗纳德•雅格布斯（Ronald L. Jacobs）教授发邮件（rljacobs@illinois.edu）咨询。希望您有兴趣参与我的访谈。

祝您工作一切顺利！
童小平

伊利诺伊大学香槟分校博士候选人

2017 年 12 月
APPENDIX E: INTERVIEW CONSENT LETTER

Dear leader,

Thanks very much for kindly agreeing to participate in my dissertation research interview. All information you provide in the interview will only be used for my research. If we use any information from the interview in my dissertation, it will be anonymous. The interview will be recorded. I will save the recording in a private place and destroy it after it is transcribed.

We will use all reasonable efforts to keep your personal information confidential, but we cannot guarantee absolute confidentiality. When this research is discussed or published, no one will know that you were in the study. But, when required by law or university policy, identifying information may be seen or copied by: a) The Institutional Review Board that approves research studies; b) The Office for Protection of Research Subjects and other university departments that oversee human subjects research; c) University and state auditors responsible for oversight of research; and d) The financial sponsor of the research, The College of Education at University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

Your decision to participate or decline participation in this study is completely voluntary and you have the right to terminate your participation at any time without penalty. You may skip any questions you do not wish to answer.

If you have any question later about your participation in this interview, apart from contacting me at xtolong6@illinois.edu, or my principal investigator, Professor Ronald Jacobs, at rljacobs@illinois.edu, you can also contact a liaison in China. He is Dr. Zinan Zhang, an instructor in Zhejiang University of Finance and Economics. You can reach him at zinan_zh@gmail.com. If you have any questions about your rights as a participant in this study or
any concerns or complaints, please contact the University of Illinois Office for the Protection of Research Subjects at (+1) 217-333-2670 or via email at irb@illinois.edu.

Please tell me whether you agree with the above content. After you agree, we can go ahead and start the interview. Thank you.

访谈知情同意书

尊敬的领导:

非常感谢您善意地同意参与我的博士论文研究访谈。您在访谈中提供的信息将只被用于我的研究。如果我们在研究中使用您访谈提供的任何信息，它们都将是匿名的。本次访谈将会被录音。我将把录音保存在一个隐秘的地方。在录音被转录成文本之后，我将摧毁录音文件。

我们会尽所有合理的努力来对您的个人信息进行保密，但我们不能保证绝对的隐密性。当我们讨论或发表本研究时，没人会知道您参与了这项研究。但是，当受到法律或学校政策要求时，鉴别性信息可能会被以下机构查阅或复制：a）批准科学研究的机构审查委员会，b）监管人类对象研究的研究对象保护办公室或学校其他部门，c）负责监管研究的学校或州里的审查员，及 d）本研究的经济资助者——伊利诺伊大学香槟分校教育学院。您参与这项研究与否的决定是完全自愿的。您有权在任何时候终止参与，并不受惩罚。您可以跳过任何您不想回答的问题。

如果您之后对于您参与访谈这件事情有任何疑问，除了可以联系我（xtong6@illinois.edu）或我的研究主持人罗纳德•雅格布斯教授（rljacobs@illinois.edu）之
外，您也可以联系一位在中国的联系人。他是张子楠博士，浙江财经大学的讲师。您可以给他写邮件到 zinanzh@gmail.com。如果您对于您作为此研究参与者的权利有任何疑问、顾虑或投诉请求，请联系伊利诺伊大学研究对象保护办公室。电话：(+1) 217-333-2670；邮箱：irb@illinois.edu。

请告诉我您是否同意以上内容。您同意了之后，我们就可以开始访谈了。
APPENDIX F: INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

Dear leader, thanks for coming to the interview. The purpose of this interview is to understand your opinions about your training college programs and others. I have prepared some questions for you. I may also follow up with you on salient points that emerge. Please feel free to speak up your mind to any of the questions. I will keep all the information you provide confidential and anonymous. Nobody else in your organization will have access to the content you share. The interview has nothing to do with your performance appraisal. Please let me know when you are ready.

1. What are the training needs of your subordinates?
2. What are the attitudes of your subordinates towards training?
3. What are the benefits of training to your organization?
4. To what extent have you participated in developing the programs of your training college?
5. To what extent have you participated in delivering the programs of your training college?
6. To what extent have you participated in evaluating the programs of your training college?
7. Now please focus on the “Comprehensive literacy training class of division-level youth cadres” that you participated in 2015 or 2016. To what extent did the program achieve its stated goals?
8. To what extent did the program address performance issues of importance in your organization?
9. To what extent did the program make a demonstrable impact to improve the outcomes of your organization?

10. What is the relationship between your perceptions about the value of training and your involvement in your training college programs?

11. What is the relationship between your involvement in your training college programs and your perceptions about the accountability of the “Comprehensive literacy training of division-level youth cadres” program? The accountability refers to the answers you just provided to questions 7, 8, and 9.

12. What is the relationship between your involvement in your training college programs and your perceptions about the accountability of the “Comprehensive literacy training of division-level youth cadres” program?

13. What other information can you provide that is relevant to this interview?

Thank you sincerely for your participation in this interview again. Your input is invaluable to my research. I wish everything goes well with your work and life!

访谈提纲

尊敬的领导:

感谢您前来参与访谈。本访谈的目的在于了解您培训学院的项目及相关内容。我准备了一些问题要向您提问。我也可能就某些临时涌现的重要内容向您跟进。请自由表达您对任意问题的想法。我会保证您所提供的所有信息都是保密的和匿名的。您单位的其他人不会接触到访谈内容。本访谈跟您的绩效考核也不相关。当您准备好的时候，请告诉我。

1. 您的下属需要什么样的培训?
2. 您的下属对待培训的态度是怎样的？

3. 培训给您的单位带来了什么好处？

4. 您在多大程度上参与了您培训学院项目的开发？

5. 您在多大程度上参与了您培训学院项目的实施？

6. 您在多大程度上参与了您培训学院项目的评价？

7. 现在请着重考虑您在 2015 或 16 年时参加的『青年科级干部综合素质培训班』项目。该项目在多大程度上完成了它既定的目标？

8. 该项目在多大程度上解决了您单位里重要的绩效问题？

9. 该项目在多大程度上展现出来在改进您单位产出方面的影响？

10. 您对培训的价值的看法，与您参与您培训学院各种项目的一种程度之间，有什么关系呢？

11. 您对培训的价值的看法，与您认为的『青年科级干部综合素质培训班』项目的可解释性之间，有什么关系呢？可解释性指的是刚才您对第 7、8、9 个问题的答案。

12. 您参与您培训学院各种项目的程度，与您所认为的该项目的可解释性之间，有什么关系呢？

13. 您还有什么其它的与本访谈相关的信息可以提供吗？

再次真诚地感谢您参与这个访谈。您提供的信息对我的研究至关重要。祝您工作和生活一切顺利！
APPENDIX G: SURVEY TEST INSTRUCTION

Thank you for friendly agreeing to help test this survey protocol. While testing filling this survey, please take yourself as an outstanding division-level youth cadre in a Chinese public institution. This institution has a training college which provides many programs. You have participated in at least one program the college provides: Comprehensive literacy training of division-level youth cadres. You participated in this multiple-week program in 2015 or 2016. You have worked in this institution for at least 5 years.

Please read the below Chinese questionnaire, referring to the English version after it, and fill the Chinese survey with your simulated role above. Please take it as if you are filling in the survey anonymously online. After filling the survey, please provide feedback to me in such aspects:

1. Is there any unclear or inaccurate content in the Chinese survey?
2. Is the content in the Chinese survey the same with that in the English version?

Thank you very much for your test and feedback!

Xiaoping Tong
PhD Candidate in Human Resource Development, College of Education
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

问卷测试说明

感谢您友情同意帮忙测试此问卷。测试填写的时候请您把自己当作一位国家事业单位的优秀青年科级干部。该单位有一所培训学院，开设有许多项目。您至少参与过其中一
个项目：青年科级干部综合素质培训班。您是在 2015 或 2016 年参加的这个为时数周的培训项目。您在这家单位至少工作 5 年了。

请阅读下面的中文问卷，参照后面的英文问卷，按以上虚拟身份测试填写。请当作您是在线匿名填写此问卷。填写完之后请向我就以下几方面提供反馈：

1. 中文问卷中是否有表述不清楚或不准确的地方?
2. 中文问卷所表达的内容与英文问卷是否一致?

非常感谢您的测试和反馈！

童小平

伊利诺伊大学香槟分校教育学院人力资源开发专业博士候选人

2017 年 12 月
### APPENDIX H: VALID SURVEY DATA

Table H.1: Effective survey data

| Respondent | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | Q | Q | Q | Q | Q | Q | Q | Q | Q | Q | Q | Q |
| 1          | 1 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 5 | 6 |
| 2          | 1 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 7 | 1 |
| 3          | 1 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 5 |
| 4          | 1 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 6 |
| 5          | 1 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 |
| 6          | 1 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 5 |
| 7          | 1 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 4 |
| 8          | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 3 |
| 9          | 1 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| 10         | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 |
| 11         | 1 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 3 | 2 | 2 |
| 12         | 2 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 |
| 13         | 2 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 4 |
| 14         | 4 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 1 |
| 15         | 5 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 5 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
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Table H.1 (cont.)

| Respondent | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | Q | Q | Q | Q | Q | Q | Q | Q | Q | Q | Q | Q | Q | Q |
| 1          | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2          | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3          | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4          | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5          | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 6          | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7          | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8          | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 9          | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
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| Respondent | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 1          | Q | Q | Q | Q | Q | Q | Q | Q | Q | Q | Q | Q | Q | Q | Q | Q | Q | Q | Q | Q | Q |
| 2          | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 |
| 3          | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 4          | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 5          | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 6          | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 7          | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 8          | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 9          | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 0          | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
Table H.1 (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Q</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The table continues with the same pattern for the remaining respondents.
Table H.1 (cont.)

| Respondent | Q | Q | Q | Q | Q | Q | Q | Q | Q | Q | Q | Q | Q | Q | Q | Q | Q | Q | Q | Q | Q | Q | Q | Q |
| 1          | 12| 12| 12| 12| 12| 12| 12| 12| 12| 12| 12| 12| 12| 12| 12| 12| 12| 12| 12| 12| 12| 12| 12| 12| 12| 12|
| 2          | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |
| 3          | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4          | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5          | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 6          | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7          | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8          | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 9          | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
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| Respondent | Q | Q | Q | Q | Q | Q | Q | Q | Q | Q | Q | Q | Q | Q | Q | Q | Q | Q | Q | Q | Q |
| 1          | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1 | 2 |
| 2          | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 3          | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1 |
| 4          | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1 | 2 |
| 5          | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1 | 2 |
| 6          | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 7          | 8 | 9 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 8          | 9 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 9          | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |

Table H.1 (cont.)
Table H.1 (cont.)

| Respondent | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 24 | 25 | 26 | 27 | 28 | 29 | 30 | 31 | 32 | 33 | 34 | 35 | 36 | 37 | 38 | 39 | 40 | 41 | 42 | 43 | 44 | 45 | 46 | 47 | 48 | 49 | 50 | 51 | 52 | 53 | 54 | 55 | 56 | 57 | 58 | 59 | 60 | 61 | 62 | 63 | 64 | 65 | 66 | 67 |
|------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|---
Table H.2: Survey Q1 Code

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code in the Above Matrix</th>
<th>Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Education/Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>HR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Office administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Operation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table H.3: Survey Q10 Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>The content is not very geared to actual situations. It’s rather empty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>I feel that your survey is not very suitable for me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>I suggest to conduct training about scientific management and teach the associate cadres of different levels about how to do one’s job to the full extent that his/her position expects but not exceed what is allowed for the position, and assist the main cadres without introducing more troubles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Particular questions do not fit with my department, because of lack of specificity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX I: INTERVIEW DATA

The First Interview

January 4th, 2018

Q: Group-level cadre, hello!
A: Hello!

Q: Can you hear me speaking here clearly?
A: Yeah, I can hear it clearly.

Q: That’s great, thanks!
A: No problem.

Q: You need to work today, so I estimate that you might also be very busy in the morning. I noted that you were listening to a lecture at noon yesterday. I feel that you are quite busy.
A: Oh, yes, I am right on a business trip here, and there happened to be a training session.

Q: Oh, hard work! Is the training in Beijing now? Or where?
A: No…I am in Chengdu.

Q: Oh! OK, OK. I just sent you my outline of the interview, and you may have glanced over it. In general, the questions I am about to ask you are, in fact, mostly aligned with the logic of what you responded to in the questionnaire. I may just ask, based on your feedback, ask about a little more details. May I?
A: Yes, that’s fine. That’s OK.

Q: Yeah.
A: At that time, when I filled in the interview questionnaire, in fact, I did not understand some of the terms very thoroughly. The other thing is that your questionnaire was popular and may not fit
with my personal job position very closely. Some of my answers may not meet your requirements. I’ll try to cooperate with you, OK?

Q: Hum, thank you and thank you so much! Well I did not match you with the response you filled in the questionnaire. So I’m not going to say today, based on what specific options you chose in your questionnaire and ask about them. In this case, let me follow the outline of my interview and ask the questions one by one. We should be able to finish it in about half an hour today, okay? Let’s strive for not to delay you for going to work.

A: Oh, no problem, okay.

Q: Hum, then I’ll start…Um…I will follow what’s on my outline. Let me first introduce to you and let me read. First of all, special thanks to you for coming to my interview while you are so busy. This is particularly important for my study. Hum, the purpose of this interview is to understand further about the impact of the programs provided by the training college of your Bureau on your work, as well as other relevant content. I have prepared some questions now, and I will ask you later. Then I may as well take a moment to follow up with you on some of the details that you provided to me in your feedback. I hope you can freely express your thoughts on any question in this interview. If you do not understand any of the words used in any of my questions, you can ask me in time and I can clarify and explain about it. I will ensure that all the information you provide is confidential and anonymous. That is, all the people in the departments of your organization, including anyone else within China, will not be exposed to the content of our interview. This interview does not have anything to do with your unit’s performance appraisal. It’s only related to my own research. Hum, as soon as you’re ready, we can start the interview. Are you ready?

A: Ready.
Q: Hum, okay. Then the first question I am going to ask you, that is, is related to my questionnaire you filled in. Amidst of the questionnaire there was a scale, of about six questions, just asking you: As a group-level manager, in your opinion, some of the group members that you manage, what kinds of training they need?

A: This might relate to…Well in my view it does not relate too much with the cadre training we just mentioned. Hum, talking about the group members who are my subordinates, they in fact, depending on the nature of our work, our job positions are quite…um…they should need skills training in our positions more.

Q: Job skills training.

A: Yes, hum, it’s actually a kind of skills.

Q: That is the training on some specific competences about how to conduct work and skills aspects. Is it?

A: Hum, yes, because of myself, the primary responsibility of our administrative office is, is for maintenance. Maybe our personnel are more in need of [training on] some of such knowledge and operational types, these basic skills.

Q: Oh, okay. Possible.

A: Regarding the cadre training that you are thinking about, it may not be determined, or manifested [in the needs of my staff]. It’s like so.

Q: Hum, in fact this of my question is also an open-ended question. It is not necessarily related to that training program of you. It is just in a broad sense, what kind of training you think your subordinates need. Then you think they mainly need some training on knowledge and skills related to job operations. Hum, so it is actually more towards the aspects of equipment and towards work appliances.
A: Hum, yes, towards utility aspects.

Q: Towards utility.

A: That is, the operating kind, equivalent to our knowledge kind. That type.

Q: Hum, then do you think they need training on those soft content aspect? For example, literacy, ah, quality, ah, attitude, ah, communication, ah, culture, ah, do they need training in the aspect of soft knowledge?

A: This is also needed, is needed. It may have not demonstrated to be, that is, like skills side, that is to say, as much needed as for the skills. It’s like so.

Q: Okay, got you. OK, thanks! This question is finished. Then the second question is: Then in your opinion, what are the attitudes of the group members as your subordinates, toward training?

A: Hum, very positive. They are all, if there is a training opportunity, they all very much want to participate in that training, like that.

Q: Oh.

A: Hum at normal times, they would also propose some of their own ideas and that, they want, that is to say, they would express the kind of willingness that they want to attend some training. There were indeed such situations.

Q: Hum, they…Do you think they are out of intrinsic interest, that they want to learn and improve themselves positively, or possibly they treat training more as a kind of welfare?

A: Well, it should be the first one. They want more to upgrade themselves. I…my administrative office, the people in my administrative office, I know them very well. And the nature of our work is like that as well. They really want to promote ourselves. In fact, it is not just about skills, that is, they also need to improve and upgrade themselves very much. About this point I think, just to enhance oneself, that is, how to say it, I may not express my meaning very…Or the words
I used were not very appropriate. They would also think that our training is a personal enhancement to him. He would not be like what we think, say that he would take the training opportunity to go out, that kind of. It will not be like this.

Q: Then would you worry, or would other leaders of the unit, worry about the subordinates that, if the subordinates are trained well, they competences are improved, they will change their jobs, may be poached by other organizations, such a situation?

A: Hum, I do not think such a situation would happen. It may be that I did not tell you just now, which positions I am responsible for. Because we are highly professional. Haha, it is like this. Additionally, in fact our leader treats this aspect in the way that, if there is really a person who has such an idea after training, the leader would not, say to limit your development, or whatever.

Q: Hum, OK. Good.

A: Mainly because we are highly professional, to be honest, maybe the people in my administrative office, about this aspect, being willing to change their jobs, or want, this kind of thinking is not that much. I have heart-to-heart talks with them at ordinary times.

Q: (Laugh) OK. I have understood it. Good, the next question is to ask: Then what benefits do you think training brings to your unit? You can talk from your administrative office, which is the administrative office you are in charge of. You can also talk at a more macro level you have seen. Both is fine. That is, what are the benefits that training brings to your unit?

A: Hum, it’s this. Because myself… That is… Um, that is, training, that is I participated in this comprehensive literacy training class of us. That was the comprehensive literacy training class. That is to say, the personnel in our administrative office currently do not have this. So for myself, I think in this aspect, it was very much promotion for myself, in this aspect.

Q: Oh.
A: Hum, that is to say, um, from some aspects of the management of the administrative office, this um… how to say… Some of this… That is, I do not know how to express this, ah. That is, it made me feel more cohesive power, ah. That is, from my own aspect, which is about technology, let alone myself, all the people in our administrative office are the same. It is enhancement in terms of technology training. Then in fact the training we have now is for us to be able to better, be able to complete the work we are responsible for, and for that in the future we will be given more work projects and work tasks. Well, that is to say, it can bring us some, how to say it, because we mainly do some equipment maintenance, there may be some new equipment coming in, we will have some training in advance. We are very very much, that we have a strong desire to participate in this work. Why? Because only if we understand these things in advance, and then to understand some operation of its professional work in the future, the usage requirements, ah, the methods of maintenance management, ah, and these procedures, ah, to understand it in advance, will our future work be carried out more smoothly, ah. More smoothly carrying out the work should be a kind of enhancement. It should be regarded as one. To complement about this aspect, to talk about this aspect, that is to say, this type of training will bring great convenience to our work, or that the future development of the work will be more smoothly, will provide very… Um… I do not know what words to use… that is to say…

Q: I see what you mean.

A: It is that such training makes us grasp, that is, grasp this more profoundly. Then some of the other training, including the fact that I come to Chengdu currently, we are having a seminar, which is a training session. It is equivalent to an understanding and discussion about the future trends of our industry. The content also covers knowledge expansion. Then in fact, it is also for our future work conduction, which is equivalent to laying the foundation for it. That’s it. If you
say about how much revenue or whatever it manifests, this can only be slowly reflected. This is not to say that, it can be effective immediately. I see this, can you understand? It is not the kind of thing that would be immediately effective. It takes a long time to manifest the effect.

Q: Hum, yes, yes. Is the training that you are attending this time in Chengdu belonging to the internal administration of you Bureau, or is it belonging to external industrial training or whatever?
A: ah…
Q: Is this fine to talk about?
A: Yes. Not only, not only my Bureau, there are some manufacturer personnel attending as well. In fact, it is we, this time my Bureau and a university in Chengdu, are co-cohosting this discussion and training. It has invited some foreign experts to talk about some cutting-edge things. Then it includes some, some of our domestic… Um… Some layout of the devices, ah, experiments, ah, and some things that have been done, things of this type. So everyone is very positively, very seriously… is… working on this domain.
Q: Hum, okay. During the years when you have been working in this Bureau, what is the general distribution of the training you attended? Was there more training that your training college offered? Or was there more of the internal training within the bureau in your province? Or more such kind of joint training with outside partners?
A: Hum…I have been working for such a long time, ah, over a decade, ah. I did not participate in too much training. It is not particularly a lot. Um, mainly that, most of the training I attend individually is some…Um…to …to…That is this…Um…The training in advance on devices that were to be put in operation, technical training, this kind of. Then there was another kind of, some training, that belonged to the Bureau of the nation… Um… And this… This… Our joint-
operation manufacturers of devices… The training that we jointly organized, that was to improve
technologies. Most, most of the training were of these kinds.

Q: Okay, okay. Hum.

A: Right.

Q: Ok, thanks. The fourth question is--let’s come back to the programs of the training college of
your Bureau. The fourth question is: To what extent do you think you were involved in the
development process of various programs of the training college?

A: About this… I have not been involved. The courses of the training college… he… Their set…
This one… This one… Theory and… This is that, I am not being to the training college. Not in
this area, I did not participate.

Q: Hum, OK. OK. The fifth question: Then you, that is, if looking at the area of the
implementation of the training college programs, you were mainly involved in this
comprehensive literacy training. As a participant, you were involved in this implementation,
right? Did you participate personally in any other programs of their training college?

A: Hum, of the training college, I was involved always as a participant. Of course, in addition to
the comprehensive literacy training, there were some other training which was once held in the
training college.

Q: Hum.

A: They also belonged to some… Um, some were about skills, some were about comprehensive
literacies. Some were, what categories did they belong to? That is, there was a kind of industrial
training. The industry that we belong to, well, is rather special, right. There were some, some
training that was specifically geared towards our industrial departments, which was some…
Maybe you… For example, my major is engineering. I may get to know about the area of
industrial expertise. That knowledge, after all, should be integrated. Some knowledge cannot be learnt by us in school.

Q: Yeah.

A: There would be some, similar to this kind of training. Across professions, but in the same industry and cross-profession training.

Q: Hum, like these, these training programs, these training programs, how long did they last usually? The ones you participated in.

A: All… Um… We… The comprehensive literacy training lasted twenty some days.

Q: Hum.

A: Then, hum, some other skill-type-of training usually lasted 3-5 days. It usually did not go more than 7 days. Like this.

Q: Hum, was it mostly closed training?

A: Hum, almost, almost. I mean what I personally participated in was just such. Almost all of the training was like this kind, ah.

Q: Hum, OK. I understand, thanks. The sixth question: To what extent did you participate in the evaluation of your training college programs?

A: Hum, the evaluation. First of all, perhaps, usually at the end of a course, there would be some evaluation forms to be filled out. In addition, perhaps also, that is, after the end of our training class, within one year or two years, there might also be some, some of the forms sent by the training college to us, or the survey form, ah, that we needed to fill out. All those count. I participated in all of that. After all we participated in the training, so I filled in all what they needed to know.
Q: Hum, I do feel that you are particularly positive, and very willing to participate, very good, thank you. Then did you ever express to them in person any kind of evaluative feedback, such as what you learned mainly from the training, or which area needed to be adjusted, something like this?

A: Yes. I did this. Thing like this, that is to say, that was all evaluation, evaluation of the training of the day. Hum, for example, the training I am attending right now, it would have a, definite content or a theme. And for this theme, it might, for me, whether it has reached their, whether the theme reached its effect. This may be my understanding. For example, let’s say with an analogy. That is, if I went to school and was involved in some skills training professional tasks category, then after I came to the training, if I accepted the course of him very well, I would talk to him directly. If I didn’t think the course reached the way I understood it should be, or maybe what I wanted to learn about, was not demonstrated there, perhaps I wanted to learn about ten skills but it only gave me eight; perhaps in comparison to my expectation, it did not… This may be a problem that I personally understood. If it was like this, I would also propose to them in person and make suggestions to them. I would say that, please see, next time you may want to add some content. Because from my personal point of view, I needed to understand this aspect of content, and they would listen respectfully and remember it. In this way, some of the suggestions could be reflected in the next time of training indeed, and they also really added the content, huh…

Q: Very good.

A: Hum, yes.

Q: Then have you ever received anything like a report about the final evaluation results of the programs provided by the training college that you participated in? Was it shared it with you?
A: Hum… Well… It is that, it would not be to us personally. It would be open on that website, or that content on the results and comments, in that report. This kind of report can be found on our intranet. But they would not, say, send this report to every learner.

Q: Hum.

A: This really would not be like that. This may be very troublesome. He may inform you that, “our report has come out. It is somewhere. You go and see.”

Q: So…

A: It does not mean that every training has a report.

Q: Have you ever used it, have you looked for such a report, and used such a report?

A: Hum, I looked it up, but did not use it. Currently I have not used, not used it.

Q: What is the direct relationship between the contents of the report and your actual work?

A: Well, at the moment I do not have the demand in this area, mainly.

Q: Hum, OK.

A: Why I, because my work or profession is rather special. I am not sure whether there will be such demand in the future.

Q: OK, I understand. OK, thank you. In the next few questions, I will mainly turn to the comprehensive literacy training class your participated, in 2015 or 2016. I am not too sure about in which year you participated in the program, ah. Considering this project, please review the process of your participation in this program. For such a long time, this program may have an impact on you and would be gradually demonstrated after the program. To what extent do you think this project achieved its stated goals?

A: I attended this training in 2015.

Q: Hum.
A: I participated in 2015. To what extent? Well, I think it achieved its goals to a large extent. In fact, in my own understanding, I understood what the training aimed for. Then when I was in the class, including after class, including some time after our training, there would be some contact and communication, well, among us, the learners. I personally feel the training this time, as far as the training I attended, in fact, to a large extent, it should be to a large extent, that it achieved its goals. I think it achieved. And to speak from our learner viewpoints, I personally, others may… I did not discuss these ideas with them. I benefited a lot, greatly.

Q: Hum, good. What do you think the goals of this program were?

A: It was like this. It was mainly to cultivate the comprehensive literacies of some talents inside our Bureau, some outstanding people in various areas. It mainly, it did not mention any skills. In fact, its content was rather extensive. That is to say, equivalent to…

Q: Hum.

A: Yeah, a kind of cadre management training. There was management kind of, and some expansion kind of [content]. Still other content belonged to how to communicate. Additional there might have been some content including how a person should do if his/her position level was promoted later. Mostly such content.

Q: Ok, thanks. The eighth question is: Then to what extent do you think this comprehensive literacy training program solved important performance problems in your unit?

A: Hum, the word “performance” seems to have not been mentioned for a long time now. What does performance mean?

Q: It is any, that is, within the departments of your industry, or the unit in your province which you are more familiar with, or within your administrative office, any result that relate to the work output, goals, and strategies of your colleagues, yourself, your superiors and inferiors, or the
entire unit, are all called performance. Just those problems that are related to these output, ah, results, or influence. Did this program solve any of these problems?

A: Hum, this area for me is perhaps, it may be that, about output performance, this is actually a very vague concept for me. Um… If it is about me, about my job, or about my present, that is I, some of the input and output of the work content of the administrative office that I am managing, ah, or whatever, if it is to understand it this way, then there is something. If only talking about the products, this to us, this output actually makes me feel like a kind of product, or whatever… Is there a deviation in my understanding? I think in the area of my work, in fact about output, in fact, actually it does not involve any output or what. So about the performance area, in fact, I seem to feel us… Is it this… I’m afraid I cannot express it clearly. I don’t know how to say. Because I was engaged in equipment maintenance, is it that if my maintenance amount is up, then it is the performance which is up. How about this thing…

Q: Yes, all counted, this is all counted.

A: This is very hard to understand.

Q: Let me explain about this. I’ll try to connect it to your job position, ah. That is, like what you said, except that output may be rigid. Product and output, in fact, all, all work-related. For example, the improvement of your own management abilities, you feel you may be more able to adapt to the future higher positions of management, or your abilities of managing and guiding your subordinate is improved. Also the increase of the efficiency of your unit, your administrative office, that you can troubleshoot problems better and more timely. These are all counted, all considered as performance, are considered as output.

A: Hum… um… About this there is an improvement. There is quite apparent improvement.

Q: Hum, can I talk about which are the aspects? Or give an example?
A: Hum… OK, OK. Like this. That is, for me personally, that is formerly, let me say, let me say my personally feeling. Let’s say it in straightforward language. Previously it may be a feeling that, our administrative office was already running, like in a track.

Q: Yeah.

A: That is to say, from when I took over this administrative office to when some professional work of this administrative office operate, many of its work was stipulated, as if prescribed actions. Then, we were already very well in process and modeled. No matter whether I was on a business trip or at home, the operation of our administrative office would not encounter any obstacle. It was already like, uh, we had thought of all that can be thought of. Then after the training, I discovered a lot of that, the processes we originally designed, including that, that is to say, some things we did during the time when I was in the training, possibly some solutions, were not very reasonable. After I returned, we also made some adjustment.

Q: Yeah.

A: That is to say, um… For example, possible… Take a drawn flow chart that I saw as an example. Maybe I saw it at that time and felt it was very well drawn. However, after I finished the training, I had deeper understanding. Then if I relook at the flow that we drew about, I felt that many of the processes were not connected. It did not constitute the kind of loop that we anticipated. In other words, if it was a machinery, then at the time before my training, I would think that all the gears and occlusion, ah, or the use, of the machine I designed, was quite reasonable. Then when I looked back, maybe this stuff I designed had many places easy to get stuck. There were many unreasonable places. In fact, after we made the adjustment, it was a great facilitation to our work. The personnel in our administrative office could also feel it. In the past few years since 2015, in the few years, not only our processes, but also some of our flow,
and also the operation of our professional work, have been much more smooth than before. And no matter whether our work increased, or whatever, that is to say, in our big one, this is equivalent to… This… Process, ah, or this kind of track, ah. In this environment, no matter what task was assigned to our administrative office, we can always complete it very effectively and very fast.

Q: Great, thanks. Then let me ask the ninth question: To what extent do you think this training program demonstrated impact on improving the output of your unit? In fact, you just touched some on this. You mentioned that you improved both the process and effect of your work of your administrative office quite apparently, right? Do you have anything to add? In these aspects?

A: Hum… What I can say may just be our administrative office, right? Well, indeed. That is, apart from our administrative office, for our entire unit, um… How to say it? Because our administrative office is also an indispensable part of the unit. And inside our unit, it can be considered a key administrative office. After all, we are the—if you understand about that industry, much of it relies on the devices. Devices needs to collect data. Then we are engaged in device maintenance. Only if the maintenance of our side is implemented better, its precision is improved, will its data be reliable, right? And that, for data update now, we also rely on the data, and we will also rely on this kind of big data for work in the future. Of course, in our part, that is to say, we can ensure that the devices can operate safely and stably. We can maintain these devices fast, faster and or more smoothly, and adjust the devices with deviation well. For our entire Bureau, not only our unit, but even the departments of our entire Bureau, this… The smooth flow of this kind of data of work and the smooth collection will both be greatly improved.

Regarding this, in fact, in recent years, our administrative office, I feel our contribution amount to this unit is also gradually improved. I can personally feel it as well, because when I
wrote the work summary each year, every year I would refer to what I did in the last year to. Take the summary I wrote in 2017 as an example. I would take a look at it: What did we expect in 2016 for 2017, right? To what extent did we expect to accomplish the goals? What can I accomplish? This would improve every year. About this point, it can be apparently seen in this administrative office where I am in. This is actually inseparable from this training. It does not mean that I rely on my work, one year after another. In fact, if you say that, before taking this training, perhaps my job was equivalent to that, that is, repeating, repeating and repeating. It was such work. Whether I did good or bad work may not have apparent manifestation. Yes, I may have some expectations for the next year, then, the extent of expectation would not be like that… That is, I found some shortcomings of myself. Once I made up of them, I found this new process I made, or this and that … flow… There is a method or a means of dealing with things. Then whether or not this procedure is more reasonable, or it has some higher expectations. In this way, we are actually moving toward a better direction gradually.

Q: Yes, then can I understand it like this? That is, this comprehensive literacy training program improved the device maintenance and technical capabilities of yourself greatly. Then reflected in your work, the efficiency of equipment maintenance and the efficiency of problem solving was both improved apparently, including that it led your entire administrative office to have quite apparent improvement. Is that right?

A: There was apparent improvement. Maybe this of my training was not directly related to the technical capabilities. Yet, some ideas it gave me, including some that I saw, perhaps some that I saw, and perhaps some other knowledge that I absorbed, can melt well in the work. There was great improvement. That is true.

Q: OK, thanks.
Q: I am asking the tenth question now. Please try to think about it. Your perceptions about the value of training, which actually refers to the aspects of the three questions I asked you from the very beginning. Those were: What are the training needs of your subordinates? What are the attitudes of your subordinates towards training? What are the benefits of training for your unit? Is there any relationship between your perception of the value of training, and the degree to which you were involved in the various training programs of the training college?
A: I do not really know how to express it if talking about the degree. Let me put it this way. Actually, I do not know if this of my answer is consistent with what you are want to understand about. What I would like to say is that, myself, including the people in our administrative office participated in this kind of training, of course such kind of training included, for the people in our administrative office to participate in this kind of training, first and foremost, it was I who agreed, and it was also our leaders who agreed. It was like this, right? It was recognized by us. This kind of training means improvement and promotion for all our work. Currently speaking, that is, I… When we received a notice we would advise particular people to attend the training. There has not been a situation so far that, at the moment when we saw the content of this kind of training, we decided not willing to participate, and this would not improve us. There was no, no such a thing. Every time, that is to say, if our administrative office personnel went for a training, in the training process, maybe after class or at night, he would have some exchange with us. He would tell us what class he had that day. Regarding how well this class was taught, we would have such communication among us. We would have a discussion after he came back. Every time, that is to say, including when I had training for some science and technology cadres, some content, after I came back, I would also pick some content that has can promote our administrative office, to exchange with our personnel in the administrative office, about how I
can apply such to our administrative office. This may be, may not applicable to all administrative office, just this of our administrative office. If you would like to have a management model, this is my personal management model. It is related to the nature of our work.

Q: Ok.
A: Because of us, we hope to all our training can be used in our professional work. I feel that, there was great effect after coming back from each training. Not to say however obvious improvement it was, there might be some, such as the cross-profession kind, not very obvious improvement. But for the facilitation of our work and including future development and direction, we would all integrate it. Which was not understood before, is now understood. It is better this way.

Q: Let me follow up on this question. You attend a variety of training college programs, such as these several kinds you just mentioned, skill kind, comprehensive literacy kind. Were these programs mainly designated by your superiors for you to attend? Or else that there were also some programs that you could choose on your own to sign up for participation?
A: Hum… There were designated programs for participation.

Q: Hum.
A: There were also some, after we got the news, we attended depending on demand. There were such. But we attended most of the programs based on need; there was very few that were designated. That is, there was very few programs which designated one person of a particular administrative office to participate in.

Q: Good. Hum, then can I understand it as that, because I feel that you are a very studious and very positive person yourself, then your perceptions toward training is also that you value it very much. You think that it is quite good for you and your colleagues. So overall, you view each
training program and opportunity quite positively, you pay attention to things in various aspects actively, including studying such training classes earnestly. Including that you would also pay attention to its results report occasionally, things of such kind. Can I understand it like this?
A: Yes, that’s right.
Q: OK, OK, thanks. Now I ask the eleventh question. What do you think about the relationship between your perceptions about the value of training, and the accountability of this comprehensive training program? Explanatory terms in my place refer to the three questions you asked me just now. The accountability I meant here refers to the three questions in the middle I just asked you about. That is, I asked: To what extent do you think this program achieved its goals? To what extent did the program solve important performance problems in your unit? To what extent could it improve the impact in the output aspect in your organization? This is generally its accountability. So do you think there is any relationship between your perceptions on the value of training and the accountability of this program you have seen?
A: Did we actually talked about this when we were just conversing?
Q: Yes, there must be some.
A: So there was some. It seems I don’t have much to say about this, ah. It is actually to repeat those I answered before. Like output, ah, or like… I feel like that was all included in it. Right?
Q: I may have asked this question in a way that made it difficult for you to answer. I will explain a little. That is to say, because you personally have quite positive perceptions about training overall. You feel that training in general is valuable. Then you have your own views about what types of training is more suitable for your administrative office. So I am thinking, whether your own perceptions about training that are so positive would you favor this comprehensive literacy training program and its overall final effect and the results naturally. You would just think the
program had quite good and quite obvious improvement effect. Or, you think there is no relationship between the two. Based on the demonstrated results of the program and what you objectively feel, then you felt it, either for you or for your administrative office, had quite obvious influence and facilitation in each aspect.

A: This is equivalent to our evaluation of this comprehensive literacy training class, right?

Q: Yes, we mainly focus on this training class, this topic.

A: Objectively speaking, objectively speaking, for me personally, this training class actually affected more than just myself. It really affected my management of the entire administrative office. Including how to cooperate better with the leaders. Then to be able to make a bright spot of some of our existing work, some of the routine work. It was indeed greatly helpful with this. This is, objectively speaking, not some of my subjective ideas, but that it was already shown.

Q: Hum, OK, um.

A: This kind of results was already manifested.

Q: Ok, thanks. Basically the last question I will ask: Do you feel there is a relationship between the extent of your participation in various programs of the training college, and the accountability that you think of this training program?

A: Can I understand this question as, that is, If I feel this training was done well, I can participate in more such kind of training next time. Does it mean this? Or I understand this wrongly?

Q: Maybe, possibly that, I did not make it clear. There was a little bit difference. In fact, what I would like to ask here is: Is it possible that since you participated in this program quite actively, and you put in quite some energy and effort, then in the end you are quite positive in viewing this program. Or vice versa. Is there any such relationship?
A: Well, about this I think, if it’s about attitude, it may have more to do with subjective things, right? After all, the training lasted only twenty some days. Yet, it was actually very compact. I would not say that, because I have more energy put into this, then it would definitely affect my normal professional work. I do not think I am like this.

My personal study is like this. Because I have the attitude of learning to study, just like that, I want to apply what I learn. I would firstly have that, for example I have expectation. That is, when I read the theme of this training class is I would certainly have expectation. That is what I would get if I am here. It may, it would definitely offer some course set up. Then I would think about what I will get from each course. I would also consider ahead of time what this would bring to me and myself, including of work of my unit. I would consider it in advance. In the process of learning, I will communicate about what I want with the instructors. I would have some exchange with the classmates as well.

Well, that is to say, I can say it like this, personally I feel, this training class that I attended is the most worthwhile for learning, perhaps during more than ten years since I worked. Because it was not just a training provided by a teacher who gave you the training content. More is more because some reasons that, the training participants were some colleagues in other departments from various provinces. Then among more than thirty learners of this training class, not many were engaged in the same class of work. Perhaps I was engaged in device security, there may be some doing office work, personnel work, and some from other professional departments. Perhaps all were not the same. In respect of such difference, in the past, when I worked in my unit, I might know better about what my unit was in charge of while I may not communication with other departments horizontally too much. Well, in those twenty some days, we actually communicated with each other horizontally more among the thirty some classmates. Not only did
I get to understand the other departments or the other administrative offices, and their work status, and some of the things that they were more inclined to. So in fact, there was communication between provinces in the other provinces. When we talked together, we would understand about something in each other’s province. There was particularly lot of such communication.

This actually for me personally, why did I say it means significant improvement for my job? It may be because of that, my view was relatively limited in the past, only limited to our place, for example where I worked. Then later on, I found out that in addition to some things in the class, the results from some exchanges also facilitated greatly the work. Many things that were comprehended by analogy. Perhaps my area of security, or with development, or with other professional departments, maybe for me personally in the practice, it does not have, um, direct connection. But after communicating with everyone, you would find that some thoughts and some ideas of them can be brought to your own job totally. In fact, I feel what this training brought to me, and it is indeed the most valuable training I have participated in so many years.

Q: Hum, OK.
A: Later, whether I will have more valuable training, I do not know. But at least for the moment, my personal feeling is indeed this case. I am not sure whether this answer can…

Q: Hum, OK. The question itself may be a bit unclear. But you have said so much, and I understand what you mean, which has basically reached what I wanted to know. Thank you! I basically asked all the questions. Firstly, let me summarize briefly some points you just replied, alright? Finally, if you still have additional content to add, you can complement it to me, OK?

So, through these questions I asked you, for example, you think your subordinates’ need of training is more on the aspects of the device maintenance of your administrative office and
practical skills. Then training on the soft and comprehensive literacy aspect is also needed, but may be secondary. Then you think that your group members as a whole are very positive about training. They attend training with the attitude that they learn actively and would like to improve their capabilities, instead of sabotaging, ah, or viewing training as welfare, as a leisure place. You think that training as a whole, not only leads to your personal improvement greatly, but also promote the cohesion of your administrative office. It also enables all the group members to do their job better.

You were not much involved in the development process of the training college programs. You mainly participated as a participant in several training programs of the training college, including skills kind, comprehensive literacy kind, professional knowledge kind, and even multi-major kinds. Generally, these programs each lasted perhaps less than a week. Well, you also pay more attention to the evaluation of the training college programs. You would fill out the evaluation form when completing a lesson for them, or the evaluations form sent within sometime after the completion of the lesson. Sometimes you would also provide some feedback in person on training programs you attended.

Then, you participated in this comprehensive literacy training class in 2015. You think that this literacy program achieved its originally stated goals to a large extent. That is, it needed to cultivate cadres, and train some key talents. Through communicating with the trainees and receiving the teaching of the instructors in this class, you gained quite some benefits in each aspect. This program, in your opinion, improved the management of your administrative office quite significantly. It helped you to rethink about some of the processes of your administrative office. There may be work in this area, that will help to improve the effectiveness of the work. And then you think the main thing in this training class was not that it enhanced technical
abilities of individuals, but most importantly, its ideas and content can be integrated into the management work of your administrative office. It enables great improvement of the overall working capabilities of your administrative office. You participated in a variety of programs provided by the training college, with a few designated by the higher authorities, while most of which are chosen independently based on needs.

Then, the tenth question is almost this case. Then, this training program you participated in, for you overall, finally and overall manifested effect objectively, that it allowed you to learn quite good content, and it provided you objective assistance and advancement. So in general you are very positive about this training class. Finally, your understanding of this class was generally a relatively dynamic process. That is, before your participation you had your own expectation. Then in this process, especially when there was quite some exchange between diversified students from different provinces and different jobs in the class, it made you feel this learning experience was very valuable.

In general, this is almost it. I recorded some points. Then there is more, because I’ve recorded it with a recorder, I did not record it in my notes. So, lastly, at the closing time of the interview, do you have anything to add to the topics that we just talked about?
A: No. I basically answered all I could answer to the questions you asked. Your summary is very good.

Q: OK, OK. Thank you. Then do you have any question for me? That is, no matter about training or other aspects, is there any question I can help you answer? Or is there anything you want to know?
A: Well, no. What I do not quite understand is your research. That is, it needs too much… I personally belong to this kind of… That it is not related to work, huh. Maybe I personally still
think, I feel, when my colleague notified me that there was an interview file and whether I could help to fill in it. I feel that since I participated in this type of training, no matter you want to know about the results of this training, or including some influence on me, or some content, I think I can tell you. So, I filled it up soon. In this case, I personally may not know about what information you need or want. Perhaps it means when it needs me to add, I do not know what to talk about. Maybe, if you still need any more, you can ask me in time. I will tell you if I know.

Q: Thank you! You already filled out the questionnaire and did this interview for me, which should be enough, and there should be no follow-up questions. Let me explain, because I am working on dissertation here, which is a relatively large, a quite formal study. Therefore, I am focusing on the final effect of this program offered by you're the training college of your Bureau. Popularly speaking, it is the impact on the unit and the impact on the learners, these aspects. But maybe because of some professional terms, it is not particularly easy to explain and understand. Then, I mainly send the questionnaire to conduct interviews. I especially thank you for being so active. Because in fact I have also contacted a few others, but it is slower. Your pace is the fastest, and you are the first one to arrange the interview time, and then today we finished the interview. Then you provided all such information, including some of the points that we clarified in the middle. There might have been places you did not understand in the middle, which also enables me to better improve my questions. Then when I interview others later, possibly when I ask the questions, I can do it more smoothly. Then all of the feedback you provided is of particular importance. I especially thank you! Later, I probably will not need to ask you any other questions, because the process of my research has been almost finished till the step of interviews, and then I will run data analysis, like this. I do not know if you have left your e-mail address in the questionnaire, and whether I need to provide you a result report of the
questionnaire investigation in the end. I do not remember, but there is the information in my system. All those who filled in that blank and left their email addresses, I will send the overall statistics of this data out to.

A: I left. I left this at that time. If convenient, that is to say, I want… There is no boundary for learning. So I’d like to know a little more, some of these essays, some ideas or thoughts that has some relationship to our actual work. I want to know.

Q: OK, OK. Then this I can do. On the one hand, I will send you the result report of the survey questionnaire at the end. Then finally, later, if I see something related to your job positions in the future, I personally may not be very concerned with some things particular in your industry, but if I see some of the international stuff, and I think I can share it with you, I will share it with you in WeChat. Okay?

A: OK, thanks, thank you!

Q: Hum, thank you! Thank you very much for participating in this interview today! Besides, all the information you provided is very important to my research. It is very important for me to graduate from the school and for my study. Thank you very much! Then I wish you all the best in your work and life, thanks!

A: OK, thanks, thank you!

Q: Ok, great, thanks! I’ve taken your time. Well, then we are all set. Goodbye, bye!

**The Second Interview**

January 6th, 2018

Q: Hello, division-level cadre!

A: Hi, hello! Hello, Ms. Tong!
Q: Can you hear me clearly?
A: Yes, I can. I hear you clearly.

Q: Alright, great. I’ll try to speak up, hum.
A: OK, good.

Q: Have you had your breakfast after you got up this morning? You got up so early. Haha.
A: Hum, it’s not early to get up at this time here. Under normal circumstances, we should get up at around 6 o’clock.
Q: Oh, that’s quite early, too.
A: Yes, we get up at 6 and, ah, go to work at 8:30.
Q: Wow! It’s so early! Alright.
A: Yes, that’s right. Because of time difference, maybe our… I have no idea about the time of work and life in your place. We always go to work at 8:30 am.
Q: Oh! It’s different for going to work.

Because among people still studying in school like us, there are quite some night birds. We usually stay up late in night, and we get up a little bit late in the morning.
A: Hum, right.
Q: OK! Well, I just sent you the outline of the interview. You may have just taken a look. In general, the questions I will ask are still mostly the ones you filled in in the form, the survey.
A: Oh.
Q: The general structure is roughly the same. I will just dig a little bit deeper according to your feedback. Is that ok?
A: Oh, fine, fine. Sure.
Q: Alright, good. Hum, then let’s get started. Do you have any questions for me before we start?
A: Oh, no, I don’t have any questions.

Q: Were there anything fuzzy, unclear, or unsure for you, when you filled the questionnaire?

A: Um… Since I have attended some of this kind of training, and we had some of such training classes, I filled in this survey. So, I might have some of such experience. However, I don’t quite understand what evaluation you, as the researchers, are doing about this training eventually, ah. The only thing I know is that you are doing this research.

Q: Hum, right, we are just conducting this research. It is not really an evaluation. We just want to figure out the operating conditions of this training program, and the influence to the attendants at the end. Hum, so this is not counted as an internal evaluation of your Bureau. Hum.

A: OK.

Q: You, in 2015…. Hum, go ahead.

A: Hum, does this research focus on all training? That is, does it target all categories of trainings, or does it focus only on the internal training of the administrative systems of our kind?

Q: This of my research is just done within you Bureau. And then, but I myself am not a person inside your Bureau. I am just writing a dissertation while I am attending a university here in the United States, so this is a relatively independent research. My research is mainly focused with the training college and mainly the comprehensive literacy training program that you participated in. And then also some other aspects and some of the problems on training related to this program, all together.

A: Oh, oh, oh.

Q: Hum.

A: Hum, that’s ok.

Q: Well, are you involved in this program in 2015 or 2016?
Q: Oh, OK, alright. Then I will start the formal interview with you.

A: OK.

Q: Well, first, thank you very much for coming so early today and taking the time to participate in my interview. The purpose of my interview is to understand the programs of the training college of your Bureau, as well as some related content. I have prepared some questions that I am going to ask you today. I may also follow up with you on some relatively important content that emerged when you answered my questions today. I hope you feel free to express your opinions on any issue. I will make sure that all the information you provide is confidential and anonymous. The rest of your organization will not be exposed to the content of the interview. No one in the country will have access to the content of our interview. This interview has nothing to do with your work performance appraisal in your organization. So if you know all of this and are ready, I can ask you the questions.

A: You can start it. You can.

Q: Well, thanks, uh. The first question: What kind of training do you think your subordinates need?

A: Well, regarding this in our industrial departments, it may be that different positions require different training. However, comprehensive literacy training is indeed also necessary. Because when the worker was in school, what he learned mostly was expertise, so this comprehensive literacies include the ability of writing, the ability of analysis, that is, to view comprehensively the relation of your industrial work on the society and at the strategic level of the nation. That is the theoretical knowledge in this area, or some basic understanding aspects. Well, additionally, that is, some other comprehensive literacies. For example, the social, ah, or the ability to resist
setbacks, ah, and the ability to get along with others, ah. These areas of abilities, ah, are also quite important in a group.

Q: OK.

A: These comprehensive literacies are still very necessary. I think this kind of class is still very necessary.

Q: Well, OK, OK, thanks! Hum, the second question, then what attitudes do you think your subordinates have toward training?

A: Well, because they have too few chances of receiving training, so to speak. Among my subordinates as general staff, one worker may not get one chance of this kind of training on comprehensive literacy within ten some years. If he is purely working on professional work, ah, within the last three to five years, because we have a lot of new professional work, he would have access to some purely professional-work related, or specific task training. That is, training about maintenance of a certain automatic station, or on a certain communication technology. For this comprehensive literacy training, they basically cannot get. So, because I participated in this training, I feel, ah, in a new environment, then I had contact with some new classmates and some new knowledge. Although it was closed study for every day, but for myself, it was like a change of environment, like a vacation. So I feel like if our subordinates, ah, if he had such a chance, mostly he would welcome it. He should be like this. It should be so, that it is also welfare for the unit to give them this. I think it should be good, and they should welcome it.

Q: Then you are saying that your subordinates usually have more access with their professional-work-related training, position-related training. Right?

A: Ah, yes.
Q: So what are their attitudes, their demonstrated attitudes toward such training?

A: Because our department is offices, which mainly focus on administration. Well, what I just talked about mainly focuses on business. Well, if it is about the area of professional work, then maybe young comrades would welcome it more. If for the 50-year-old and above comrades to attend such training, he feels, I personally feel that it is more difficult. I personally feel that, because there may be some conflicting emotions. Additionally, in units like our grassroots, especially the county bureaus, there are very few people. Therefore, if a certain comrade goes out for training, the other comrades would need to work overtime, and need to do more work. Well, the comrades going out should learn actively, and should also go for the training actively. Well, but in short, the contradiction between the supply and the demand still exist.

Q: Good, I understand it.

A: It should be that, young comrades would relatively, I personally feel that, he should welcome it relatively more, because he likes new knowledge relatively more.

Q: OK.

A: After a certain age, especially for us here, ah, about this, the people who started working in the seventies and eighties are all the kind of who have relatively low academic qualifications, he would have difficulties in accepting such training. This may have certain problems.

Q: Got it, um, OK. Well, the third question, what are the benefits of training to your organization?

A: About training, because the deputy group-level cadre of our office…

Q: Hum.

A: He still has some chances to attend some training, relatively more chances. For example, some emergency management training conducted by our local government is hosted by Zhejiang University. Or that, there is training of section-level cadres within our state Bureau. What’s more,
our local Municipal Party School also has training classes for the group-level and county-level cadres, which are also based on comprehensive literacies. All of these are the kinds of comprehensive literacy. After they went there, there would be a touch at that time. That is, it was at least guiding this comrade, ah, to be ideologically positive. But this thing, it does not happen overnight, nor is it effective for a very long time after attending such training. It should be an ongoing thing that would repeat after three or five years, or after training for three or five times, or repeat every two years or so. Or like this, if such training can be continued for all the staff, it would be quite good. It should be a positive stimulus.

Q: Well, OK, thanks. Well, starting from the fourth question, we are now focusing on a few questions about the training college of your Bureau, mainly about the training programs they developed. The fourth question: To what extent did you participate in the development process of your training college programs?

A: Well, about the development, because we are the trainees, we may be asked for opinions by them before a program is started. Sometimes there are “Three Aspects of Bringing”, such as what problems we’d like to resolve. But those problems may all have some universality. So, as far as that, they would solicit our opinions during this process. That is, about what are the views on this lesson, ah, I think that the trainees can make some suggestions. Still there are such opportunities to express our views, and we are able to participate. However, about the final design of the course, I think it should still be, from the actual point of view of the industrial work, overall designed by the upper levels. Our grassroots participation should still be limited.

Q: You said it very clearly. Thank you. The fifth question: To what extent do you think you were involved in implementing this training college programs? All the programs. Including this one, or other programs you’ve been involved in.
A: Then about this implementation of it that you are talking about, because we are a training session, it was certainly spoken about and listened to. So it’s just that our listening should still be dominantly passive. As far as, in the regard of, some such interactive teaching there, situational teaching, interactive teaching, for those we all participated as required. Only like this.
Q: Hum, is it that you were mainly involved in some of their programs as a trainee? Then, you did not participate in their programs with other identities?
A: Well, yes, because we were just trainees. Right, we would not have, and there should be no other identities for us, to participate. Because of that, because we cannot decide what course he is going to provide, or we cannot just change their teaching plan. Because of your teachers and other aspects are all subject to some aspects of constraints. That or if you say that which teacher is good, and we invite him or her, that is that, not realistic. Therefore, we should still be relying mainly on the college. We still follow their teaching plans, and actively participate in the lesson interaction or situational teaching, to propose something for us. For the reason that, it seemed if we were too active, because in terms of their teaching resources, whatever resources were available for them to use, or among our courses, they also invited some leaders from the Bureau at the central government level to lecture, or invited some professors from the local Party Schools to lecture, in this respect, they mastered the resources. On our side, we should still mainly be accepting it passively.
Q: So how many programs of the training college have you participated in total? That is, in addition to this comprehensive literacy training class, what other programs have you have participated in?
A: I have only participated in this one since I joined in work until now.
Q: Oh.
A: Because this training college, ah, that is, it had training in rotation once for the county heads of the bureaus, at the levels of our administration. Possibly it trained the county heads of the bureaus across the country in rotation for twice, but it targeted the county heads of the bureaus at the grassroots. For us at the municipal level, these middle-level cadres, there was no class in this area. It was a coincidence for me to just have such a comprehensive literacy training class.

Q: Oh.

A: This one I went to participate in, I went to attend it. Regarding comprehensive literacy training, I participated only in this class and no others.

Q: Hum, hum, um. Then were there any other programs conducted by the training college that were for some professional and technical personnel, focusing on the professional and technical positions, and then you were as a middle-level leader to coordinate, and you assigned your subordinates to participate in the programs, were there these programs? Were there?

A: Well, our department is an administrative department, so those were rare. It could actually be seen often on the internet, including direct registration, and also distance teaching. These all had nothing to do with our jobs, so we had not assigned our subordinates to attend.

Q: Well, OK, thanks! The sixth question: To what extent did you participate in the evaluation of your training college programs?

A: Regarding evaluation, it should be said that there were still questionnaires. Hum, yes, yes, for conducting some evaluation on the lessons.

Q: OK.

A: This, this, um, anyway, this is the conventional form, that is, they would send us a survey questionnaire. Well, this, the teacher also talked with us. Hum, I remember the last time, my teacher specifically came to us for a discussion, letting us provide comments and suggestions on
this teaching outline. Well, for this class we had, it should be admitted that the college and the teachers did quite sufficient work in seeking the views of the trainees. It quite adequate.

Q: OK.
A: Well, if to think about it from the perspective of this kind of questionnaire, and if they want to give everyone more sufficient time, I would suggest that this college should send out the survey one day in advance, to allow everyone thinking time.

Q: OK.
A: What to avoid if that? If you have ten minutes before a class, and you give it to the audience, you fill it out within ten minutes. Perhaps in this case, the results of this survey is relatively less ready prepared than if they had longer time.

Q: Hum, I got it.
A: This class of us, like just said, for us the trainees, there are several times it asked us for comments, including lastly the college leaders talked with us. Because it was a new class, our cohort was the third of the comprehensive literacy class, with two cohorts before us.

Q: Hum, yes, it was a pilot class.
A: Their work on soliciting opinions, it should be, I felt it was very sufficiently done.

Q: Well, yes, um, for this program class, after it was over, did they still continue to ask for your opinions within a year or two?
A: Oh, they did not.

Q: Um, OK.
A: Well, because of that…

Q: Well, thanks. Starting from the seventh question, let us consider this comprehensive literacy training program that you took part in in 2015. And then first of all I would like to ask this: To what extent do you think this program achieved its stated goals?
A: To what extent? I think at least, I felt that above 80 percent, we should say it achieved its stated goals. It should be counted as it achieved quite well. Hum, we were the third cohort, and they had been constantly modifying the teaching materials with the teacher, since the earlier cohorts…

Q: Hum.

A: It constantly adjusted the instructors and teaching approaches, while also adjusting the content of teaching. Then, about this, during the teaching, they also deepened the connections among the students through the construction of WeChat groups and such ways. So, in our class, most were young, while I was considered older. That later on, in our WeChat group, there have often been classmates speaking, and exchanging. In our respective jobs, we still maintain the kind of feeling of learning, all the time. A lot is still going on. Therefore, for this, many of the classmates also felt big gain after this class. So I felt that, its teaching purposes, ah, were reached at least 80% and above, which should be quite high.

Q: Hum, um. As I understand, the goal of this training class should mainly be to train middle-level cadres, right? Cadre management training, the training of core talents. Hum, do you think this training class had any other goals?

A: Hum, at that time, this class should be a, a, and a class shift for cadres at the group-level to the division level. Therefore, its training goal should be higher than that for the group-level cadres.

Q: Well.

A: That is, those who went for that training were basically group-level cadres. Um, most of all those went back for work, there were many of them, that they might have been promoted to
division levels. Therefore, its cultivation goal, ah, was different from the group-level cadres, which was at a higher level.

Q: Well.

A: Hum, there were also many classmates who were promoted to a higher position, after coming back. It should be said that, at the municipal level, if one is at the associate-division level, he is basically considered among the top leadership, yeah.

Q: Well.

A: If talking about the provincial level, then the division-level cadres are not at the highest positions yet.

Q: Hum, um.

A: Well, in our class, there were a lot of provincial-level cadres, who accounted for about one-third of the total, while municipal-division-level cadres took up of about a half. So, it was basically such a cohort. It should be pretty good.

Q: Well, OK, OK, thanks! Then the ninth question: To what extent do you think this training program solved important performance problems in your organization?

A: About this issue, it should be said that it would not solve some problems immediately. It is because that, after all it only cultivated me, that is, there was only me who attended this training class. I could only apply what I learned into my own work. In addition, some of them would only cause some association or some touch. Then you, how much you can directly, uh, this will not be getting effect instantly, thought for sure promotion would be there. But sometimes the kind of habits of a person, ah, it would also restrict some of you, your play. You learned a new thing.

Q: Well.
A: Maybe that old thing would still dominate, but you got to know something new. But there would be some distance from how you apply it, ah. So about its effect on the unit performance, I think it would be, just like this training, still a sustained, sustained play. Um, it is constantly possible that, there may be change in a particular aspect this time, a certain small aspect, or the perception about learning, or that of co-worker relationship. Maybe everyone's feeling would be different. As for the performance you said, this thing is quite big, and also quite obvious, or what. Well, I do not think it would have such a significant effect. It should be said that anything, like this kind of training, would not have such a significant effect, unless it is a discussion of a problem or a reform targeting the teaching method, or a reform of the work methods, in which I would have only this one problem, and then we discuss it, and oh, there is a relatively good way you can get it back, and you can go to copy and apply it. This kind of comprehensive literacy training, it is training people, and to change everyone's thinking and cognition, or to increase knowledge of certain aspect. This is not the kind of thing that would get effect immediately.

Q: Hum, then you think…
A: There should be no direct or big facilitation.

Q: Then do you think that, since from your personal point of view, you learned something from this class that might affect your cognitive aspects of the mind, did it indirectly touch you to think about some of the performance problems related to your personal work? That is, anything that might have been changed a little bit due to this class, such as work modes and leadership styles.
A: Hum, yes, this would be sure. This is for sure.

Q: Can you give me an example? A little example?
A: To give you an example, this one, because among these curriculum, they invited a vice mayor to teach us a class. He them told us his experience in politics, uh, that is, how to improve the
methods and capabilities of leadership, such things. It should be said that the students were enjoyed very much listening to it. With this, after we went back, it was very helpful for us to think about how to improve leadership skills. They also invited a teacher in the psychology aspect, to teach us the knowledge of psychology. It should be said that, we also felt it very novel. It was quite good to have something like using some phenomena of psychology, to see some of our own cognitive areas where there were some blind spots, or something. As for the others, there was also teaching of the history of the Communist Party of China, the history of the party. We now talk about some of the policies in the economy. Knowledge of this category, in the past, usually would not be taught within our own unit so systematically. So, they invited the Party school teachers or experts in this field to give an overview of it, about the history of the development of our party and our country’s economic reform and opening up. It should be very helpful for everybody to correctly understand about it. So, that is, this curriculum had quite much content. I felt it had quite a lot of content.

Q: OK, after all, it lasted quite long, three weeks or so. OK, next question: To what extent do you think this project demonstrated its impact on improving the outputs of your unit?

A: Well, to what extent? About this, because the outputs of our unit, taking the positions of our office as an example, are to further improve our abilities to comprehensively coordinate, handle problems, and provide services. For these, I think the program was very helpful. Well, this, because it was training and improvement of comprehensive quality. So, in addition to the position responsibilities, there were some methods of work and some of the knowledge which could be directly applied to our work, still helpful. But it is difficult to quantify it. Because for jobs like ours which are administrative, such performance problems can hardly be quantified. You cannot quantify it, but just say that you feel it helpful and it is facilitating your work.
Q: Hum, good. Um, OK. The following questions may be a little abstract, and we may need to be a little bit that, possibly I need to give a little explanation somewhere. Because these are something relational questions that requires you to exert your subjective thinking about your opinions. So for the tenth question, I want to ask about that, in your opinions: Your perceptions on the value of training--about this, your perceptions on the value of training means what was demonstrated by your answers to the three questions I asked you at first, or others that what value you think training has--um, is there any relationship between it and your involvement in the various programs of your training college?

A: First of all, about this training, ah, I personally think that it is highly important for a unit, very necessary as well. Just as said in the past, a great ethnic group or a great employee is cultivated by educated and training. His education and training should have played a crucial role in his growth. Therefore, this education and training, even for our administrative units and such units, I think should also be particularly important. Because we accepted knowledge at school, and the new environment that you are in once coming to the unit, and the tasks you now undertake, need everybody to unify their thinking, unify their understanding, have a common value, and have a common understanding. Only by uniting one another together, can we push the work forward. If without such systematic training or education, everyone, ah, would be in a free and loose. Therefore, ah, this training, ah, no matter for large units, or small units, at all levels, is very necessary. Very important. This is about the value of training. What was the second question you just asked?

Q: That is the degree to which you participated in various programs at this training college of your Bureau? Is there any relationship between it and your perceptions? What do you think?
A: About this relationship, there would be some. However, what should this relationship be? It should be in a large scope, as if soliciting opinions from the masses. They generally report certain areas of knowledge that we lack, and we target such areas to strengthen it one time. But really, of such knowledge, which level of teachers shall be invited to speak, or which kind of persons should be invited, this initiative, should still be held in the training unit. So, for the trainees like us, it should be said that to a certain extent, we are still more passive. Well, because you are not so suitable to, you can only express it, just like “The three kinds of bringing”, that is, you share about which aspects you feel lacking of. If it is common, then there may be a possibility for an actual combat. If not common, some people hope this, some people want that then it can only be considered overall by the school.

So for this, I noted that you are very concerned about extent of involvement of the trainees. I think regarding this issue, of course, ah, the high and low extent of the participation, ah, varies with everyone. Everybody has a different background from each other, and he used to have different education and training. His experience of work is not the same, and his position is different. Therefore, in this respect, the degree of participation of this trainee, ah, should still play a secondary role. I think the main role is, then after you implemented the questionnaire or analyzed the need of their positions, levels, and himself, your teaching units should develop targeted teaching. Nothing more than this. So about this, because my personal hope is, then I may wish, possibly because I have done many years of management at this group-level position, I may want something deeper. Some may feel since he just came to the group-level position not for very long, he may want things of another aspect. Therefore, there is a difference among the needs of each individual. Regarding this, it should be an issue of overall consideration. This is also for the organizing unit to consider it. Or the unit can require that, regarding the class for the
trainees to attend this time, the trainees should be at a certain level, only how many years I require you have entered a leadership position, or whatever.

Q: Let me explain this a bit: In fact, what I want to know about here, because you mainly participated in only this program of the training college, right? I would like to know that, you may be different from other trainees who attended that training, and you are a person who has very positive opinions about the importance and value of training. So I think, is it possible that such a fact that your expectations and perceptions of the value of training itself are quite high, so when you just started to participate in this program, and during the whole process you were quite active, and your enthusiasm of learning was relatively high? Is this different from other people? For some people, he may think, well, training was just like that. You go to class, walk away, and complete the tasks, and then it is over. Do you think such difference existed?

A: This difference will exist, but I will not say that, the deviation is so big. Because this class was a training class for youth cadres. Among so many classmates, ah, I would say regarding age, many were younger than me. Then for them, such states of being active and aspirant of them, since they were still at that certain age period, were quite adequate, and quite full of energy. It should be said that, the majority was still the case. It may be that once you reach a certain age, or faced with certain opportunities and threats, your cognition about training may not be like that. There would be people like that, but no, the number would not be too large.

Q: OK, thanks. Now the eleventh question, which is still around this training class. Do you think is there a relationship between your perceptions of the value of training and the accountability of this training program? The accountability I am referring to, is exactly your answers to the three questions I just asked in the middle. These three questions include such: To what extent do you think this program achieved its intended goals? To what extent did it solve performance
problems of your organization? And to what extent did it improve the output of your unit? In this respect, we use a word “accountability” to summarize it. Do you think there is a relationship between your perceptions of the value of training and the accountability of this training class?

A: Ah, they are related, because the purpose of our training is to improve the overall quality of each person, while the overall quality includes what we just said, coordination ability, or the ability of analyzing problems, and then training also increases some knowledge about the party, in economics, and all aspects of psychology and so on. This is a comprehensive goal. Well, about this, for our cadres, there really was such an improvement. But I would say about this, it is very hard to quantify this thing and what you call accountability. Because it is not like this, especially this kind of numerical thing. It does not have this kind of quantification. First of all, it will not be obvious, nor will it be immediate. Secondly, it does not have a standard of measurement. Thirdly, from an individual point of view, the gain can hardly be quantified. For example, after I came back from training, I was in the unit, maybe I had improvement in solving a particular problem, in comparison to the past, but I also felt it not too obvious. Ah, because after all, it has a process. So, that is, training is not a so-quick success, and you cannot rely on one time of training for immediate effect, or very significant improvement and effect. Between them, from a scientific point of view there would not exist very high accountability produced by a single time of training, I think.

Q: Well… this is not necessarily the case, oh.

A: Well, it should be a gradual process. Maybe for different people, his accountable intensity is different. For example, for those of us who had not been exposed to this kind of comprehensive literacy training in the past, when we went this time, we would feel, oh, so much new knowledge. I felt so touched. If he had attended such a training, and went to such a similar training, for him
maybe, this accountable extent was not that strong. Feeling that the teacher spoke well, you also had gains, but after returning to your job position, for this, for the individual emotion, you participated in a new training class, you may maintain a long time of that emotion, and you may still be in that effect of promotion. If for the second time of training, maybe after maintaining the enthusiasm for a month, it would decrease.

Q: Well, I understand. So what I want to know about here is, because I feel overall you attach quite much significance to training, and then your overall evaluation of this comprehensive literacy training class is quite high, so I want to know you, and other similar trainees like you who pay quite some attention to training. During participation, including after attending the training, you would pay some attention to observing whether this training class had any indirect impact on yourself, and your subordinates, as well as the output, ah, in terms of promoting your work and all aspects, and finally you would have noted quite some details for improvement, because of which, your evaluation of the accountable extent of this training class is relatively high. Do you think there may be such an inherent relationship?

A: Oh, because that, I think that training is a continuous process, and then it cannot be said to be a process that would have immediate effect, so I attended the training, and even if my subordinates went to attend this class, and after he came back, I do not hold too much hope about how much his performance can improve, because it is a very slow process. Some people say that it takes ten years to grow a tree and a hundred years to bring up a generation of good people. There would not be immediate result of improvement after he took part in one training session. Neither should we nor is it necessary to hold such a big expectation. Because there is a daily routine, in fact, this training was only a concentrated education of his mind. Then more education may be in the daily work, then you, have this change. But these two are mutually promoting.
Q: Well, OK, thanks. The next is probably the last question I have to ask you. Well, do you think there is any relationship between the level of your involvement in this program of the training college of your Bureau and the accountability of this program as you think of it?

A: The relationship should be there. That is, indeed, the more participation from such trainees, the more motivated the students would be. It may also have an extreme value. You let him to participate too much, and he feel very tired, he would have a resistance mood about participation, and it may start to play a reaction. So, proper participation, or appropriately increase the extent of participation of the students, for example, making suggestions to the teacher, proposing ideas of improvement for the class, which I think is helpful for the teaching.

Q: Well, good, thank you. Then in the end, let me briefly summarize the feedback you just gave me, and after my summary, if you have any other information related to the content that we talked about, you can add it, OK?

Let me briefly summarize it. First of all, you think that, from the perspective of your subordinates, they need different training for different positions. However, comprehensively speaking, comprehensive literacy training is also very necessary. These aspects may include writing ability, global view, theoretical knowledge, social skills, stress tolerance, and communication skills, and so forth. And then secondly, you think that your subordinates’ attitudes toward training are divided in two aspects. Firstly, you feel that there are too few chances for your subordinates to participate in this kind of comprehensive literacy training, however if they have such opportunities, they would certainly welcome them. And then regarding the training for professional positions, the attitudes may vary according to age: younger subordinates would be more active; older subordinates, because of their backgrounds, learning abilities and ages, they might be a little more resistant, with some problems of work
shift adjusting, and so on. Thirdly, regarding the benefits of training for your organization, you mainly mentioned that, people like you and your deputy group-level cadre have higher chances of attending training. Then you mentioned that, units such as the Party School of your Provincial Party Committee, and the Party School of your Municipal Party Committee provided you some group-level training. And then from the effect aspect, you mentioned that at the time of training and after it, as a trainee, there will be some psychological touches on you, and then the effect of training will be gradually reflected in the later work.

Fourthly, about your involvement in developing the training college programs, you as a participant, mainly provided some opinions to help them develop the curriculum. Fifthly, about your participation in the implementation of the training college programs, you were also mainly as a trainee, primarily just participated in this one comprehensive literacy training program. Then you were actively involved in the interactive teaching of the training class. And then, for the sixth question, you provided your evaluation and opinions on this program through ways such as a survey questionnaire, discussion with the leaders and so on. Then you think that the training college has generally done an adequate job in collecting the students' opinions on this program. Then you made a suggestion that they shall allow more time for the learners to prepare when soliciting their opinions.

Seventhly, you think that the comprehensive literacy training program reached its stated goals to about 80% overall. Its goals were not only training middle-level core talents of management, but also having a positive expectation for the students, through comprehensively training them in all aspects of their qualities and abilities, in order for them to be able to fit into higher positions in the future. For the eighth question, about to what extent this program solved performance problems of this unit, you think training would not have immediate effect for
performance problems, while it must be a gradual process. And then you personally did learn something from this training class that can be applied to your own work, and this class had some direct impact on your thinking and cognition aspects. Such effect would make you rethink some of the content including your personal work styles and some management styles. Then you gave some examples that, when a vice-mayor shared his own political experiences and the improvement of his leadership abilities during his lecture, and there were some psychology content as well as the history of the Communist Party of China. These aspects have quite positive influence and facilitation on your personal cognition. For the ninth question, you think that this program, specifically speaking, taught the students, or for you personally, improved the abilities of co-ordination, problem solving, and serving, and then you brought such aspects to your administrative office which improved the abilities of your office in these areas. Then you also gained some abilities of improving your personal work from the training class.

For the tenth question, your overall perception of the value of training is quite positive, very positive. Then your overall evaluation of this comprehensive literacy training class is also quite positive. Then you think it is necessary to have training for either administrative units like yours or other units, so that it can unify the thinking and understanding of all. Then you think, if comparing your and some of your other classmates, if you have different opinions on the value of training, then it would have slight impact on the extent of their participation in the training classes. But the impact would not be particularly large, because generally everyone is relatively young and active. For the eleventh question, overall you think training is a continuous process which would not have immediate effect, and you should not expect it to have a quick effect, instead you should give it time to allow it demonstrate its effect slowly. For the final question, you think that there is a certain relationship between the extent of your participation in the
training college programs and the accountability of the program you think. Because the more the students participated in the program, the more active he or she participated in the interactive parts in appropriate situations, the more motivated he or she would be to learn. In the end, his/her views on the program may be more positive. Probably like these. I do not know if there is anything wrong with what I summed up.

A: Well summed up. You summed it up very well.

Q: Thank you. Then as you see, what else can you add, please?

A: Well, it is to be added that, at that time when I attended this training class, my personal opinion was that, if every one of our employees, that is, every one of our staff, could attend this kind of training class for one time, it would be so great. Well, we should say that, making it as a training program for all the employees, and let everyone, ah, have such a chance, would be the best. It had better not to be limited to only middle-level cadres, or top-level leaders, ah. And this kind of training can be popularized. Of course, when carrying out this training, it should be targeted at different audiences. There should be one kind of training content and approaches for the middle-level cadres. There should be another kind for our staff members and comrades in general. That is, the training should be specific for the audiences, which is the kind of all personnel training. This would let everyone go out to liberate ideas, and get a change of environment. This should be helpful for work. In terms of time, it should be about a week, or three to five days, like this. So for such leading positions, for the leaders who are responsible for relatively greater responsibilities, this kind of comprehensive literacy training class can be like ours to have time of three weeks or two weeks. It would be better this way, quite helpful.

Q: OK, OK, thanks. The questions I would like to ask today have all been asked by now. Thank you very much for all your replies. Again, I sincerely thank you for participating in this interview
today. All the information you provided is very important for my research. It is also very important for my personal study. Thank you very much, then I wish you all the best in your work and life!

A: Well, good, good, OK. I also wish you success in your research!

Q: Thank you.

The Third Interview

January the 7th, 2018

Q: Dear leader, thanks for coming to the interview. The purpose of this interview is to understand your opinions about your training college programs and others. I have prepared some questions for you. I may also follow up with you on salient points that emerge. Please feel free to speak up your mind to any of the questions. I will keep all the information you provide confidential and anonymous. Nobody else in your organization will have access to the content you share. The interview has nothing to do with your performance appraisal. Please let me know when you are ready.

A: Hello. About the questions listed in the protocol you provide, I will answer it one by one, and send my reply to you. Can such arrangement be acceptable to you in lieu of an interview?

Q: Sure, thank you, group-level cadre. This should work. It’s just I may need to follow up on some of your feedback, so I will also ask you that here.

A: OK.

Q: What are the training needs of your subordinates?
A: What the Finance and Accounting Group I belong to needs the most is training on the finances and management aspects, such as budget management, final account management, asset management, government procurement, and the usage of the accounting work system.

Q: Besides the most needed training for your subordinates on the professional work of financial management, do they also need training of comprehensive literacy aspects, for instance, communication capabilities, emotion management, and theoretical knowledge, etc.?

A: Yes, they need. As government employees, these skills are indispensable qualities that we need to improve.

Q: OK, thanks.

A: I was trained in these respects while I was in the comprehensive literacy training program, therefore, I think such aspects of training are really good and quite necessary.

Q: What are the attitudes of your subordinates towards training?

A: They are eager to have sufficient time to participate in training about financial management aspects beyond completing their own work, and if they do have such opportunities, they would cherish such opportunities a lot, in order to improve their levels of financial management.

Q: OK. I understand. Were there any circumstances where your subordinates had conflicts between their training time and their own work?

A: Yes, there were. That is because the authorized size of a management administrative office itself is quite limited, and every member in the group has different share of work, which makes it very normal to have conflict with training when there were unfinished work.

Q: OK, thanks.

Q: What are the benefits of training for your organization?
A: For sure it enhances the management levels of people, and secondly it improves their personal abilities, which forms basis for personal development. It also allows people to learn some advanced experience and knowledge about management, accelerates the development of the overall cause. After all, the cause can’t develop without the improvement of people.

Q: How many chances are there for your subordinates to receive training overall? What are the benefits of training for them?

A: There are a lot of chances for my subordinates to take training, mostly the training sessions are remotely conducted, which also covers different aspects of financial management. Rarely are there any chances of targeted or special face-to-face training. Regarding benefits, the first thing is the enhancement of management quality of individuals, while it can also foster the promotion of the management function of the whole Financial and Accounting Group.

Q: To what extent did you participate in developing the programs of your training college?

A: The thing that we, the grass-roots, could do was to provide our own training need to the training center of our local bureau, and then attend on time every kind of training, including training conducted remotely or in centralized manner etc.

A: You really don’t have to be so mannerly. How should I call you?

Q: Ha-ha. You can either call me Xiaotong or Xiaoping.

A: Ha-a, I don’t think that is appropriate. It’s better for me to let call you Dr. Tong and so like. Let me call you Teacher Tong.

Q: The key point is that I am still a little bit away from completing my Ph.D. It feels close if you call me Xiaotong. You have a higher professional grade, and your age might also be older than me.

A: Let me just call you Dr. Tong, which is more appropriate.
Q: Fine. Then I’ll just wait for your answer to Question Five.

A: OK, I’ll answer it right away. Regarding the aspect of the implementation and evaluation of the programs of the training college which Question Five and Six are about, our situation is such that, the place I work for does not have a training college, the training college is within the bureau of the municipality. Therefore, my participation in their training development and implementation is very limited. I mostly participated in their training classes and gave feedback of advice or suggestions occasionally, in ways such as survey questionnaires or report submission of feelings and experiences.

Q: Did you ever participate in a discussion to provide feedback, or provide feedback through other face-to-face communication?

A: There seemed not many chances of that.

Q: OK. Were you ever exposed to or did you ever search and read their overall evaluation reports of the training programs?

A: Nope.

Q: OK. Then I’ll wait for you about Question Seven.

A: This is related to the departments we are in. While I belong to the financial department, the training is under charge of the personnel department.

Q: OK, I understand. Were you answering Question Seven just now?

A: Actually, the comprehensive literacy training class was a training program targeting the youth cadres in different regions in nature, and it was also cultivating a batch of division-level reserved cadres for each region. Among those who participated in the training in every place, many got promoted to key positions. Of course, this also depended on the numbers of leader positions in different regions. Overall, the program was very effective. It was very meaningful for thoroughly
implementing and executing the strategies and policies of the Bureau of the country. (My last message was complementing my answers to Questions Five and Six.)

Q: OK, then now you can answer Question Eight.

A: What do you mean by “the program” and the “performance” in Question Eight?

Q: Feel free to answer my question through voice messages when it is convenient for you any time, which will make it faster for you. If we finish it sooner, you can rest sooner. I feel sorry for bothering you for a little long.

The “program” means the comprehensive literacy training class mentioned in an earlier sentence.

A: Not a problem. It will be finished soon.

Q: The “performance” means anything that is related to work results and could be quantified or felt.

A: This is not an easy question. After I participated in this training program, I was transferred to the position in the Financial Management Group, which was also an arrangement of my unit to best use its talents—can this be counted as “performance”? Coz the performance I think is to better conduct one’s own work through training.

Q: If we view this from the angle of a more superior unit, transferring your position could also be a motion reflecting the purpose of the performance of your unit.

A: If I was transferred to a higher management level, that could facilitate the progress of the unit overall.

Q: The program you participated in was about comprehensive literacy training, a lot of the learning content of which could be applied at this new position, right?

A: Yes, it could. For example, the aspects of communication and so on that you mentioned before could be applied.
Q: OK. So let’s move on to Question Nine.

A: How about this, Dr. Tong, you can do your own things, and I will answer your questions one by one, and if you have follow-up questions I will answer them consequently, and will also mark to which question I am answering, does this work for you? Considering that I am resting and you are working.

Q: Ha-ha, it is you who are sacrificing your resting time to help me with my work. I should do whatever needed. I think the pace would be more smooth if we I follow you like this. And also there are only four questions left.

A: For Question Nine, there were two aspects of the influence on improving output, mostly on updating management ideas. One aspect was infused by the design of the curriculum listed by the training program per se. The other aspect was the result of communication among the learners from different provinces. The other was the change of management approaches, which could change some previous management approaches which could be considered as solidified. Overall, it really made tremendous improvement for the financial management of the unit.

Q: Regarding the first aspect, can you elaborate on which management ideas taught by the training class? Which places of your financial management work did you apply such management ideas?

A: In sum, all the management approaches should be on the same page with the policies and strategic deployment of superior departments. For example, in the directions of project application and the directions of finance management, there was different extent of issues of being disjointed.

Q: Good. Let’s move on to Question Ten.
A: For Question Ten, regarding the value of training, I think everybody should be able to learn however old he/she is, just as how sedulous Dr. Tong is studying now! I think training, on one hand, can enhance the value of a person in a unit. Training can promote this kind of value of a person. On the other hand, through the fulfillment of one’s own values, it can advance the level of financial management of the whole region, and bring along the impact of the unit in the whole municipality. This is exactly what training brings. I am not sure whether it is suitable to say it like this?

Q: Yeah, this could definitely help me understand. Other than this comprehensive literacy training class, did you ever join in any other programs provided by your training college?

A: Yes, including two rotary training classes for county-group-level leaders within our Bureau and several times of training programs on financial management. Other latter training related to finances is distance training. Let me take a short break and then answer Question Eleven, OK?

Q: Is it because you see training as more important, so you are more motivated toward participating in the programs offered through your training college?

A: True. I have always been looking forward to and am warmhearted for attending similar training, because I really believe such training is extremely necessary for me.

Q: Thanks, Group-Level Leader. Are you not feeling very well today? You can reply to Question Eleven after taking a break and when you are feeling comfortable.

A: Question Eleven: My perception about the value of training is consistent with that I have been attending different kinds of training since I started working, and with my gain from attending the comprehensive literacy training class. It is also consistent with the fact that I have always been demanding my subordinates to attend different kinds of training in my management processes. I persist because of its benefits.
Q: Do you understand the meaning of the comprehensive literacy training program? Do you need some explanation?
A: I roughly understand it which is the results of the training program, including that for individuals and that for units.
Q: Hum um, pretty much the same.
A: Actually the twelfth question is almost the same with the eleventh question.
Q: Then is it possible that because you think highly of training, your perceptions about this training class are naturally quite positive about this training class?
A: Possible, it is in nature that, personal attitudes are determined by personal needs.
Q: OK. Then I’ll wait for you about the twelfth question. This question is different from the last one. It asks about the relationship between the degree of your attendance in your training college programs and your overall perceptions about this training program.
A: From my point of view, training elevates personal abilities and provides a platform for people to demonstrate their own values. If there are more people like this, then it will definitely improve the management level of the entire unit. This was the way I participated and benefited, and I hope that there are more people in my unit to have the same thoughts. That’s almost it, Dr. Tong.
Q: Is it possible that because you were quite positive in attending all kinds of programs of your training college, you naturally have quite positive attitudes toward this comprehensive literacy training program?
A: Regarding this, I don’t think I am the only one who has this kind of thought, others would have the same thoughts.
Q: Great, thank you. If there is no other relevant information that you would add, we can just end our interview here.
A: Good. I am not sure whether Dr. Tong is satisfied with the answers I provided above. I apologize for my limited abilities.

Q: Thank you very much for your participation in my interview today. I am sorry that I disturbed your rest. The information you shared today is invaluable for my research. I wish everything goes well with you!

A: You are welcome. It’s my pleasure to cooperate with you.

**The Fourth Interview**

January 13, 2018

Q: Hi.

A: Hello.

Q: Hello, I think you are having a rest on the weekend. Am I disturbing you?

A: Oh no, I am just staying at home, with nothing busy right now.

Q: Hum, okay, thank you! I heard yesterday that you get home at around 8:30 every night. You work so hard.

A: It’s not like that. It is mainly because my personal situation is special. You know, where I live is about 20 kilometers away from where I work, and there is huge traffic jam during daily peak hours to and from work, so I may get home relatively late.

Q: Oh, that’s it. Then I heard you saying you are a researcher now, so we can be counted as peers.

A: Hum. Is this your doctoral thesis? It feels like so.

Q: Yes, my dissertation.

You can just call me “you,” or “Xiaotong” or “Xiaoping,” because I think my age might be younger since my work experience is relatively less.
A: Hum, OK, but I haven’t read the list of questions you just gave to me. I barely just gave it a glance.

Q: Hum, that’s alright. I actually just gave it to you for a first glance, to see what the questions are in general. Maybe you know that the questions are overall similar with those in the survey.

A: Oh, the same questions.

Q: Then according to what you told me yesterday, you transferred to another position later, is that right? Did you participate in this program in 2015 or 2016?

A: Hum I participated in 2015. My cohort was the first batch of that comprehensive literacy training in the bureau.

Q: Hum, was the first batch the first cohort?

A: Hum, yes, it was the first cohort. Well, it was in the January of 2015. Then we had a month of training.

Q: Hum, OK. So you were an assistant to a director before, and now putting your heart and soul into research, correct?

A: Hum, yes. I transferred because, well, that is, I used to work at the Xinjiang bureau. You know there are several same-level units in this bureau and I worked in one of them. Then after working for a couple of years, my unit arranged me to attend this training class, for the purpose of transferring me into the bureau. After I came back upon finishing the training I moved to the bureau as an assistant to a director.

Later, for some rectification reasons of the Xinjiang bureau, all persons whom joined later to the bureau were cut back together to another subordinate center, so I went to that center to work as an assistant to the director. Perhaps about over two years after that, along with some other reasons, my current institute held an open recruitment. Thus, I resigned from the center,
that was, after I was not responsible for the center, I competed and was hired by my current institute. Then doing research may be more suitable for me, so from this year, that is, what we call the beginning of 2017, I came to my current institute to concentrate on that, that is, scientific research aspects.

Q: Oh, very good. I feel you may be very interested in doing scientific research. And I took a glance at your WeChat moments. I found your writing style pretty good. You are pretty and very talented.

A: Well, maybe, and personally I think, because I have worked for so many years, I feel it is relative pure of doing research. Because, perhaps, if you do administrative work, you may not only need to have the ability to do professional work, but may also need to communicate with all roles in superior and inferior positions. There may be many subtle, to be straightforward, many things you need to worry about.

Q: Especially some interpersonal matter.

A: Well, interpersonal aspects take up of some. The key is that there are many things you have to worry about, which is not a pure thing. That is to say, for a simple example, during this period of time, if your subordinate’s family has any problem and it affects to anything, you also have to worry about it. You know, things like this. Perhaps it will distract a great deal of your attention and energy. So, this may also be part of the reasons for it. Anyway, because of some coincidences and chances, I went to my current institute.

Q: Yes, yes, I thought, I interviewed several people and finally met a female leader. I am pretty happy...

A: So, it should be that I did not notice it at the beginning. Because I thought, when it was sent to me with a note that the survey is about the comprehensive literacy training program, I thought it
was just a routine, because the program had been over for more than two years. So I finished the questionnaire. Then I saw it after I submitted the survey that the survey was like part of your dissertation. I think, in fact, I did not think too much at that time. And later this morning when you messaged me, I read it carefully and thought that this may be an interview with a leader. Perhaps interviewing a leader is more useful for you, so I told you that in the morning.

Q: All useful. Because you were a leader, and who once was a leader is a leader in his/her whole life. That thoughts and temperament are always with you, right? In addition,

I would like to ask you another question about your background before we start, for that it will help me adjust my questions soon. Did you manage some people when you were an assistant to the director, or did you mainly assist the director?

A: Yeah, I managed some persons, eighteen persons totally.

Q: Ok, good, that is fine. So in a while, I will ask some questions about subordinates, mainly in my first two or three questions, then you can answer them based on your previous experience, okay?

A: OK, no problem.

Q: Ok, good, let’s start the interview, okay?

A: OK, no problem.

Q: Let me introduce the background of the interview and then begin to ask questions. Firstly, I thank you a lot for taking time off to participate in my interview. I know that your work and life are both very busy. The goal of this interview is to understand the programs provided by your training college and related stuff. I have prepared some questions for you today, and may also follow up on salient emergent points. I hope you can express your thoughts on the questions freely. I will make sure all the information you provide is confidential and anonymous. Other
people in your organization will not have access to our interview. This interview has no relationship with your performance appraisal and other things. When you are ready, we can start the interview.

A: Hum, you can get started!

Q: Well, the first question: In your opinion, what kind of training did your subordinates need when you were an assistant to the director?

A: The department I was in before, mainly use technology materials to provide services for various cities and districts. Therefore, it is mainly about professional work. We may relatively need training about our own professional work and computer-related content.

Q: Oh, did they likely need some training about comprehensive literacy?

A: Well, I was actually thinking about this when I was looking at your protocol. That is, um, I think it was like so, that is, there was such a demand. But for a department like ours, ah, it is definitely that this kind of training would only come to whom that may need to do some managerial work. If, um, the professional workers are mainly doing professional work, perhaps they have relatively less access to such training. However, I have actually considered this issue seriously. In my opinion, training of this kind is also quite needed. But from the point of the unit, because you also know that training requires a number of people and funds, so such training for normal professionals will be quite little.

Q: Okay, thank you. Then the second question: What are the attitudes of your previous subordinates’ toward training?

A: Well, I think like this, which may not necessarily be correct, that new hires may be more positive towards training. It does not matter whether they were prepared for long-term or short-term, then they needed to enrich themselves more, and needed to, that is, perhaps, after all they
just arrived in a new organization, there was a big gap between what they had learned before and utilized in practice, perhaps they would feel such training was more needed for them. Then their attitude would be better, that is, more positive.

Then for people who had stayed longer, because they may have undergone a variety of training sessions and meetings, then he may, maybe, would not have that great passion towards longer-term training, such as that more than a month, because after all there were bonds from his peripherals, family members, and even parents and children. Then for training in these aspects they would find it too long. Then additionally, depending on how much the training improves his quality in the course of his own professional work, he may choose such training more positively. I do not know if my answer will be able or not to…

Q: I understand. Actually, this is a... A former group-level leader also told me a similar situation. That is, the people who are older, with senior qualifications, especially those in the fifties and sixties, the educational background of their time made them that, their extent of acceptance seemed weaker than younger. The reasons include attitude and backgrounds that you mentioned. Um, okay, that’s fine. Then the third question: what benefits do you think training brings to your organization?

A: Well, what benefits can the organization get from training? This questions is quite. . .

Q: Yes, um, if you think the question is too big, you can talk about the unit you are now working in, a situation you have observed, and you can also talk about the unit which you previously worked as the assistant to the director.

A: Well, OK, then I will talk about a training about English that I recently participated from early September to middle December in a university in Beijing. Personally, I like this training a lot. Actually, I applied for attending this training last year, but I was not able to go for various
reasons, because you know, only one person in my entire autonomous region can go. So I wasn’t able to go at that time. So when the notice was released this year, I applied for it again very quickly and was admitted.

I feel that, I am particularly grateful for this class, because after I arrived at the training location, that is, what word can I use to describe it? First of all, regarding English, I need this aspect of training. In particular, it was not quite the same as my original anticipation, but when I went there, I would find, it would make you realize a different training method from what you used to have at college or during work. Firstly, you would become very interested from the beginning, and then because of the interest, you would spend a lot of effort and then work very hard to accept the training. Then the other thing is that, my training mates were probably from different provinces and cities of the country, because there was one quota for one province, and Beijing may have more quotas. So because we all came from different locations, we were very happy to have such opportunity to get together. That is, we would all talk about some, that is, share some learning methods and learning experience and mood. Sometimes the training mates would also talk about some things in our local bureaus, which broadened our viewpoints. Not only in English, but also in ways and issues of perceiving things, there may be some differences.

Then, I enjoyed this period of life very much. Although I was not young anymore, well, I cannot say that, perhaps for people, because after all I already had my family, leaving my own home for three months is perhaps quite a long time, but very, very special. That is, this training made me feel quite enjoyable. I almost did not have time to think, ah, this, this training is quite meaningless and I want to go home very much. This kind of time was very rare. So I said, these three months provided me such, this training made me very touched.
Then I’ll talk about a long-term training before this one, probably the training class you talked about, and that was in 2015. I also enjoyed that training and I felt it particularly good. Why? Because the training we received formerly was mostly focusing on professional work, such as training about a particular technology, computer related training, and even some training about some software or systems that we frequently used. Yet, that training course really brought me different enjoyment. It trained from the point of view that how you communicate with your subordinates, then assign tasks, and then with your superiors, to report or convey some situations. Also, what was particular interesting was that there were some lessons teaching you how to deal with media questions. How to work with some other departments, because of our industry, it may cooperate with some other professional departments, to meet and discuss about topics. This training program would mention some of such content. Further, we would think beforehand that politics may sound boring, then in my class, I was pretty impressed that, a professor was hired from the Hunan University. He taught that lesson in a super vivid and interesting way. Thus, it also made me feel that month flied too fast.

In my impression, that training class was also like the English-training class I just told you about, that it chose only one person from each region including Xinjiang and Beijing, with a total of two dozen trainees. Then, um, it made up that a training class. Then it was also that people from every province brought you different feelings and information. So that class was also, we still have contact sometimes although separated for more than two years. Then we would talk about our current situation.

So I think that class was really not the same with the others, even different from the current English class. Because you know, what we have learned in school has always been English, math, chemistry, and something like this, or after you go to college, you learn some
professional courses, and then you go to a graduate school and you will become more, that the expertise you can receive is deeper and deeper, but in fact your scope of knowledge is getting increasingly narrower. However, the training of this program is to train you what you were not capable of, what you needed but would not to train yourself about, or similarly how you deal with people, similarly how you face the media, and how to speak in public places, and so on. That was, pretty good.

Q: Well, very good, ok, thanks. The fourth question is about program development of your training college. I think is it that you participated in this process relatively limitedly? Is it that you provided needs when you were the assistant to the director, right?

A: There seemed to be once, I did once, and it was also something like a questionnaire. There was only once in my impression. The others I should have been involved very limitedly. The rest of the three questions I think are the aspects of cadre education and training, about which my experiences were very little.

Q: No problem, then we can go on faster. Therefore, the fifth question: Did you participate in other programs of your training college, in addition to this comprehensive literacy training class?

A: …

Q: Hello, group-level cadre?

A: Oh, maybe the internet is not so good. It was off. Then let me continue to talk.

Q: Well, I was just asking you the fifth question.

A: Oh, I heard the fifth question. Except that, let me see, the most recent training was the comprehensive literacy training, and then the foreign language training. Then in-between there may be some short-term, for example, seven-days or about-five-days training. You let me
carefully recall them now, I may not be able to say about them very clearly. Maybe I remember longer-term training relatively clearly.

Q: Are all these programs organized by the training college, or they belong to your local organization?

A: English training class was organized by the training college of my bureau. Then, the comprehensive literacy training you just mentioned was also organized by the training college of the bureau. Because the bureau also established several branch colleges in addition to the training college headquartered in Beijing. Then all such training was overall planned by the bureau, and for specific development, each branch college will report some demands. The training college in Beijing will arrange all the training depending on both aspects. It’s only that the training venues may be different. That is, some places may think this is better to be arranged by the bureau, to mainly host the training. The first cohort of comprehensive literacy training was in Hunan. That was the case, all were organized by the training college.

Q: Well, so in these programs you mainly, well, played the role of a participant, right? You were less ...

A: Yes, I was less involved with things like what you just said. The planning of the entire training, and things like this, I was less involved. There was a dedicated department and staff to do this thing. At most, they may send out some questionnaires and then ask you about your aspects of needs. Then what kind of needs or how much needs, and then what kind of training can be provided. Mostly this kind of, questionnaires and things like that. I may have done it once in my impression.

Q: Hum, good. Next question: When you participated in such programs, did they ask you to fill a questionnaire or something at the end of the project?
A: Right, it should have been like that every time.

Q: In addition to the evaluation questionnaire at the end of the class, did they have any other ways for you to provide evaluation feedback? For example, did you have a chance to talk with them face to face?

A: Hum, the comprehensive literacy training did provide such a chance in my impression.

Because the training in Beijing was carried out by a university in Beijing, that is, we were put in the university, and the training was implemented by the university, we may have no chance to share the feedback face to face. At the end of the comprehensive literacy training, we did have that a chance in my impression. Since, after all, we were the first cohort, then the provincial branch college at that time paid high attention to this matter, then they often host some, particular, um, conducted many activities. In those activities, they also came to ask us the feelings about these courses, or whether to make some temporary adjustment, and things like these.

Q: Well, the seventh question: now please consider the first cohort of the comprehensive literacy training program you participated in 2015. To what extent did this program achieve its originally stated goals in your opinion?

A: In what score? Or shall I use adjectives like “very”? ... I think that training achieved its intended goals very well. My personal feelings, ah.

Q: Can you elaborate about it a little more?

A: Well, in fact, I probably already said something about it when I just talked about my views on training. That is, this comprehensive literacy training was different from all our previous training. It did not train your professional capabilities. It may focus on some comprehensive literacies you need in a leading position. Particularly something that, I was impressed, you know
that for example, when cadres are facing media, it seemed that, that is, there were some problems in Zhejiang, the media said something, then the bureau realized at once that, in public...

Q: Hello, hey, I’m sorry, I cannot hear you. I’ll reconnect with you.

A: Hi, hello…

Q: Hello, no problem.

A: I do not know whether it’s because my network is not good.

Q: It does not matter whatever the problem was. You mentioned just now that the departments in Zhejiang may get into a little trouble while speaking in front of media, then your training courses may target on such areas, and then I lost your voice.

A: Oh, yes, then specifically focusing on this aspect, the class replayed that event, and then gave us some professional exposition. Then additionally, we had something similar to a role simulation. What deeply impressed everyone was the simulation. That is, they asked us to prepare something similar to role simulation, or they also hosted a simulative press briefing. So for problems like these, problems on such aspects, we usually may not have access to in all kinds of training. Because, for example, we would mainly have a general direction of our training. Normally in terms of training, such as that, for example, training targeting on specific professional work, possibly they would say it is training about GIS, or MAS system training. Therefore, the kind of training such as this comprehensive literacy training, it mainly target on your comprehensive literacies. As I just said, it taught you about how you can better decompose this thing after it was arranged to your department, and then, let your departmental colleagues to finish the work better, and then how you can be play a connecting role better. Then, how to communicate with the outside, even that, how to, with your parallel departments, that is, other departments of the system, how should you all work together to complete the task. Then, I felt it
really great. Anyway, I have only participated in such a comprehensive literacy training for just one time in so many years.

Q: Hum, yes, good, thanks. Then the next question: To what extent do you think the comprehensive literacy training program solved important performance problems in the unit where you were an assistant to the director?

A: In fact, I read your questionnaire. I thought back about that performance issues. The performance issues at that time was indeed covered by a lecture provided by the finance department. It was a lecture. However, it seemed that regarding performance issues, you ask about how to solve them, the lecture seemed not to touch on much about it.

Q: Well, yeah, this might be because I asked a little indirectly. Not only that superior inspection departments inspected you, that kind of inspection. That is, every aspect of personnel work performance that you think as related to your then work outputs and the work output of the department, all of which can be counted in.

A: Um, the performance you are referring means the treatment aspects, or means others?

Q: Performance refers to the results of work.

A: Oh, work-related aspects?

Q: Correct. Performance simply means the results of work.

A: The results of work? Is it the kind of performance appraisal at the end of each year? Does it mean so?

Q: Right, then you can think so, because for you, for example, performance appraisal is also based on the final achievements you demonstrated over a year, right?

A: Oh, I understand. If so I may have misunderstood it before. I thought that performance may refer to treatment aspects. I thought that training really did not solve any treatment problem. In
that case the answer I told you before may have a bit problem. If you are talking about the performance of work, I think the training program was quite useful for it.

Well, the yearly assessment was like this before for me. Of course, my current department is different. This department is more towards research. Every year, it assesses how many papers you have, and whether you have gained special fund this year, and what kinds of research topics you have, assessment like this. Yet, in my former operation department, it was like this: Every year, the national bureau will set an assessment index down to my Xinjiang bureau; according to these various indicators, my provincial bureau will assign responsibilities to various units like the one I used to work in; and then this unit, ah, it will specify each indicator to every department based on this assessment index. Then by the end of the year, there will be a score behind each specified indicator, then you completed the indicators every year. By the end of every year, you must report your completion situation, um, that is, we would have a system of performance appraisal, you would have to provide some evidence for your completion. For example, if you provide ten advisory reports for the Xinjiang region this year, and if you completed all ten, then you need to upload all the ten.

So, that is, there is a detailed management model for this performance aspect in the Bureau. Then I, after I finished this comprehensive literacy training, also, each of our departments would specify and allocate the performance goals to every member at the beginning of the year. Then there would be a meeting to allocate tasks you will do, this kind of thing. And then there would be another meeting at the end of year. Probably in August or September, in August, an additional examination may be done to see how far all the staff have accomplished. Then provide supervision. Then at the end of the year, approximately from the end of November until the beginning of December, the examination would be done internally again and then to the
center. In mid-December you would upload all of your supporting evidence. Similar to this. I do not know whether what I understand is correct about your question?

Q: Hum. What you’ve said is surely helpful to me, because then I can understand some of the information I need from your content. Ok, alright, thanks. Then I ask the next question: To what extent do you think this comprehensive literacy training class showed impact in improving the output of your original unit?

A: …

Q: Hey, did you hear the question I just asked?

A: No, there was no sound after you said it may be helpful to you.

Q: That is, to what extent do you think the comprehensive literacy training class demonstrated impact in improving the output of your original unit?

A: Hum, output? I think it may, what you said about the output aspect, I cannot specifically say what it is. According to my understanding, this training targeted on teaching you how to better work in your position as well as to manage. Then, the performance appraisal of output may be more of that, in accordance with the overall tasks assigned by the national bureau, then you follow such overall appraisal objectives to accomplish them. If you say there is any extra work, then it is according to your unit situation. Anyway, I feel the relationship between these two is not particularly strong.

Q: If anything, it should be indirect, that is, it indirectly affected some approaches of managing subordinates, such as management efficiency.

A: Yes, similar to this.

Q: Next question: What is the relationship between your perceptions of the value of training and the extent of your participation in various programs of your training college?
A: Um, my perceptions about training? Oh, personally, I like all kinds of training a lot, because I think different training classes bring you different benefits, and it’s only a problem of more or less, or whether it targets to your needs. Then what you just asked about is, is how to perceive, ah I’m sorry, how to perceive what?

Q: That is to say, these two. Please consider the relationship between these two things. A is your opinions on the value of training, and B is the degree to which you participated in the training programs of your training college. Is there any relationship between the two?

A: Well, I think they should be relevant, because a good training will produce great trust for future training. Particularly for, um, no matter one works long or short time, I think it is so always. If you participated in a good training, and if the training is particularly good, then you will have a lot of confidence in the future training, regardless of similar or not similar training. Yet, like some training, for example very short, which lasts about three or four days, after you go to the training, when you feel you don’t have any gain, for training like this, that you have to leave your job, and we or you have a bunch of things around for you to do, you may not have too strong desire to participate in such training in the future. However, I felt good about the comprehensive literacy training. It made me like training a lot.

Q: Ah, thank you. The penultimate question: What is the relationship between your perception of the value of training and the accountability of this comprehensive literacy training program? Accountability refers to the answers you gave just now to the three questions in the middle, which are the seventh, eighth, and ninth questions. The questions were: How well did the program accomplish its goals? How well did it solve the performance problems of your organization? How well did it improve the output of your organization? Well, it means that.
A: Um, that is about me, my believed accountability of the training and comprehensive literacy training class. This question may be a little bit similar to the previous one.

Q: Well, let me clarify on this a bit more. It is that: Is there any relationship between your opinions on training and your overall view of the comprehensive literacy training class?

A: I think there definitely is a relationship. The reason is that although I may have taken part in many training courses since I was employed, there is one kind of training, similar to that of the comprehensive literacy training class, which I may not forget for a long time. That is, it has these effects on me. It let me to [rethink] some problems in my work. The methods of dealing with such problems would affect me for a very long time. So I think there may be a lot of training after induction that I have forgotten that I participated in these training, and I may have forgot about people in these training courses, but I may not forget the training of this comprehensive literacy training class in a long time.

Q: Can I understand it that there is a mutually reinforcing relationship between the two? Is it like this?

A: There is a relationship.

Q: Isn’t it?

A: Well, yes, I meant that.

Q: Okay, thank you. Lastly, is there any relationship between the extent to which you participated in various programs of your training college and your overall perceptions of the comprehensive literacy training program?

A: The extent to which I participated in the training?
Q: Is there a relationship between the degree of your participation in various training programs of the training college, and the comprehensive literacy training program you perceived, your overall opinions of the comprehensive literacy training program?
A: Sure there will be a relationship, that is because, in my opinion, the latter three questions are very similar.
Q: Yes.
A: Regarding the training of the training college, if it is me, I am also in this training depart, you see that it provides pretty good training for one time, then after that, I will trust the training offered by the department to a great deal. Then I will be very proactive and willing to participate in the training here. However, it may also be like this in a unit like ours, it may be that, that it will have quota limit. If you are very willing and interested, but there may be a lot of people in the middle, that is, there will be a process of screening. You may not be selected, which can also be a problem.
Q: Is it possible that because your participation in these programs per se is very positive, so you are more involved in the learning process, then in the end naturally your overall view of the comprehensive literacy training program is more positive?
A: Well, I think this is really very important and I may be like this. Because from my own perspective, there may be some people--I will not take the example of comprehensive literacy training class, but use the training at the university in Beijing--there may be some people who felt that such training lasted a bit long and may have felt somewhat tired during their stay in the training, and may be a little tired of what the teacher taught. But for me, since I had a very good mental state at the very start, I enjoyed the whole process very much and felt good about its output. It’s almost like this. So I think a very optimistic mental state, and then that you believe
this institute can bring you value. Primarily that you must, especially from the very beginning, you must have a kind of feeling, that it gave you a very good--what is the word--very good, that it gave you a very good sense of treatment and gift to you in the first meeting at the very beginning, you will really like this training.

Q: Ok, alright, thanks. I have asked all the planned questions. Let me briefly summarize the feedback you provided to me, and then if you have any other information, you can add that, okay?
A: OK.

Q: Your main point today was firstly about the professional work in your original department. Therefore, what your former subordinates needed relatively more was some training on professional work related technologies. Training courses on comprehensive literacy was relatively more demanded by managerial positions. You mentioned that among your previous subordinates it was ...
A: Um, can I interrupt you a bit?
Q: Of course.
A: The managerial positions I referred to was not to say that they were management position per se, but rather such positions that may need some management functions. It does not mean those purely administrative positions.
Q: Ok, alright, thanks.
A: I wonder if you understand what I said?
Q: Hum, I understand, understand, thank you. Then you mentioned that your previous subordinates treated training with a bit differentiated attitudes. The younger would be more active, while the older may consider more factors, and may not welcome and accept too long training that much.
Then you highlighted your training about English at this university in Beijing when it came to the benefits of training for your organization. You think that this training not only improved your English, but also improved you through the communication among diverse trainees from different provinces. This experience was very much like what you experienced from the comprehensive literacy training course, which was quite enjoyable.

Then you mentioned that you had quite limited participation in the development processes of your training college programs. You provided feedback on demand aspect once. You mentioned that you were primarily involved as a participant in the implementation of several programs of the training college. The comprehensive literacy training class and the training on English and other training of medium to long terms that lasted three days to a week. You once used the written questionnaire to provide review of these training college programs. Face to face provision of evaluation was less.

The seventh, you think that the comprehensive literacy training program achieved its stated goals quite well, because it intended to training the comprehensive literacy of leadership positions, and then in this aspect it used some very good teaching approaches and content. You enumerated the simulation and training it provided to you around the thing that how your peer departments coped with media in Zhejiang at that time. You felt very deeply impressed.

You mentioned that, at the time of talking about the impact of this comprehensive literacy training program on your organization’s performance, you introduced some of the details regarding the performance appraisal of your organization. Then the impact of this program on your organization might be quite indirectly. Then, because the impact on improving your organization’s output was also more indirectly, because you mainly followed the overall
examination requirements from the upper levels overall each year. This program may have changed your management and working model, and promoted your work efficiency.

You personally very much like various kinds of training and embrace it a lot. You feel that you are always rewarded after joining no matter what kind of training. Then your view of the value of training has a mutually reinforcing relationship with your overall view of the comprehensive literacy training program. That is, your opinions on both are quite positive and they facilitate each other.

The last one is, that is, you are, you have always had a very enjoying and positive mental state for either the comprehensive literacy training program or the other programs, you participated very actively in and devoted yourself very enthusiastically to them from the very beginning. So basically you have quite positive views of all kinds of programs. There is such a quite positive influencing relationship. So probably so much. What else do you think you need to add?

A: Well, almost, that’s almost what I meant. I do not know if it helps you.

Q: Surely helpful. Very helpful, thanks. Then you have talked to me so much today, do you have any questions you need to ask me?

A: Well, you, what is your thesis mainly about? That is, what is the topic generally on?

Q: My title is particularly long. Let me think about it and translate it into Chinese. Anyway I mainly study about the training college of by your bureau, focusing on this comprehensive literacy training program. I just used a noun. In fact, I should not use the kind of noun such as “accountability” in interviews. In other words, as a youth cadre you participated in the project, whether your general view of the program has anything to do with some other variables. Because you are engaged in scientific research as well, I used the word “variable”. Some other variables
include your opinions about the value of training, the extent that you were involved in the program, and some other background information, like this.

A: Hum, are you also a part of our system?

Q: Well, I am, I am outside this Bureau, but I have a very good friend at your training college.

A: Oh, that’s why. Hum, which year are you in your program? Because preparing the thesis.

Q: The sixth year.

A: The sixth year?

Q: Well, all the PhDs in the United States have to study for so long. The length of six or seven years is common and normal.

A: Quite normal, ah.

Q: There are quite some in their eighth or ninth years.

A: You are so great now. So you are actually preparing to graduate next year, right?

Q: Well, I hope to graduate in 2018. Yeah.

A: Oh, then will you come back?

Q: Go back, going back is a definite thing.

A: Then you will, will you come to a position in our bureau? Or will you go to other sections?

Q: I should go to colleges and universities, I think. Staying in colleges is relatively free. My major is not particularly geared to the needs of your Bureau.

A: Ah, then I wanna ask about a side topic, about which I am not sure it is suitable or not.

Q: No problem, you can ask freely.

A: That is why you have stayed abroad for so many years but still choose to come back?

Q: Oh. Because when I first came abroad I was originally sent out by the Chinese government, and the government provided a lot of this subsidy. Then I have never thought of staying in the
United States from the very beginning. I am a quite traditional and quite patriotic person. Then because of from my family aspect, the education of elders is also that I can study abroad but must go back and cannot settle abroad. The thoughts of the older generation are also very traditional. That is, anyway, everybody in my family just wants to be able to stay together often, and not to separate too far.

A: Oh, your big family is really very happy, ah.

Q: Ok, alright, thanks. Do you have any other questions?

A: Hum, no! I hope you that, ah, hope you graduate smoothly.

Q: Then lastly, let me thank you very sincerely for your participation in this interview. All the information you provided today is very important for my research. I hope that all aspects of your work and life will go very well. I’d like to add especially that, it was very happy for me to talk to you today. Then I, I just feel that there is a very small proportion of women in the list of cadres in your Bureau, approximately one third to one quarter or so, very rare... And then whiling talking with you, you were particularly talkative, also particularly frank, so the overall feeling of the conversation was particularly happy. Thank you very much.

A: Ah, I am very happy too, thank you and thank you. Then if there is anything I can help with, just leave me a WeChat message or give me a call of it.

Q: Good. If you have any need for some foreign information or what from my side, maybe I can also help.

A: Hum, that would be great, thanks.

Q: Hum, thank you. Then I will not delay further of your rest, see you. Bye-bye.

**The Fifth Interview**

January 16th, 2018
Q: Dear leader, thank you for coming to the interview. The purpose of this interview is to understand about your training college programs and others. I have prepared some questions for you. I may also follow up with you on salient points that emerge. Please feel free to speak up your mind to any of the questions. I will keep all the information you provide confidential and anonymous. Nobody else in your organization will have access to the content you share. The interview has nothing to do with your performance appraisal. Please let me know when you are ready.

A: I am ready.

Q: What are the training needs of your subordinates?

A: They require training on new knowledge and new technology of professional aspects.

Q: Please allow me to ask: Do they also need comprehensive literacy training?

A: The need of promoting comprehensive literacies depends on the person. It is very much needed by management personnel. However, general technicians still need expertise the most.

Q: Sure, I got it.

Q: What are the attitudes of your subordinates towards training?

A: All of them hold a welcoming and positive attitude towards training.

Q: Do they welcome training more because of the opportunity of learning new things per se through training, or they welcome it because they take it as job benefits and a chance to leave their position?

A: Admittedly, there are people with either of the reasons you mentioned.

Q: Which kind of attitude is more dominant?

A: My subordinates have more positive attitude toward national-level face-to-face training; toward province-level training, half of them have positive attitude and the other half negative;
regarding training at the prefecture or city level, it varies according to the pertinence and practicality of the content.

Q: Ok, I see.

Q: What are the benefits of training for your organization?
A: It provides greater benefits in enhancing personal technical and working capabilities.

Q: Did the enhancement of personal capabilities improve the work of your department?
A: The training improved personal capability greatly. If the training is targeting professional work of generalization, then it promoted the administrative office quite well; if it is just technological training, then the effect on the administrative office depended on the management competence of the person in charge of the administrative office. I am no longer in charge of any administrative office, but just an onlooker.

Q: To what extent have you participated in developing the programs of your training college?
A: I did not participate in developing the training programs.

Q: Sure and thanks. A follow-up question for your response to my 4th question: Did you ever report training needs to your training college?
A: About the follow-up to the 4th questions: No.

Q: To what extent have you participated in implementing the programs of your training college?
A: I sometimes gave speech for training about technology aspects in my unit.

Q: Follow-up for the 5th question: Did you participate in the training programs of the training college more as a learner or more as a speaker?
A: Regarding the follow-up: I participated in the programs more as a learner, and most of the participation occurred before 2011. I participated less in recent years.

Q: To what extent have you participated in evaluating the programs of your training college?
A: There exists a phenomenon in the unit that training is for completing training. There is another phenomenon that communication between the management departments and the specific units of professional work is not quite in place.

Q: For question 6: Regarding the training programs you participated in before, did you have the experience of submitting a program evaluation form?

A: About question 6: I did submit an evaluation form. But that form was not as systematic and comprehensive as yours.

Q: Now please focus on the comprehensive literacy training program that you participated in 2015 or 2016. To what extent did the program achieve its stated goals?

A: I participated in the comprehensive literacy training class in 2015. For me, this was a quite systematic training on comprehensive literacies, especially in organizational management aspect. This training made me transform from previously experiential management to relatively standardized, normalized, and systematic management thought approaches. After the training class, when comparing the problems in work existed before, it is quite clear now to find out the reasons that caused the problems, and I also pay attention to avoid in work any contradiction and problems occurred because of management. Comparing to before, I can view the social life and some problems that exist in the work of the organization at a more macroscopic level. Now I also pay quite some attention to learning some knowledge about organizational management. It was truly beneficial a lot for me to participate in the training offered by the training college.

Q: To what extent did the program address performance issues of importance in your organization?

A: For me, it was significant improvement for my management competence. Now I am only in charge of certain work in my unit, being self-governing.
Q: To what extent did the program make a demonstrable impact to improve the outcomes of your organization?
A: The key of changing the unit is on the person who is in the main charge of it.

Q: What is the relationship between your perceptions about the value of training and your involvement in your training college programs?
A: Basically no relationship, for the reason that I was not involved in the design of the training programs.

Q: About question 10: Is it possible that there is such a relationship: because you value training quite much, you participated in the training programs of your training college quite actively?
A: About question 10: Personally I value training quite much. However, how much we participated in the training programs were mainly determined by the leader of the unit. Some leaders take training as a benefit or grace to the employees. Currently, the superior departments take the participation in training as an indicator of examination.

Q: What is the relationship between your perceptions of the value of training and the accountability of the comprehensive literacy training program? Accountability refers to the answers you just provided to questions 7, 8, and 9.
A: Comprehensive literacy training should be training for reserve cadres; it was really beneficial for those who were in decision-making positions after the training. Because of provincial policy change, my position is awkward.

Q: About question 11: Thank you for your information. Is it possible that because you think highly of training, you view quite positively the whole comprehensive literacy training program?
A: About question 11: The comprehensive literacy training program really helped a lot with promoting my comprehensive literacies, and I feel like it opened a door for promoting my capabilities.

Q: What is the relationship between your involvement in your training college programs and your perceptions about the accountability of the comprehensive literacy training program?

A: I was just executing certain training of my unit.

Q: About question 12: Is it possible that because you were both a learner and an instructor in the training programs of your training college, you have quite positive overall opinions about the comprehensive literacy training program?

A: About question 12: Personally I think any formal training would generate more or less benefit to me. Every instructor prepares carefully and wants to impart knowledge to the learners.

Q: What other information can you provide that is relevant to this interview?

A: Comprehensive literacy training should be included into routine training to employees or learning content of students. Lots of us are lacked of learning in this aspect.

To put it in others’ words: The leaders and cadres and normal cadres at the lowest levels, are actually a rough group of people. Because as a group at the very bottom of the pyramid and the weakest in the political ecological chains and the managers nearest to the populace, they seldom experience special training in management aspect that fits with their job characteristics. It’s not that they do not want to learn, but that they don’t know where to start to learn. There is nobody teaching them at school nor after joining in work. Those speechified earnestly and tirelessly instruction, earnest advice of meetings rather than training, and the great brilliant work of professionals all seem too far from them. They purely learned on their own and taught themselves to be talents. It’s true that there was a broad avenue leading them to succeed, but
there were more rugged paths. What’s more, I personally think that the focus of comprehensive literacy training is still on the top leader of the basic levels. A general without capability only leads soldiers on the verge of death.

Q: Thank you sincerely for your participation in this interview again. Your input is invaluable to my research. I wish everything goes well with your work and life!

The Sixth Interview

January 21st, 2018

Q: Hi, Hello. Group-level cadre, group-level cadre, how are you doing?
A: Hum. Go ahead.

Q: I thought you were a woman before. I am sorry. Because it seems like you were a mother of a child in your moments in WeChat.
A: No, I am not.

Q: I misunderstood it, I am sorry. You can feel relieved about the interview content. There is really nothing bad for you. I just ask some questions quite similar to what were in the questionnaire, you can talk more details through this interview, so it would be a complement. OK?

Q: Ok. Then I will start right away. Let me follow the agenda. First of all, thanks for finally agreeing to come to the interview. Because this is really the last one. I know you have some concerns about this interview, maybe you do not feel safe enough to talk in this interview, however, there is really nothing you need to worry about. I really appreciate you attending this interview. The main goal of this interview is to understand the training programs in your Bureau, primarily the comprehensive literacy training program and some related stuff. It is to further understand some details based on the survey. There are twelve questions that I have prepared to
ask you in the interview today. Then possibly, when you provide feedback, if I have a follow-up question about some details, I may ask you. I hope you can freely express your opinions on any questions I ask. I promise that all the information you provide is confidential and anonymous. Nobody else in your organization will have access to the content you share. The interview has nothing to do with your performance appraisal or what. Please let me know when you are ready, OK.

A: Ready.

Q: For the first question, I would like to know that: What are the training needs of your subordinates?

A: Professional work and management. Mainly training on professional work.

Q: So the training is centered on that related to the job positions, right?

A: Yeah.

Q: With regards to “management,” you are referring to some training on management ideas, management styles, and management tips?

A: Yeah.

Q: Does it include comprehensive literacy training?

A: It had better to include comprehensive literacy training, just like what we had.

Q: Ok, sure. Question Two: What are the attitudes of your subordinates towards training?

A: Um… Anyhow they are neither opposing nor… supportive.

Q: So their attitudes are neutral, right?

A: Correct.
Q: Can I interpret it as that, if superiors arrange them to attend the training programs, they would participate, yet, the subordinates would not actively look for training chances on their own. Is that what you meant?

A: Yes.

Q: Oh, OK. Then Question Three: What are the benefits of training for your organization?

A: Training has not benefited our organization. It only benefited us individually.

Q: Hum, then can you talk about what benefits training has brought to you personally? Some aspects related to your work or the organization?

A: Primarily because it is a comprehensive literacy training program, there was much stuff you could have access to, including something on management. You could understand something, and then understand and learn it more deeply later on. This was the best. Because what you were interested in including some national policies and so on. You may consciously get to understand such stuff after coming back. It was definitely helpful to enhance personal aspects, but it seemed nothing for the organization.

Q: Other than the comprehensive literacy training program, have you ever attended any other programs of the training college?

A: Do you mean the training in the unit?

Q: I mean all the training programs provided by the training college of your Bureau.

A: I did.

Q: Could you please provide a few more examples?

A: That was the science popularization base training. There was such as well. I participated some training on professional work formerly. There was also that.

Q: Is it the science popularization base training?
A: Yes, the science popularization education base.

Q: Good. Question Four: To what extent did you participate in developing the programs of the training college of your Bureau?

A: I participated in one before. That was, I helped them with video recording of a training program that they did. It was us we made it.

Q: OK. Other than this, have you ever participated in the process of developing the programs in any other ways?

A: No more.

Q: Hum, good. Thanks. Question Five: To what extent did you participate in implementing the programs of the training college of your Bureau?

A: Basically I did not participate in it before. What do you mean by “implementing”?

Q: What I mean is that, for instance you participated in several programs as a participant. Other than this, did you ever introduce your subordinates or other colleagues who were parallel to you to participate in their programs? Did you coordinate the implementation process of the programs?

A: No, no. I did not have such kind of professional work.

Q: Hum, good. Question Six: To what extent did you participate in evaluating the programs of the training college of your Bureau?

A: That was, after the training program was over, after I came back, I reported about it to my unit. That was, after the whole program was done, the training college implemented a survey questionnaire like what you had and what you are doing now. Just these two.

Q: Oh. So there were only these two situations?

A: Additionally there was one in the unit. That was, I would report to my unit about the situation after I came back.
Q: was it also a questionnaire investigation for your report to the unit? Or was it in the form of a work report?
Q: OK. Thanks. Can I ask whether you participated in the comprehensive literacy training program in 2015 or 2016?
A: It was in 2015.
Q: Regarding the comprehensive literacy training program, to what extent do you think it achieved its stated goals?
A: I think it was about 80%.
Q: I suppose that means it was very positive. That is, it was quite positive for you in terms of the program achieving its goals, your gain, and every aspect you felt about?
A: Yes.
Q: Then regarding the rest 20%, in what aspects do you think the program could be improved?
A: The first is the training period. I felt the training time was still too short. Moreover, the level of the instructors they hired from outside was fine, yet, the level of the instructors inside the training college was a little bit worse.
Q: Oh. How about the content?
A: That was about the content. The instructors hired from outside prepared more sufficiently; the internal instructors did not prepare as sufficiently.
Q: OK. So Question Eight: To what extent do you think the program resolved performance issues of importance in your organization?
A: Hum, none of that. It didn’t relate to that.
Q: Did the training programs possibly touch on or trigger you on the aspects of your personal work performance?

A: Maybe the training program slightly improved my own aspects. In terms of my thoughts of management. Just like what I mentioned, after you came back from the training, you might go understanding much new knowledge about management. Some new management methods. You might want to understand that. Perhaps there was more in this regard.

Q: Hum, good. So this would make you adjust in some ways later on? In terms of your communication approaches and so on?

A: Correct.

Q: OK, thank you. Question Nine: To what extent do you think the program made a demonstrable impact on improving the outcomes of your organization?

A: I don’t think there was anything about this, given that this was a training program for individuals, which was talent training. It did not connect to the organization in that way.

Q: So you cannot connect the training program quite directly to any impact on the output of your administrative office, right?

A: Yes.

Q: Hum, good. For Question Ten, I would like you to think about the relationship between two things. Then you tell me whether there is any relationship in between. The first one is your perceptions about the value of training, and the second one is your involvement in your training college programs. Do you think there is necessarily a relationship between these two?

A: There should be. I suppose there is.

Q: What kind of relationship is it?
A: That is, if there is such a need, if the training college needs me to provide something, such as some materials, or some feelings that I have from training, I would possibly provide to them.

Q: Hum. Is it that you personally value training quite much?

A: Definitely it is so. It is a kind of improvement after all.

Q: Hum, so… good, I understand. Question Eleven also examines the relationship between two things. The first is still your perceptions about the value of training, and the second is your overall view about the comprehensive literacy training program. Is there any relationship between these two?

A: I think it was quite fine for young cadres, at least the design by the upper management was OK. However, I always think that the content could be more abundant, and it did not have to be limited to the industrial stuff too much. For the reasons that it was comprehensive literacy training, if it included too much professional work, it would become training on professional work.

Q: Hum. OK. Can I interpret your words like this: Overall, you value training quite much and you recognize its value quite well, so you definitely would like training to bring you quite high value. Therefore, you treat training connotation and training quality with an excelsior attitude. This would influence how you view this comprehensive literacy training program.

A: Yes. I think that just the content… Anyway, there is a certain gap between the demand and the expectation, and the practice. I felt.

Q: Hum, OK. I understand. The last question is still about the relationship between two things. The first is the extent of your involvement in the programs of the training college of your Bureau. The second is your overall perceptions about the comprehensive literacy training program. Do you think there is a relationship between these two?
A: I don’t think there is a relationship.

Q: So no matter which program it is, the extent of your involvement in it would be pretty much the same, right?

A: Right.

Q: Ok, I have finished asking all of the questions. Let me briefly summarize your feedback. Then lastly, if there is anything I do not summarize well, feel free to correct me or give me any additional information, alright?

A: Fine.

Q: First of all, you said that what your subordinates need is still training that related to professional work, training that relates to management, and training on comprehensive literacies. You think that their attitudes toward training are neutral. You feel that training seems not to be beneficial for your organization, while the main benefits should be for the individuals who participate in training.

Fourthly, you once participated in the making of a training video material for the training college of your Bureau. Other than that you were not much involved in the process of their program development. Fifthly, you participated mainly as a learner in several programs provided by the training colleges. Sixthly, you once provided evaluation of the comprehensive literacy training program in the form of a survey questionnaire, and also submitted a work report to your unit after return from the training.

Seventhly, you generally think this program achieved its goals to an 80% extent. The 20% space where it can be improved, is mainly because its training period was rather short, and you think it could have lasted longer, and also the teaching level of the internal instructors can be further increased. Eighthly, you think the comprehensive literacy training program did not cover
importantly performance problems in your organization too directly, but triggered some aspects of your own management thoughts. Ninthly, you think that this program did not connect much to the outputs of your organization, with its main influence on your own.

Tenthly, probably because you view training quite positively overall, you would join in some things that relate to training actively. For the eleventh question, overall you have quite positive and quite high expectation for training, therefore, you have an excelsior attitude toward training, and so your general opinions about this program is also that it was good overall, while there were still things to be improved. For the twelfth question, you do not think there is any relationship between your involvement in the programs provided by the training college of your Bureau and your overall views of this training program.

Basically that’s it. Is my summary OK?

A: OK.

Q: Can I ask a follow-up question a bit: Which cohort did you participate in?

A: It was in 2015. It should be the third cohort.

Q: Ok, what other information can you provide that is relevant to this interview?

A: Nothing. I just think that it would be better if there are more people attending this kind of class.

Q: There were about twenty or so people in your class, weren’t there?

A: Yes. One person per province.

Q: OK, thanks. Then is there any question regarding this interview and my research that you would like me to answer?

A: No.
Q: Then lastly, Thank you very sincerely for your participation in my interview. The information you provided is crucial for my research. Then I wish everything goes well with your work and life! Thank you, group-level cadre.

If there is nothing else, you can hang up the phone, thank you.

A: OK.

The Seventh Interview

February the 1st, 2018

Q: Dear leader, thanks for coming to the interview. The purpose of this interview is to understand about your training college programs and relevant content. I have prepared some questions for you. I may also follow up with you on salient points that emerge. Please feel free to speak up your mind to any of these questions. I will keep all the information you provide confidential and anonymous. Nobody else in your organization will have access to the content you share. The interview has nothing to do with your performance appraisal. Please let me know when you are ready.

Q: What are the training needs of your subordinates?

A: The most important training is about executive capability. In addition, professional ethics and career literacy should also be the focus of training.

Q: What are the attitudes of your subordinates towards training?

A: Most of the training is arranged by the superiors and meaningless for practice. However, my subordinates treat seriously the training that enhances their capabilities or relates to their work.

Q: What are the benefits of training to your organization?

A: The benefits are not apparent, because systematic training is too rare.

Q: To what extent have you participated in developing the programs of your training college?
A: Almost never. There is one time every year the training college asks for opinions on the training plan, yet, we don’t take it seriously.

Q: To what extent have you participated in delivering the programs of your training college?

Q: To what extent have you participated in evaluating the programs of your training college?

A: After each training program, there is a survey investigation. Yet, I gave positive feedback to all of the programs.

Q: Now please focus on the comprehensive literacy training program that you participated in 2015 or 2016. To what extent did the program achieve its stated goals?

A: This is a very meaningful training. It has certain effect on improving theoretical knowledge and practicing capabilities of execution and overall planning. Moreover, I got to know a group of colleagues with similar qualifications and of similar ages. It should be counted as having attained 90% of its stated goals. Its deficiency is that its schedule was too tight to allow the audience to gain in-depth knowledge.

Q: To what extent did the program address performance issues of importance in your organization?

A: It hasn’t shown apparent effect so far.

Q: To what extent did the program make a demonstrable impact to improve the outcomes of your organization?

A: It sheds light in some aspect of technology innovation.

Q: What is the relationship between your perceptions about the value of training and your involvement in your training college programs?
Q: What is the relationship between your involvement in your training college programs and your perceptions about the accountability of the comprehensive literacy training program? The accountability refers to the answers you just provided to questions 7, 8, and 9.
A: If the training is closely connected to our professional work, I can resonate with it better. I can hardly comment on the other training.

Q: What is the relationship between your involvement in your training college programs and your perceptions about the accountability of the comprehensive literacy training program?
A: If the training is coherently related to my professional work, there is certain relationship. Other than that there is no big influence.

Q: What other information can you provide that is relevant to this interview?
A: A lot of the content of the interview isn’t appropriate for me to address. Please forgive me for my responses due to the time limitation.

Q: This is pretty good, associate-division leader. Thank you. I have several follow-up questions, which you can reply directly in the WeChat at your convenience.
Q: Regarding question 5: Which training programs held by your training college did you participate in?
Q: Regarding question 6: You provided in your former response that you gave “positive feedback to all the training programs.” Was it because the programs per se deserve positive evaluation, or was there a consideration that you “did not have the nerve to give negative evaluation”?
Q: Regarding question 8: In which aspects do you think the performance issues of your organization mostly focus on?
Q: Regarding question 9, Which outputs of your organization do “the directions of some technology innovation” you mentioned relate to?

Q: Regarding question 10: Is it because you value training to a moderate extent overall, your overall extent of participation in the training programs of your training college is moderate as well?

Q: Regarding question 11: Is it that your overall perceptions about the comprehensive literacy training program is mainly based on whether its content related closely to your professional work?

Q: Regarding question 12: Can I interpret your answer as that the reason your perceptions about the comprehensive literacy training program is quite positive is primarily that its content related to your work closely, while it has nothing to do with the extent you were involved in all the kinds of programs provided by your training college?

Q: Sorry for letting you feel at last that the content of the interview isn’t appropriate for you to answer. If we conducted the interview through instant verbal communication, I would have been able to explain on the questions more, which would help you understand. The questions asked are actually quite relevant to you. Please complement your responses through answering the questions above when you have time. Then, this interview will end. Thank you!

Q: Associate-division-level leader, could you please respond to the follow-up questions? Please!

A: Hi, I already replied to your questions last time, and all the answers were true feelings. For those questions I didn’t reply to it was because I did not understand the content of the questions or I felt there was no suitable answers. Our investigation cooperation is over now. Hope you understand.

Q: Thank you sincerely for your participation in this interview again. Your input is invaluable to my research. I wish everything goes well with your work and life!
# APPENDIX J: INTERVIEW CODING SCHEME

Table J.1: Coding scheme of the interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parent Code</th>
<th>Child Code</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subordinates’ training needs</td>
<td>• Needs of work-task-related training&lt;br&gt;• Needs of management competency training</td>
<td>• Training demand related to specific work of positions&lt;br&gt;• Soft skills such as: a) executive ability, b) business ethics and career literacy, c) management skills, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subordinates’ attitudes towards training</td>
<td>• Positive attitude&lt;br&gt;• Neutral attitude&lt;br&gt;• Negative attitude</td>
<td>• Like training, welcome training&lt;br&gt;• Neither like nor hate training&lt;br&gt;• Resistant to attend training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training benefits</td>
<td>• Benefits at the manager’s work unit level&lt;br&gt;• Benefits at the individual level&lt;br&gt;• Nearly no benefits</td>
<td>• What an entire office, department, unit, or the whole organization can gain from training&lt;br&gt;• What the individual participant gain from training&lt;br&gt;• No gain at all for whatever level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers’ participation in program development</td>
<td>• Participated in submitting training needs&lt;br&gt;• Participated in developing training content&lt;br&gt;• Rare participation in program development</td>
<td>• Reported about what kind of training is needed&lt;br&gt;• Assisted in preparing training materials&lt;br&gt;• Very limited involvement in either submitting training needs or preparing training materials, or other ways of developing a training program of the TC&lt;br&gt;• No involvement in any of the activities mentioned in the above bullet point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers’ participation in program implementation</td>
<td>• Participated as a trainee in the training college (TC) programs&lt;br&gt;• Participated as a trainer for TC programs&lt;br&gt;• No more participation in the implementation other than as a trainee</td>
<td>• Involved as a learner in the TC training classes&lt;br&gt;• Taught TC training classes&lt;br&gt;• No other involvement than as a learner</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table J.1 (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parent Code</th>
<th>Child Code</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Managers’ participation in program evaluation | • Submitted survey feedback  
• Submitted other written evaluation  
• Involved in in-person meeting  
• Provided other oral feedback  
• Use of program evaluation reports | • The manager completed at least one evaluation form at the end of a training class  
• The manager submitted report about experiences of training  
• The manager participated in formal meetings called by the TC for providing feedback  
• The manager provided feedback face to face but not in a TC-called meeting  
• The manager’s search, reading, or use of an evaluation report of the TC training programs |
| Extent of achieving its stated goals by the comprehensive literacy (CL) program | • Largely achieved the stated goals  
• Space for improvement regarding goal achievement | • The CL training program accomplished its goals well  
• The CL training program could improve in certain aspects |
| Extent of resolving performance problems by the CL program | • Work-unit-level performance problem resolution  
• No work-unit-level performance problem resolution  
• Individual level performance problem resolution  
• No significant resolution of performance problems | • Resolution related to more macro levels other than the individual level  
• No help with resolution  
• Resolution related to the individual level  
• Almost no resolution |
| Extent of demonstrating impact on improving outputs by the CL program | • Organization-level impact on output  
• Work-unit-level impact on output improvement  
• Individual level impact on output improvement  
• No significant demonstrated impact on output improvement | • Impact on output at the whole Bureau level  
• Impact on output at the local bureau, department, or office levels  
• Impact on output at the individual level  
• Not much impact on output |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parent Code</th>
<th>Child Code</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relationship between managers’ perceptions about the value of training and managers’ extent of involvement in the TC programs</td>
<td>• Strong relationship between the value of training and involvement in TC programs</td>
<td>• Quite direct relationship from the one to the other variable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Certain relationship between the value of training and managers’ involvement in the TC programs</td>
<td>• Some relationship, not too strong, not too weak, between the two</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• No relationship between the value of training and involvement in TC programs</td>
<td>• Basically no relationship between the two</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship between managers’ perceptions about the value of training and the accountability of the CL program</td>
<td>• Certain relationship between the value of training and accountability of the CL program</td>
<td>• Some relationship, not too strong, not too weak, between the two</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• No clear relationship between the value of training and accountability of the CL program</td>
<td>• Basically no relationship between the two</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship between managers’ extent of involvement in the TC programs and the accountability of the CL program</td>
<td>• Certain relationship between the manager’s involvement in the TC programs and the accountability of the CL program</td>
<td>• Some relationship, not too strong, not too weak, between the two</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• No clear relationship between the manager’s involvement in the TC programs and the accountability of the CL program</td>
<td>• Basically no relationship between the two</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table J.1 (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parent Code</th>
<th>Child Code</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Reject to provide responses</td>
<td>• The manager refused to provide complementary responses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to follow-up questions</td>
<td>• The manager participated in the program in 2015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Attended the program in 2015</td>
<td>• The manager’s understanding about the goal of the program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The manager’s perceptions about</td>
<td>• Why and how the manager joined in the program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the goals of the CL training</td>
<td>• The manager switched position after the program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>program</td>
<td>• The cadre’s past with subordinates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Background of participating</td>
<td>• The manager’s negative comments regarding training in his local unit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in the program</td>
<td>• The manager’s high thoughts regarding training</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Job change after the program</td>
<td>• The manager would like to populate the CL training to more employees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The cadre used to manage</td>
<td>• The manager’s recommendation of having more learners in each cohort</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>subordinates</td>
<td>• Policy regulation related background</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Criticism about unit</td>
<td>• The manager’s perception that his subordinates mostly stays stably</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The manager’s positive view</td>
<td>• The manager’s example of a training program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>about training overall</td>
<td>• Training that the manager took part in at work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Manager’s recommendation about</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The manager suggested</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to include more learners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in each CL training class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Quota limit for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>participating in the CL program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The manager did not worry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>about his subordinates leaving</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the organization after training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The manager gave a case of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>joint training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The manager introduced the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kinds of training he attended in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other content
Table J.1 (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parent Code</th>
<th>Child Code</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other content</td>
<td>• The manager introduced about some kinds of training programs he participated through the TC</td>
<td>• Various programs provided through the TC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The manager was once designated to attend a minor portion of TC programs, while most were chosen by his own or his subordinates per needs</td>
<td>• Designation and choice of program attendance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Clarification on the meaning of “performance”</td>
<td>• A few interviewees had difficulty in understanding “performance”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Subordinates’ time conflict between training and work</td>
<td>• When and why the subordinates have time conflict for training</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>