THE POLITICS OF EVALUATION FOR HUMAN RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT:

A STAKEHOLDER PERSPECTIVE

by

HANBYUL KIM

(Under the Direction of Ronald M. Cervero)

ABSTRACT

While centering on the impact of power and politics embedded in the evaluation of training programs, the purpose of this study was to understand how power and interests are negotiated by stakeholders in determining the merit and worth of a recurring training program. Three research questions guided this inquiry: 1) What are the interests of the stakeholders affected by the training program? 2) How do power relations among the stakeholders affect the evaluation process? and 3) How do power relations among the stakeholders affect the evaluation outcomes? To answer these questions, a qualitative case study of the managerial leadership development program of a Korean insurance company was designed. Eight, open-ended interviews with the stakeholders of the program were conducted as the primary source of data. Three sets of findings resulting from constant comparative analysis indicated that various power relations among stakeholders and the structural power and politics of the host organization shaped both the evaluation process and the outcomes of the training program. The findings reveal that the asymmetrical relationship of power among the stakeholders was structured by the organizational hierarchical system through which positions and role status of the stakeholders signaled their different capacity to influence the training program evaluation. The HRD practitioners of the case held control throughout the evaluation, and their dominant power was

maintained and reproduced by other stakeholders' recognition of their expertise in training and

development area. However, due to the structural relationship between the HRD unit and the

corporate management, the HRD practitioners perceived themselves as the marginalized. The

findings also showed that such unequal power relations were sustained in the evaluation mostly

by stakeholders' self-regulation of their conduct in terms of norms, standards, and expectations

about one's roles. Finally, this study found in spite of immense criticism, the use of end-of-

course participant surveys in HRD practice could be traced to their meaning as a political

bargaining tool.

INDEX WORDS: Organizational power and politics, Training program evaluation, Human

resource development, Critical workplace learning, Stakeholders, Qualitative

case study

THE POLITICS OF EVALUATION FOR HUMAN RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT:

A STAKEHOLDER PERSPECTIVE

by

HANBYUL KIM

B.A., Korea University, Seoul, Korea, 1999

M.A., Korea University, Seoul, Korea, 2001

A Dissertation Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of The University of Georgia in Partial

Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

ATHENS, GEORGIA

2004

THE POLITICS OF EVALUATION FOR HUMAN RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT:

A STAKEHOLDER PERSPECTIVE

by

HANBYUL KIM

Major Professor: Ronald M. Cervero

Committee: Laura L. Bierema
                   Sharan B. Merriam
                   Wendy E. A. Ruona

Electronic Version Approved:

Maureen Grasso
Dean of the Graduate School
The University of Georgia
December 2004

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to acknowledge the immense contribution of my committee to the development of this dissertation. All of my committee members have been very respectful, supportive and their demeanor was so kind. I deeply appreciate Dr. Ronald Cervero who is my major professor. He always encouraged this work, and his advice was very sound, insightful, and substantive. Furthermore, in his program planning, which I took in 2002, he taught me the framework of power and politics, which is and will be the cornerstone of my lifelong academic journey in adult education. Dr. Laura Bierema provided me with a number of substantive comments and suggested important resources and materials in developing the work. Dr. Sharan Merriam constantly encouraged my work, and greatly helped me analyze the data by offering very helpful guidelines. Dr. Wendy Ruona introduced many resources about evaluation in HRD and gave me substantive feedback in shaping the overall structure of this work. I also thank Dr. Tom Valentine who gave me sound advice on my adaptation to this foreign culture at the very beginning of my new life in America. I thank Linda Chester who has already retired and Denise Collins. They constantly gave me reliable and supportive help in relation to administrative matters and my assistantship work.

Without the precious help, understanding, and support of my kind, delightful friends here in Athens, I could not have finished my work. Karen Braxley, my kind English friend, has read many papers ranging from class papers to this dissertation for almost three years, and gave me substantive feedback on my awkward English. Although I cannot list all their names on this small space, I have had many warmhearted Korean friends in Athens. I would like to thank them for their consistent friendship, especially the Korean Catholic Community members at UGA, who showed me what love is and what it is to be a friend. Many thanks also go to Fr. Jack

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

"Evaluation is an OBSERVED VALUE compared to some STANDARD. It is a simple ratio, but this numerator is not simple. In program evaluation it pertains to the whole constellation of values held for the program. And the denominator is not simple, for it pertains to the complex of expectations and criteria that different people have for such a program" (Stake, 2000, p. 347).

Background

In the field of human resource development (HRD), evaluation is regarded as a systematic feedback and an improvement process for the function of effective planning, designing, and implementing of HRD interventions. Among various components of HRD interventions, personnel training and development (T&D) constitutes the largest realm of HRD activity (Swanson & Holton, 2001). In this sense, evaluation for training programs is a critical feature that offers the opportunity for HRD practitioners to justify the reasons for HRD interventions, which are aimed at increasing the effectiveness of organizations. In addition, environmental pressure from global competition has also led HRD to increasingly demonstrate that training programs contribute directly to the organization's bottom line (Holton, 1996). Therefore, evaluation has been among the most crucial issues for HRD practitioners as they seek to justify training programs through evaluating the outcomes.

Generally, there are two types of evaluation models that have dominated the evaluation literature in HRD—the outcome-focused approaches and the process-focused approaches. First, many training evaluation models or approaches focus on outcomes and adapt, for the most part

utilizing some derivation Kirkpatrick's four-level model. In brief, Kirkpatrick's four level model asks HRD professionals to measure four outcomes: (a) *reaction* which focuses on measuring participants' satisfaction with a training program, (b) *learning* which is concerned with changed skills and knowledge of trainees, (c) *behavior* which measures changed behavior of participants when they return to the job situation, and (d) *results* which emphasize the organizational impact of training. Russ-Eft and Preskill (2001) state that Kirkpatrick's model offers a solid starting point as the first attempt to formalize the notion of various outcomes that should be evaluated for a training program. They acknowledge that it is interesting to find that the majority of evaluation models found in the literature (e.g., Brinkerhoff, 1987; Kaufman & Keller, 1994; Phillips, 1997) either directly or indirectly build on Kirkpatrick's four-level model. Many of the evaluation models that followed from Kirkpatrick's taxonomy are concerned with the measuring outcomes at each level, and some have added other relevant outcomes such as return on investment (ROI) (Phillips, 1997).

The outcome-focused evaluation models have been criticized in that they have largely failed not only to apply their theoretical framework to practice but also to improve practice. Swanson and Holton argue "the prescriptive frameworks have generally failed to be confirmed by practice" (2001, p. 366). For instance, the recent ASTD 2002 State of the Industry Report shows that 78 percent of organizations conducted reaction level evaluation, 32 percent of organizations tested for learning, 9 percent measured behavior changes, and only 7 percent evaluated return on investment (ROI). This report confirms that in spite of the importance of the higher level evaluation, the degree of use declines from level 1 through level 4.

Nevertheless, as a mainstream of evaluation in HRD, the outcome-focused evaluation models have been clearly consistent with the performance-oriented HRD paradigm including a

bias that a primary outcome of HRD should be improved performance. The outcome-focused approaches to evaluation embrace learning *and* performance together as two different levels, which compliment each other. For instance, Kirkpatrick's framework includes behavior and results that are related to the performance domain as well as reactions and learning that are akin to the learning domain. Furthermore, as mentioned, in order to justify the value of training programs in a host organization, it is necessary to demonstrate a program's contribution in relation to the organization's strategic goals. It is said that "if HRD is to be strategic partner, it must measure results" (Swanson & Holton, 2001, p. 144), and evaluating training program outcomes has been a primary avenue to demonstrate whether training programs align with the organizational needs in that those outcomes are indicators of HRD's contribution.

Second, in addition to the outcome-focused approaches, there are also process-focused approaches to evaluation. Instead of evaluating outcomes, the process-focused approaches are concerned with the how people are engaged in the evaluation process. The ultimate effect of the evaluation comes not just from the findings, but from going through the thinking process that the evaluation requires (Patton, 1997). Although the process-focused approaches to evaluation have not been as common in the field of HRD, there has emerged the viewpoint that evaluation in an organization is a *learning* process. As a case in point, Preskill and Torres (1999) envision evaluative inquiry as a process for "investigating and understanding critical organizational issues" (p. 3). They suggest that organizational learning is achieved through the social construction of knowledge and can be transformative when stakeholders are able to alter their perceptions and understandings based on evaluation processes and findings (Russ-Eft & Preskill, 2001). They state that "learning from evaluative inquiry is socially situated and is mediated through participants' previous knowledge and experience" (Preskill & Torres, 1999, p. xix).

Likewise, evaluative inquiry is concerned with the evaluation process which is a collaborative effort among organizational members. Through evaluative inquiry, a variety of constituencies who have vested interests in training programs share information, apply it to organizational practices, and construct collective knowledge; it is indeed akin to an organizational learning process.

Evaluative inquiry, which is a process-focused approach, is different from the outcome-focused approach to evaluation in that it focuses on very different things. In outcome-focused evaluations, which have comprised the majority of evaluation models in HRD, the purpose of evaluation is to measure or assess the training outcomes—typically, to evaluate and ensure the learning and performance of organizational members and to demonstrate the cost-effectiveness of training. In contrast, evaluative inquiry views the evaluation process as an organizational learning process in which multiple stakeholders are engaged. It thus emphasizes change and development at the individual level as well as the organizational level as a result of evaluative practice. As outcomes of evaluative inquiry, Preskill and Torres highlight that "changes in the organizational structures, systems, products, services, or processes" are anticipated as well as "changes in individual growth and development with respect to how they think, feel, and act in the work environment" (p. 189). These outcomes can be achieved while going through the evaluation. In sum, both the outcome-focused approach and the process-focused approach have contributed to HRD practice in a different way. The outcome-focused approach is committed to ensuring the accountability for training programs, whereas the process-focused approach introduces a new meaning of evaluation practice as an organizational learning process.

An additional and important perspective regarding the evaluation of training programs has gained momentum in the evaluation literature, but has yet to become popular in HRD theory

or practice. It has typically been accepted by many scholars specializing in evaluation that

evaluation as an organizational practice is political; engaging different people who have different

standards, values, beliefs, and interests. Much of the evaluation literature (Cronbach, 1980;

Greene, 1997; Palumbo, 1987; Patton, 1997; Russ-Eft & Preskill, 2001) argues that evaluation

practice is political in the sense that evaluators work on problems with other stakeholders. Since

evaluation is a decision-making process closely involving multiple stakeholders, those who

participate in evaluation have different perceptions about training programs. Michalski and

Cousins (2000, 2001) report there are multiple perceptions about the results of training

evaluation among stakeholders. The evaluation process corresponds to the negotiation of these

differences among stakeholders and evaluators. Through negotiation, the social and cultural

relations of power shape both the process and, in turn, the outcomes of evaluation. Cronbach

(1980) maintains that a theory of evaluation must be as much a theory of political interaction as

it is a theory of how to determine the facts. Indeed, evaluation is never a value-neutral practice.

Each stakeholder group attempts to have influence throughout the whole evaluation process. For

this reason, a certain dominant stakeholder group's interests can become the primary criteria for

determining outcomes such as good/bad, true/false, or desirable/undesirable. Therefore, the

question, 'Whose interests affect establishing the criteria for evaluation?' is critical in examining

the outcomes of training programs. As such, "the fact that evaluation requires classifying and

categorizing makes it political" (Patton, 1997, p. 347). Regarding the theoretical framework

utilized for the current study, a program planning model for educational programs is important.

Cervero and Wilson (1994) address the sociopolitical aspect of program planning that has been

overlooked in adult education. Since educational programs are a construct of power relationships

and interests of those people involved in the programs, three key concepts of power, interests,

and negotiation become central. Briefly, power is the "capacity of act, distributed to people by virtue of the enduring social relationships" (p. 29), and interests refer to "motivations and purposes that lead people to act in certain ways" (p. 29). Moreover, negotiation is the "central form of action that planners undertake in constructing programs" (p. 29) in that program planners negotiate not only with specific interests and power but also between the interests of other people. Cervero and Wilson conclude that program planning is the process in which planners "responsibly negotiate interests in organizational relationships of power" (p. 115).

While addressing the political nature of program evaluation, the concept of the stakeholder is central. For the purposes of this study, stakeholders are defined as people who have vested interests in the training program and, thus, the evaluation because the outcomes of evaluation affect their lives within the organization. Literature in the field of program evaluation (Gold, 1983; House & Howe, 2000a, 2000b; Palumbo, 1987; Patton, 1987a, 1997; Stake, 1983, 2000; Weiss, 1983a, 1983b) delineates three major stakeholder groups: the program staff group who is in charge of operating the program, the client group who is interested in the use of evaluation findings, and the decision making group who influence and support the program. In terms of overall HRD, on the other hand, Garavan (1995) classifies key stakeholder groups and presents their different expectations and values on HRD functions. According to Garavan, stakeholders are divided into internal stakeholders and external stakeholders. Internal stakeholders consist of HRD specialists, individual learners, line managers, top management, and personnel managers; and external stakeholders include national training advisors, training unions, and external training providers. These stakeholders would be considered as either direct or indirect stakeholders of training program evaluation. Weiss (1983a) suggests that justifying stakeholder involvement should be based on whether it increases the use of evaluation results.

She says, "the stakeholder approach to evaluation was designed explicitly both to increase the use of evaluation results for decision making and to bring a variety of people into active participation" (p. 8). It is concerned with the involvement of people, attention to their interests, representation of their intended use of results, and an emphasis on feedback. The stakeholder-based approach is an umbrella concept that encompasses a variety of evaluation models which address the diversity of people involved in evaluation.

<div align="center">Statement of Problem</div>

The outcome-focused approaches to evaluation emphasize the outcomes expected as a result of training interventions, and the process-focused approaches delineate evaluation as a collaborative learning process and pay attention to the effect of that process on participants and organizational learning rather than simply the outcomes expected of training programs. In both approaches, however, the effort to understand the political nature of evaluation has been largely overlooked. Although viewing evaluation of training programs from the political perspective has begun to emerge in the HRD literature (Russ-Eft & Preskill, 2001), the paucity of empirical research on this issue needs to be resolved to build a more solid foundation for HRD practice and theory.

This study utilizes the stakeholder-based approach to understand the political aspect of training program evaluations. The stakeholder-based approach is relevant to explore the politics of evaluation in that it assumes that stakeholders want the evaluation to focus on specific goals they think are important and ignore goals that might be of interest to others in the organization (Russ-Eft & Preskill, 2001). The stakeholder-based approach admits that stakeholders have different, sometimes conflicting, desires, values, expectations, and interests in evaluating one another. Indeed, acknowledging the diversity of stakeholders allows us to look at evaluation

from a political perspective. Moreover, the stakeholder-based approach is also appropriate to the politics of evaluation in that its ultimate value involves the fairness and justice of educational and social service provisions (Stake, 1983). In connection with the concept of stakeholders, this approach encourages evaluators to understand their relationships with the stakeholders involved as well as the relationships between stakeholders to conduct evaluators' work effectively and contribute to the resolution of the issues at hand (Rossi, Freeman, & Lipsey, 1999). In brief, the stakeholder-based approach to evaluation for training programs is an effort to address a critical element that is missing in both the outcome-focused and the process-focused approaches.

Purpose of Study and Research Questions

The purpose of this study is to understand how power and interests are negotiated by stakeholders in determining the merit and worth of a recurring training program. In particular, this study is aimed at articulating how power relations among stakeholders in a Korean business organization affect negotiations during the evaluation process, and how power relations shape the evaluation outcomes. As Cervero and Wilson (1994) frame program planning with the three concepts of power, interests, and negotiation, this study also explores an evaluation for a training program focusing on these concepts. Three research questions guide this study:

1. What are the interests of the stakeholders affected by the training program?
2. How do power relations among the stakeholders affect the evaluation process?
3. How do power relations among the stakeholders affect the evaluation outcomes?

Significance of Study

This study contributes to both the theory and practice of evaluation for training programs within organizations. Theoretically, most research in HRD has been focused on how to assess training outcomes and measure the contribution of training interventions to organizational

performance neglecting the social aspect of evaluation. This study informs that evaluation of

training programs is not merely an act of assessing training outcomes and measuring the

organizational impact. Rather, the evaluation process is an interpretive and collaborative process

in which varied stakeholders are involved either directly or indirectly. In this manner, the

findings of this study shed light on how evaluation outcomes are socially constructed through

negotiation of power and interests among stakeholders, which is a political process. By

illuminating the social aspect of evaluation, this study helps researchers grasp evaluation in a

comprehensive way. In addition, this study provides a substantial body of research with

additional empirical evidence of how evaluation is a political practice.

   Practically, the findings of this study will enhance the accountability of HRD

practitioners who are responsible for conducting evaluation of training programs. By addressing

the political nature of evaluation, this study helps HRD practitioners understand the complexity

of interests, claims, and concerns within evaluation processes in organizational settings.

Recognizing this complexity, HRD practitioners would be able to represent the multiple interests

responsibly; ensure the fair inclusion of those interests in the evaluation process; and avoid the

improper selection of criteria and slanting outcomes in a certain direction. In this way, HRD

practitioners could evaluate relevantly the value of training programs in a particular

organizational context as well as the quality of training programs. Furthermore, although this

study is conducted in a business organizational setting, the findings may offer some applicable

significance to evaluation of other institutional settings in the field of adult education.

Definition of Terms

Stakeholders: The definition of stakeholders in this study is people who affect or are affected by

a training program. Stakeholders are either the members of groups that are palpably affected by

the program and who therefore will be affected by evaluation outcomes or the members of

groups that make decisions about the future of program through the evaluation process (Weiss,

1983a).

Interests: Interests are defined as a "complex sets of predispositions embracing goals, values,

desires, expectations, and other orientations and inclinations that lead a person to act in one

direction or another" (Cervero & Wilson, 1994, p. 29).

Negotiation: Negotiation is to "confer, bargain, or discuss with a view to reaching agreement

with others" (Cervero & Wilson, 1994, p. 29).

Power: Power means the "capacity to act" (Cervero & Wilson, 1994, p. 29). Power is regarded as

a necessary characteristic of all relationships among stakeholders.

Politics: In this study, politics refers to the exercise of organizational power at either individual

level or structural level that affect the evaluation process and its outcomes.

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The purpose of this study is to understand how power and interests are negotiated by stakeholders in determining the merit and worth of a recurring training program. For this study, the following three research questions were examined:

1. What are the interests of the stakeholders affected by the training program?

2. How do power relations among the stakeholders affect the evaluation process?

3. How do power relations among the stakeholders affect the evaluation outcomes?

With regard to this purpose, this review of the literature is focused on articulating the following areas. First, issues of organizational politics and power and of critical understanding of HRD and workplace learning are addressed. Second, evaluation models for training programs in HRD are highlighted for a better understanding of the current evaluation research and practice. Third, three program evaluation models that emphasize the roles of stakeholders are articulated. Finally, now that this study is focused on investigating the politics of training program evaluation in terms of process and outcomes, political aspects of the program evaluation process and outcomes are elaborated.

Organizational Politics and HRD

In this section, in considering organizations as a political entity, the notion of organizational power and politics are articulated as a theoretical framework. Second, this section also encompasses two functions of workplace learning and training in terms of power and politics in organization: Controlling employees and empowering employees.

Organizational Power and Politics

Politics is often regarded as a fact of life in organizations. The premise that every organization is composed of people who have varied task, career, and personal interests allows us to understand an organization as a political entity. Morgan (1998) says "the idea of politics stems from the view that, where interests are divergent, society should provide a means of allowing individuals to reconcile their differences through consultation and negotiation" (p. 149). Pfeffer (1981) defines organizational politics as "those activities carried out by people to acquire, enhance, and use power and other resources to obtain their preferred outcomes in a situation where there is uncertainty or disagreement" (pp. 4-5). When organizational politics matters, the concept of power is centered in the sense that the meaning of politics in organization is conceptualized as the exercise of power to negotiate different interests among members maintaining one's interests in certain organizational issues. Meanwhile, power is defined as the "capacity to act" (Cervero & Wilson, 1994, p. 29). Power is looked upon as a necessary characteristic of all relationships among organizational members. Based on the concepts of politics and power, it is known that the substantive importance of politics and power in organizations lies in its potential influences on work outcomes.

The literature on organizational politics endorses that such conditions of organizations as a coalition of diverse people, shared organizational goals, uncertainty, and resource dependency give rise to political behaviors in the organizational context (Ferris & Kacmar, 1992; Hickson, Hinings, Lee, Schneck, & Pennings, 1971; Morgan, 1998; Pfeffer, 1981). First, an organization is a coalition of people. As "people-work is always political" (Forester, 1989, p. 4), engaging diverse people leads an organization to be a political arena. French and Raven (2001) focus on

the basis of power used in individual interaction in organizations. By the basis of power, they

mean the "relationship between O and P which is the source of that power" (p. 321).

Second, sharing the same goal is another element of politics of organizations. People

collaborate in an organization to attain shared organizational objectives and goals. A shared goal

drives people to negotiate different ideas, thoughts and interests one another. Unless people

strive the shared goals, they hardly find themselves in a power situation regardless of any

cultural differences or inequalities (Crozier, 1973). Therefore, power relations can only develop

if two or more parties are already part of, or choose to participate in, an organized system whose

members seek shared goals.

Third, uncertainty is a given condition of an organization, and actors within the

organization make efforts to resolve the uncertainty. (Hickson, Hinings, Lee, Schneck, &

Pennings, 1971; Morgan, 1998; Pfeffer, 1981). As a matter of fact, reducing uncertainty is not

easy to achieve using only rational behaviors because individuals or teams often face the

constraints of bounded rationality (Morgan, 1998). Therefore, an alternative way of behavior,

which is a political behavior, is needed for organizational members to overcome uncertain

organizational circumstances. Ferris and Kacmar (1992) discuss that political behaviors are most

likely to occur when a reasonably high degree of uncertainty or ambiguity exists in the work

environment.

Fourth, the necessity of resources for organizational functions construes the political

nature of organizations appropriately. Every organization needs resources such as information,

technology, money, and personnel who have critical skills in order to be successful, and, in

reality, those resources are allocated unequally within or around the organization. Therefore, the

success of some actors' practices is dependent upon resources of others. Based upon this

situation, those who control the resources are able to gain power to influence the organizational practice, and it can certainly be translated into power when the resource is in scarce supply (Morgan, 1998). Accordingly, the process through which actors should be aware of their contextual pertinence and control and use them is known as politics (Hardy & Clegg, 1996).

There have been two distinct streams of research on organizational power. One is an approach found in mainstream management work. This approach puts the notion of rationality as central when analyzing organizational processes. Organizations are viewed as structures of formal, legitimate, and functional authority, and rational organizational members are assumed to act in ways to maximize the efficiency and effectiveness of the organization. Drawn from mainstream management work, power is exercised to thwart initiatives intended to benefit the organization for the sake of self-interest, and therefore, it is equated with actions that are dysfunctional and illegitimate (Hardy & Clegg, 1996). Similarly, Minzberg (1983) claims that politics refers to the illegitimate use of power. "A system of politics arises in internal coalition to displace legitimate power" (p. 173). The mainstream management theorists assume that employing power is illegitimate when it is sanctioned neither by formal authority, accepted ideology, nor certified expertise (Minzberg, 1983). Organizational power, from this perspective, is almost exclusively exercised in and around the decision-making arena as part of a deliberative strategy to overcome some conflict, resistance or opposition (Hardy & Leiba-O'Sullivan, 1998). It is called the functionalist viewpoint on organizational power because functions of power to defeat conflict are emphasized.

On the other hand, the critical approach to organizational power is developed on the basis of the Marxist and Weberian traditions. From this perspective, "power is conceptualized as domination, and actions taken to challenge it constituted resistance to domination" (Hardy &

Clegg, 1996, p. 626). Advocates of this stance believe that organizational practices could never be neutral; the dominant group attempts to exercise power to manipulate discourses of an organization on behalf of itself. By doing so, it can keep on imposing its own interests on the dominated and then reproducing its privileges over the dominated. Pointing out a latent conflict, which consists in a contradiction between the interests of those exercising power and the real interests of those they exclude, Lukes (1974) argues that "the most effective and insidious use of power is to prevent such conflict from arising in the first place" (p. 23). Through the production of everyday beliefs and practices, power is used to produce apparent consensus and acquiescence, replacing visible controls by hidden cultural forms of domination (Hardy & Leiba-O'Sullivan, 1998). This form of power that is associated with preventing the conflict seemed to be ideological in that it is exercised to justify the dominant group's interests and agenda in a hidden way by managing the symbolic meaning of various elements of organizational culture. In an organization, meaning, identity, and power relationships are produced, maintained, and reproduced through organizational processes by fixing meaning and articulating it to a certain group's interests (Conrad, 1983; Hardy & Leiba-O'Sullivan, 1998; Mumby, 1988, 2001).

In addition to these two approaches to organizational power and politics, there has been growing interest in the contribution of the work of Foucault to understanding of organizations (McKinlay & Starkey, 1998). In fact, a Foucaultian perspective exposes an important but rarely discussed dimension of organizational practices in terms of the manifestation of power. Foucault believes power does not reside in things, but in a network of relationships which are systematically interconnected (Burrell, 1998). Foucault disputes the critical theorists' idea of power that posits that power is often used by the dominant group who possesses power in an oppressive way to manipulate and maintain their hegemony. Instead, while contending that

power is exercised rather than possessed (Foucault, 1977), he views that power is exercised as deeply entrenched domination in the body of the individual; it is not exercised as oppression on the individual from above. Individuals are always in the position of simultaneously undergoing and exercising this power. In this sense, Foucault articulates that the individual is already one of the prime effects of power that certain bodies, certain gestures, certain discourses and certain desires come to be identified and constituted as individuals (Foucault, 1980). In other words, "individuals are the vehicles of power, not its points of application (p. 98).

The mechanism of exercising this power, according to Foucault, is identified as disciplinary power. Foucault (1977) explains disciplinary power,

> …refers individual actions to a whole that is at once a field of comparison, a space of differentiation and the principle of a rule to be followed. It differentiates individuals from one another, in terms of the following overall rule: that the rule be made to function as a minimal threshold, as an average to be respected or as an optimum towards which one most move. It measures in quantitative terms and hierarchizes in terms of value the abilities, the level, the "nature" of individuals. It introduces, through this "value giving" measure, constraints of a conformity that must be achieved. (pp. 182-183)

In essence, disciplinary power is "a type of power which is constantly exercised by means of surveillance" (Foucault, 1980, p. 104). Surveillance is not simply about direct control but it may range from cultural practices of moral endorsement, enablement and persuasion, to more formalized technical knowledge (Clegg, 1998). More specifically, the rationale underlying the general method of disciplinary power was that of breaking up groups and collectivities into separate units that could be subjected to individual surveillance, and consequently self-

surveillance (Brookfield, 2001). Brookfield articulates how self-surveillance works as the most important component of disciplinary power:

> Instead, we watch ourselves because we sense that our attempt to stay close to the norm is itself being watched by another, all-seeing, presence. We carry within us the sense that "out there", in some hidden, undiscoverable location, "they" are constantly observing use. It is hard to deviate from the norm if you feel your thoughts and actions are being recorded figuratively and sometimes literally by cameras hidden in every corner of your life. (p. 11)

From the Foucaultian perspective, a central theme of research in terms of organizational practices is to examine the connection between discipline and organizational virtue (Clegg, 1989). Doubtless, at the heart of disciplinary power is surveillance through organizational norms, standards, and values. Types of surveillance range through forms of supervision, formalization, mechanization, and legislation that seek to effect increasing control of organizational members' behavior, dispositions, and embodiment (Clegg, 1989). Understanding organizational power and politics through the Foucaultian lens allows us to see that power is omnipresent throughout organizational practices and it is exercised by being deeply inscribed in organizational members' mind and body.

Power and Politics in HRD

In considering that organizations are composed of people and organizational goals are attained by people, the development of people's expertise within the organization, which is the primary function of HRD, becomes a crucial issue for the success of the organization. Therefore, aspects of HRD interventions are inevitably related to organizational goals, visions, and agenda. Furthermore, since an HRD unit is considered as one of the sub-units of a host organization, it is

likely to be affected by organizational politics and power relationships. "HRD can be thought of as a subsystem that functions within the larger host system for the purpose of advancing, supporting, harmonizing, and leading the host system" (Swanson & Holton, 2001, p. 9). In sum, it is necessary to examine HRD practices not only because the nature of HRD interventions are susceptible to organizational agenda, but also because the function of an HRD unit should be understood in terms of the broad organizational context. This section addresses the political functions of HRD that involve control of employees and empowerment of employees.

Controlling employees. From the critical perspective, education allows students to internalize beliefs, ideas, and assumptions of the dominant group as value neutral or even true. That is to say, these dominant beliefs and assumptions, which are usually called 'ideology', are produced and reproduced through education. Apparently, ideology is a critical tool of domination of what Gramsci named 'hegemony.' Ideology constructs power of the dominant group and, in turn, power allows the dominant group to sustain its ideology. Equally, the function of education in society corresponds to the function of HRD in an organization.

Organizational power is geared toward justifying one's dominance in invisible ways, and in this sense, HRD functions, such as training and development (T&D) and organizational development (OD) are primary channels though which organizational power mobilizes for the purpose of the hegemony of the management group (Carter, Howell, & Schied, 2001; Schied, 2001; Schied, Carter, Preston, & Howell, 1997, 1998; Schied, Carter, & Howell, 2001). It is pervasive in the critical viewpoint that HRD is viewed as a practice skewed to organizational goals and values, which are about performance improvement rather than individuals' growth and development.

From the critical standpoint, HRD interventions involve the 'control' issue. For the most part, now that HRD is seen as a system of control based on human relations theory and human capital theory, "who controls learning" and "who controls knowledge production" in the workplace are significant issues (Schied, 2001; Schied, et al., 1997). In a similar vein, Solomon (2001) insists that workplace learning is a "cultural practice constructed by discursive practices of work" (p. 43). The culture of the workplace is the structures, norms, beliefs, and values that underpin certain expectations and behaviors in the organization. Viewed as a cultural practice in which educators must negotiate effectively the meanings and values of differences among employees, workplace training has become a tool of cultural "control," rendering differences invisible to construct particular kinds of workers (Fenwick, 2001). Solomon highlights that "it is a common experience for workplace educators to experience the repressive power of workplace learning, particularly when learning experiences are constructed to fit a monocultural controlled norm and when differences of learners and learning are rendered invisible" (p. 50).

Regarding "control" issues, Schied and others (1997, 1998, & 2001) argue that HRD is committed to managerial controls over the worker group. In general, there is no doubt that priority is given to managerial interests and instrumental-rational interests in a modern organization (Deetz & Mumby, 1990). In this context, what often happens in corporate training is that participants are silenced, sometimes out of an instinct for job and self-preservation and sometimes by already being socialized according to the institution's ideology, discourse, and hegemony (Schied, et al., 2001). Therefore "HRD actually masks the new way of controlling workers" (Schied, 2001, p. 132).

For example, a case study (Schied, et al., 2001) shows the role of HRD as a source of power on behalf of managerial interests. The study shows that HRD programs tend to inculcate

organizational norms and values into employees. If this purpose is not achieved quietly and properly, then employees must submit themselves for "correction" through more training and development; HRD programs can be a kind of punishment. Accordingly, corrective influence and persuasive influence become the elementary forms of social power (Scott, 2001), and, therefore, the training and development function as a typical HRD practice is a form of exercising power that helps the management group to gain control over employees.

Similarly, such notions as performance, effectiveness, and improvement also reflect the dominant group's interest. Defining and assessing these notions inevitably go through the political process. Newcomer (1997) argues that there are no correct answers when it comes to selecting performance measures. "The right measures are so defined by those stakeholders who hold the most influence over the process" (p. 12). In the context of corporations, the management level's interests are more important when selecting performance measures and determining their attainment than the employee group's. In fact, the effectiveness and efficiency of training programs are significantly different if looked at from other interest standpoints (Deetz & Mumby, 1990).

Empowering employees. In spite of these skeptical views, there is another perspective that stresses the role of empowering employees of HRD. Inglis (1997) points out that "empowerment involves people developing capacities to act successfully within the existing system and structure of power" (p. 4). For him, empowerment is about "encouraging workers to rationally choose to commit themselves to the values, goals, policies, and objectives of the organization as a rational means of improving their life changes" (p. 6). As HRD is defined as a "process for developing and unleashing human expertise through organization development and personnel training and development for the purpose of improving performance" (Swanson & Holton, 2001, p. 4), it

provides employees with rational means of improving their life changes by developing and unleashing their expertise.

There are two main approaches to the use of the concept of empowerment in organizational settings: the psychological perspective and relational perspective. The psychological perspective focuses on the individual employee's subjective experience of being empowered (Potterfield, 1999). In line with this, Thomas and Velthouse (1990) describe psychological empowerment as an "increased intrinsic task motivation" (p. 666). Likewise, while quoting the discussion of Davis and Davis (1998), Swanson and Holton (2001) indicate that personnel training and development not only allows employees to become more effective and efficient in their work, but also the organization to fulfill its purposes and goals. Through participating in training programs, therefore, employees can improve their employability by being better qualified for the job. Employees' enhanced capabilities for the job can be linked to their psychological empowerment. Bandura (1995) specifies four main forms of influence on the development of efficacy: mastery experiences, vicarious experiences, social persuasion, and physiological and emotional states. The function of T&D is associated with that of mastery experience. In other words, the experience of enhancing relevant skills, knowledge, and attitude for the job through T&D can improve self-efficacy in that a sense of efficacy involves "acquiring the cognitive, behavioral, and self-regulatory tools for creating and executing appropriate courses of action to manage ever-changing life circumstances" (Bandura, 1995, p. 3).

Like T&D, organizational development (OD) also constitutes HRD practice. "OD is the process of systematically unleashing human expertise to implement organizational change for the purpose of improving performance" (Swanson & Holton, 2001, p. 260). The relational perspective on empowerment, which involves the structural arrangement of the organization,

highlights the impact of OD intervention. The relational perspective focuses on designing the organizational structure in order to facilitate the transfer of power (Potterfield, 1999). By restructuring the organization, empowerment can aim at reducing the dependencies that make it difficult to get the job done by delegating power and authority (Hardy & Leiba-O'Sullivan, 1998). In this sense, Potterfield (1999) argues that empowered workplaces are characterized by a flat structure rather than a hierarchal structure. The essential ingredient of empowerment from the relational perspective is the transfer of power from the high-level management to the line-level. Empowerment in an organization implies that the organization distributes power more equally among managers and employees.

However, with regard to structural change for empowerment, the critical approach still posits a skeptical standpoint because power remains in the flat or team structure. From the critical perspective, the vertical control associated with the hierarchical structure of organization is just replaced by horizontal control with peer pressure operating through teams as members sanction and correct those who jeopardize or criticize established guidelines (Schied, et al., 1997). In addition, even in collective team-learning situations, employees' positions in the authority structure lead to different power distribution and, in turn, affect the team-learning process and outcomes (Brooks, 1994). Such power differences result in the "exclusion rather than the integration of multiple and divergent perspectives and thus severely limit the learning that is possible by teams in work organizations" (Brooks, 1994, p. 232).

In summary, the educational function of HRD can be seen either as a dominance process of the managerial group over the employee group or as an empowering means for employees. In both formulations, power cannot be eliminated; power is always embedded in the organization

even if organizational structures are altered as a result of an HRD intervention. Indeed, HRD practice itself is subject to organizational power relations.

Evaluation in HRD

Swanson (1989) asserts that "the mission and goal of business and industry are to maximize the economic return on investment through the production and sale of goods and services" (p. 71). In accordance with this goal, various interventions of HRD should be a critical means to achieve business goals, and in this sense, evaluation of training programs is necessary to demonstrate the linkage between training interventions and business goals whereby performance improvement at either individual or organizational levels are assessed. In this section, some recurring evaluation frameworks are overviewed. In specific, two main frameworks, Kirkpatrick's four level framework that chiefly focuses on measuring training outcomes at various levels, and evaluative inquiry that delineates evaluation as an organizational learning process are addressed. In addition, Phillips's return on investment (ROI) is also presented as one of the most intriguing evaluation model in HRD.

Kirkpatrick's Four-level Framework

Kirkpatrick's evaluation framework is the most commonly used framework in the field of HRD because of its usefulness in determining the focus and importance of interventions and initiatives (Gilley & Maycunich, 2000). Russ-Eft and Preskill (2001) state that as the first attempt to formalize the notion of training and performance evaluation, Kirkpatrick's model offered a solid starting point. They acknowledge that it is interesting to find that the majority of other models found in the literature either directly or indirectly build on Kirkpatrick's framework.

Kirkpatrick's framework is composed of four levels: reaction, learning, behavior, and results. The first level of evaluation, "reaction" is related to participants' level of satisfaction with a training program. Participants' feelings about the training program are the main issue at this level. The next level of evaluation is known as the evaluation of "learning." On this level, the extent to which participants change their knowledge, skills and attitude due to training is measured. The third level of evaluation measures the "behavior" changes of trainees when they return to the job situation. The main issue of this level of evaluation is the extent to which training participants transfer knowledge, skills, and attitudes to the job. The fourth level of evaluation focuses on the organizational "results" that come from each individual's learning and performance improvement. While the third level of evaluation is concerned about individual behavior changes, as a result of training, this level of evaluation is closely related to the organizational changes (Kirkpatrick, 1998).

The strength of Kirkpatrick's evaluation framework is that it suggests a simple practical framework for understanding various outcomes of training programs. In fact, the American Society for Training and Development (ASTD) has embraced this framework in its learning outcomes report (Holton, 1996; Swanson & Holton, 2001). Moreover, a number of modifications to the Kirkpatrick's framework have been suggested (Brinkerhoff, 1987; Kaufman & Keller, 1994; Phillips, 1997). In spite of practical usefulness, Kirkpatrick's four-level framework has been criticized: some claim that it is not supported by research; it emphasizes reaction measures; it is not updated; it is not used; and it can lead to incorrect decisions (Swanson & Holton, 2001). In this sense, Holton (1996) disputes that it is best labeled as a taxonomy, which is a simply classification scheme. He argues that it cannot be an evaluation in the sense that the implied

causal relationships between each level of the taxonomy have not been demonstrated by research.

Kirkpatrick's four-level framework emphasizes the use of evaluation findings in that it focuses on generating knowledge or information about the merit and worth of training programs by assessing results of the programs at four levels. Each finding is often aimed at making decisions about programs (instrumental use) or conceptual understandings of programs (conceptual use).

Evaluative Inquiry

Based on the problem that evaluation has not paid attention to the learning dimension of evaluative activities, evaluation inquiry has been developed looking at evaluation as an organizational learning process. Evaluative inquiry, proposed by Preskill and Torres (1999), assumes that learning from evaluation occurs within the context of the organization and is therefore mediated by the organization's internal systems and structures (Russ-Eft & Preskill, 2001). "Evaluative inquiry is a means for fostering individual and team learning about complex organizational issues" (Preskill & Torres, 1999, p. 17).

Preskill and Torres (1999) explain the components of the evaluative inquiry process, which is the organizational learning process. According to them, organizational members come together to engage in the processes of (a) dialogue, (b) reflection, (c) asking questions, and (d) identifying and clarifying values, beliefs, assumptions, and knowledge. Dialogue is a medium to deliver multiple viewpoints that need to be addressed and negotiated. It contributes to developing shared meanings, understanding complex issues, and uncovering assumptions. Reflection enables members to think holistically about the evaluative issue and explore other's values, beliefs, and knowledge as well as their own. Reflection is "central to sustaining evaluative inquiry efforts"

(p. 56). Asking questions involves acquiring information, insight, clarity and direction that would resolve problems more efficiently and effectively. Preskill and Torres argue that asking questions facilitates a "spirit of curiosity that serves as a catalyst for learning" (p. 65). Finally, identifying and clarifying values, beliefs, assumptions, and knowledge are important for organizational members. Since organizational members operate on their own values, beliefs, and assumptions when they engage in dialogue and reflection, understanding these elements helps members mediate potential conflicts among team members more quickly and effectively.

Clarifying the range of stakeholders is highlighted in evaluative inquiry because the inquiry is conceived as a collaborative process involving stakeholders. The process of identifying stakeholders involves "reflection about who the stakeholders might be, why they are stakeholders, and what role they should play in the inquiry process" (Preskill & Torres, 1999, p. 88). Although some significant stakeholders may be part of the team, other potential stakeholders may be outside the team. Therefore, it is necessary for team members to find as many stakeholders as possible and then include their concerns and needs. By delimiting the stakeholders in evaluation inquiry, evaluation can be increasingly responsive to the evolving information needs of stakeholders.

Evaluative inquiry should be ongoing and integrated into all work practices rather than be enacted as an add-on activity or only as a product-oriented effort at the end of a program (Russ-Eft & Preskill, 2001). As an evaluation framework in the context of an organization, evaluative inquiry is different from other typical evaluation models in that it emphasizes its process for organizational learning. In other words, the distinct focus of evaluative inquiry is on learning through evaluation rather than on assessing program outcomes.

Evaluative inquiry is concerned about process use,which refers to the manner in which the conduct of the evaluation impacts on individuals or organizations (Alkin & Taut, 2003; Preskill, Zuckerman, & Matthews, 2003). It stresses "individual changes in thinking and behavior, and program or organizational changes in procedures and culture, that occur among those involved in evaluation" (Patton, 1997, p. 90). Apparently, evaluative inquiry pertains to process use because it focuses on the learning effect that the evaluation process has at individual, team, and organizational levels.

Return on Investment (ROI)

Return on investment (ROI) is one of the most intriguing issues in HRD. Phillips (1997, 2003) proposes the ROI models to demonstrate the impact of training programs and performance-improvement programs in financial terms. Particularly, the essential feature of ROI is to "compare the program's monetary benefits with actual cost of the training program" (Phillips, 2003, p. 13). The data that show the impacts of training programs are converted to a monetary value so as to apply them to the formula for calculating ROI. The ROI model is based upon the Kirkpatrick's four-level taxonomy. However, it is developed as an attempt to improve four-level evaluation for training programs; in particular, it adds ROI as a fifth level to the four-level evaluation. ROI evaluation is closely related to other levels of evaluation in the sense that the data that come from the different levels of evaluation can be used for ROI calculation (Phillips, 1997; Phillips, 2003; Phillips & Stone, 2002). That is to say, although ROI calculations with the data from Level 4 are mostly preferred, data at other levels are also an important part of a comprehensive and systematic evaluation process for ROI.

Phillips (2003) suggests the ROI model as a step-by-step approach. The ROI model is largely composed of four steps: evaluation planning, data collection, data analysis, and reporting.

First, during the evaluation planning process, (a) the data collection plan, (b) the ROI analysis plan, and (c) the project plan should be developed. Second, collecting data at all four levels is important for ROI because of the "chain of impact" (Phillips, 1997, p. 110). The chain of impact means that participants learn something from the training that they apply on the job that produces an impact on business results (Phillips & Stone, 2002). In other words, to link the chain of impact, evidence of training results should be collected at each level in evaluating training programs. Third, data analysis involves five sub-components such as (a) isolating the effects of training, (b) converting data to monetary benefits, (c) tabulating cost of the training, (d) calculating the ROI, and (e) identifying intangible benefits. Fourth, reporting is the final step in the ROI model. It is a critical step for the ROI model to guarantee its success. Phillips (2003) indicates that matching the communication method with the audience is essential to ensure that the information is understood and appropriate actions follow.

In spite of some technical difficulties in isolating the effects of training from other effects and identifying intangible benefits, the ROI model for measuring the effectiveness of training programs is seen as useful in influencing management to be more supportive of HRD efforts due to the concrete results of ROI. However, the ROI approach may undermine the effectiveness of training that can produce slight gains in knowledge and competence to a fully effective performance improvement effort (Brinkerhoff & Apking, 2001). In terms of research, research on ROI is also hard to find and even existing studies do not provide much guidance for trainers in designing and conducting their own ROI evaluations (Russ-Eft & Preskill, 2001).

Stakeholder-based Approach to Program Evaluation

Just as the term implies, stakeholders are those who care about the outcome of a program. The aspects of stakes are varied depending upon their relations with the program. That is to say,

they are involved in program evaluation with different reasons and different roles. Much literature that mentions the roles of stakeholders within program evaluation describes various features of stakeholders (Gold, 1983; House & Howe, 2000a, 2000b; Palumbo, 1987; Patton, 1987a, 1997; Stake, 1983, 2000; Weiss, 1983a, 1983b). As a result of reviewing the literature, three stakeholder groups can be identified. The first feature of stakeholder groups is the program staff group. This group people are responsible for operating the program and their exchanges with evaluators are more to serve the data needs of the evaluation than to serve their own information needs (Stake, 1983). The second group is the clients of the program. The perception of stakeholders as clients prevails in the literature. The client group means people whose lives are affected either directly or indirectly by information of evaluation. Particularly this group is concerned about the program evaluation because they are the user group of evaluation findings (Patton, 1997; Weiss, 1983a). The third group comprises people who make decisions about the overall program, or influence the decision-making process. The funding group for the program is a case in point. Evaluation results are usually reported to this group to justify the support of this group to the current program, and to help their decision-making whether their funding continues or discontinues for the future program (Gold, 1983; Weiss, 1983b). The following three evaluation models are articulated because they can provide some implications for training programs, especially as they portray the important aspects of stakeholders within training programs.

Responsive Evaluation

Evaluating training programs requires being responsive to people inside and outside of an organization. Indeed, as "the purposes of the audiences are all-important" (Stake, 2000, p. 357), the extent to which findings of evaluation meet the needs of stakeholders in and around the

organization is linked to the justification of the evaluation practice. Human resource development (HRD) is valued by demonstrating the connection between its efforts and organizational requirements of stakeholders. For instance, managers favor HRD when they believe it leads to improved job performance, increased compliance with organizational policies and procedures, or greater profits (Rothwell & Kazanas, 1994).

The responsive evaluation model developed by Stake is oriented to employing the perspectives of stakeholders in characterizing and judging programs. For Stake (1975), "it is an approach that trades off some measurement precision in order to increase the usefulness of the findings to persons in and around the program" (p.14). This approach is called relativistic because it pursues no final authoritative conclusion while emphasizing findings against stakeholders' different and often conflicting values (Stufflebeam, 2001). In the end, as the basis for the evaluation, responsive evaluation relies little on formal statements and abstract representations. Rather, it requires an informal and continuous exchange between evaluator and stakeholders (Stake, 2000; Stufflebeam, 2001).

Stake proposes three conditions for an educational evaluation to be responsive. Evaluation is responsive, "(1) if it orients more directly to program activities than to program intents, (2) if it responds to audience requirements for information, and (3) if the different value perspectives of the people at hand are referred to in reporting the success and failure of the program" (p. 14).

In responsive evaluation, the evaluator collects data by interacting continuously with the evaluative needs of the stakeholders. Instead of predetermined objectives, Stake (2000) proposes issues as advanced organizers for an evaluation. Issues or problems of evaluation become clear by talking with program stakeholders. In a similar vein, Stufflebeam (2001) explains the

relationship between evaluator and stakeholders should be continuing communication for the

purposes of "discovering, investigating, and addressing a program's issue" (p. 69).

However, in spite of the emphasis on the stakeholder group in evaluation, Stake is firmly

opposed to stakeholder participation. In conversation with Abma, Stake maintains that "to be

responsive does not automatically yield design authority to stakeholders" (Abma & Stake, 2001,

p. 9). It implies that, from his viewpoint, the actual evaluation process is not a cooperative effort.

The evaluation study is the job of the evaluator, and the evaluator remains in control of all

aspects (House, 2001). Stake emphasizes that "evaluators conduct evaluation and the

stakeholders provide a good vicarious experience and reconstruction of quality" (Abma & Stake,

2001, p. 9). In short, although he acknowledges the importance of stakeholders' inclusion, in

particular, stakeholders' responses, he insists that the evaluation practice is a job that is

exclusively given to evaluators.

A major strength of responsive evaluation is that it reflects an open, flexible evaluation

plan, it looks deeply into stakeholders' interests, and it searches for relevant information

(Stufflebeam, 2001). On the other hand, a major weakness of responsive evaluation is that it is

not very amenable to reporting clear findings in time to meet decision or accountability

deadlines. In addition, since it is oriented toward the relativistic viewpoint, which admits

multiple interpretations, there might be conflict and ambiguous findings (Stufflebeam, 2001).

Utilization-focused Evaluation

Swanson and Holton (2001) indicate that the idea of improvement is the "single most

important idea in the profession and the core motivator of HRD professionals" (p. 15). They

assert that the overarching concern of HRD is improvement, either of performance or of learning.

In this manner, it is imperative for HRD professionals to consider whether organizational

performance is improved as a result of training. In essence, the question, "are training programs really useful for organizational performance improvement, which is mediated by individual development and performance improvement?" matters. This HRD context renders utilization-focused idea of evaluation meaningful.

Essentially, utilization-focused evaluation is an approach concerning actual use of evaluation findings. In contrast to the traditional approach, which emphasizes following rules and procedures of preconceived models and determining the technical extent to which a program attains its goals, utilization-focused evaluation focuses on particular issues, which are decided by the primary intended users. Hence, when emphasizing situational evaluation, evaluators should examine intended use by the intended users rather than general use of evaluation findings (Patton, 1997, 2000a; Stufflebeam, 2001). Maintaining that "use is the essence" (Patton, 1997, p. 23), Patton, a proponent of utilized-focused evaluation, suggests that "use concerns how real people in the real world apply evaluation findings and experience the evaluation process" (p. 20). In this context, he believes that working with the stakeholders is aimed at increasing the potential for use by building a genuine commitment to and understanding of the evaluation over the course of the evaluation process (Patton, 1987a). "Utilization begins as soon as stakeholders become actively involved in evaluation because that involvement, properly facilitated, forces them to think about program priorities and realities" (p. 120).

In utilization-focused evaluation, the increased use is linked to the increased participation of intended users in the overall evaluation process. Similar to responsive evaluation, utilization-focused evaluation endorses stakeholders as a data source of evaluation. It requires evaluators to conduct careful and thorough analyses of stakeholders, through which the evaluator identifies the multiple and varied perspectives and interests that should be represented in the study

(Stufflebeam, 2001). However, Patton (1997) stresses specifying the range of stakeholders because "potential users with low opinions of or little interest in evaluation may not have given much thought to the benefits of evaluation" (p. 52).

Utilization-focused evaluation suggests that stakeholders need to participate in evaluation not only because "the bases for interpreting evaluation findings are the users' values" (Stufflebeam, 2001, p. 78) but also because increased stakeholder involvement in an evaluation guarantees that "the odds for use are increased" (Patton, 1987a, p. 117). However, as far as the extent of participation is concerned, since no evaluation can deal with all potential issues equally, utilization-focused evaluation advocates that the evaluation process is "necessary for narrowing the range of possible questions to focus the evaluation" (Patton, 1997, p. 42). Hence, instead of trying to reach and work with all stakeholders, evaluation should be conducted with a select group of stakeholders (Patton, 1987a, 1997, 2000a; Stufflebeam, 2001).

Compared with other models, utilization-focused evaluation is a more realistic model of stakeholder involvement. It suggests that evaluators work with selected, primary intended user groups rather than with all potential stakeholders (Stufflebeam, 2001). Moreover, it is also feasible that evaluators should narrow the range of possible questions to concentrate on intended use instead of dealing with all potential issues. In spite of this strength, utilization-focused evaluation seems to be vulnerable to corruption by the user group since they are given so much control over the whole evaluation process (Stufflebeam, 2001). Active participation of stakeholders requires a highly competent evaluator who has strong skills for dealing with stakeholders' conflict, and possesses expertise in various evaluation methods. Few evaluators can meet these requirements.

Deliberative Democratic Evaluation

Politics and power relations exist within organizational activities including HRD interventions. As a feature of HRD intervention, training evaluation is also affected by this power imbalance among members. Improper selection of criteria, biased interpretation of findings, and slanting recommendations in a certain direction are ways in which power imbalances are likely to be manifested (House & Howe, 2000b). In this sense, the deliberative democratic evaluation model should be articulated because it is essential to articulate the deliberative democratic requirements in order to conduct ethically fair training evaluation in HRD.

House and Howe (2000a, 2000b) suggest inclusion, dialogue, and deliberation as three requirements for deliberative democratic evaluation. Inclusion means that all relevant interests are represented in the evaluation and given full expression. Without including people whose interests may affect evaluation, evaluators have only a "sham deliberation" (House & Howe, 2000a, p. 6). Dialogue is a way of interaction between evaluators and stakeholders. Through dialogue, stakeholders' voices are present and the evaluative conclusions are agreed upon guaranteeing validity. Deliberation highlights the method of emerging evaluation conclusion. Deliberation is important because, through deliberation, values of objects can be determined rationally and, consequently, the values can be transformed into evaluation findings. "Deliberation ensures good judgment" (House & Howe, 2000b, p. 410).

These three requirements may overlap, and sometimes, interfere with each other. But all three are necessary for successful evaluation because the quality of dialogue is closely related to the quality of each person's deliberation, and sound dialogue and deliberation can be achieved on the basis of inclusion. For example, if the inclusive and dialogical dimensions are adequate but

the deliberative dimension is deficient, erroneous conclusions might result. Moreover, if the inclusive and deliberative dimensions are adequate, but the dialogue is missing, an inauthentic evaluation would result (House & Howe, 2000b).

House and Howe (2000b) admit that, in reality, stakeholder groups do not have equal power in evaluations and that dialogue is not fully democratic. In this manner, evaluators should recognize the power imbalances among stakeholders that bias the design and findings of evaluation explicitly. In so doing, evaluators make sure these asymmetrical power relations do not distort evaluation process.

In deliberative democratic evaluation, stakeholders must be willing to engage in open and meaningful dialogue and deliberation at all stages of evaluation (House & Howe, 2000b; Stufflebeam, 2001). In other words, the evaluator determines the evaluation questions through dialogue and deliberation with engaged stakeholders. In terms of reducing the bias of evaluation, deliberative democratic evaluation is more interested in involving the greatest range of relevant stakeholders than in involving a few stakeholders in depth (House, 2003). "Active stakeholder participation *per se* does not control for stakeholder bias, whatever other advantage it may have" (House, 2003, p. 55). Although deliberative democratic evaluation does not devalue stakeholders' active participation in evaluation, it shows a negative stance about the feasibility of all groups' active participation.

A key advantage of deliberative democratic evaluation is that the deliberative democratic evaluator expressly reserves the right to rule out inputs that are considered incorrect or unethical (Stufflebeam, 2001). However, feasibility seems to be a critical challenge for this model. House and Howe (2000b) admit that this approach is unrealistic and often cannot be fully applied to practice.

Political Aspects of Evaluation

It is widely admitted that evaluation is a political practice (Cronbach, 1980; Greene, 1997; Palumbo, 1987; Patton, 1987a, 1997; Russ-Eft & Preskill, 2001). Evaluation typically goes through a series of activities, which can be called a process, and evaluation always produces certain types of outcomes, which are the result of this process. In this section, while reviewing program evaluation literature, the political aspects of the evaluation process and its outcomes are highlighted.

Evaluation Process

Rossi, Freeman, and Lipsey (1999) declare that "evaluation is a practice in which the initial evaluation plan must be tailor-made to the particular program circumstances and then typically requires revision and modification during its implementation" (p. 24). Likewise, an evaluation process ranging from organizing an evaluation plan to reporting its outcomes involves flexibility. Planning an evaluation should be situated in a specific context, and implementation is not necessarily fixed; rather it allows changes depending upon the evaluation purposes, social contexts and the influences of stakeholders. Furthermore, it is apparent that in order for an evaluation to be responsive, stakeholders' views and perspectives are fully represented in the evaluation process (Chen & Rossi, 1992; Stake, 1975). In terms of flexible situations and the involvement of various views within the process, the evaluation process is inevitably concerned with negotiation to decide the optimal evaluation under certain conditions. This negotiation aspect during the evaluation process leads to the political considerations. In this section, issues like sustaining communication and establishing program theory and criteria are articulated to shed light on the political aspects of the process.

First, there is no doubt evaluation is mediated by communication among multiple actors, and evaluation findings are generated through the communicative process between stakeholders and evaluators. House and Howe (2000a) posit that "evaluation findings are not necessarily waiting to be discovered, but are forged in the evaluation and discussions of findings" (p. 7). Gold (1983) also maintains that evaluation findings are formed through periodic information feedback to stakeholders. As the main vehicle of communication, language is one of the key factors of evaluation in that "the evaluation language we choose and use, consciously or unconsciously, necessarily and inherently shapes perceptions, defines 'reality,' and affects mutual understanding" (Patton, 2000b, p. 15). Not only is language a social construct of individuals, but it is also a critical medium of evaluation. For this reason, when stakeholders and evaluators communicate with each other, some conflicts could occur owing to people's different education levels, backgrounds, and positionality.

There are empirical research studies that focus on the impact of language on evaluation. A research study about the evaluation of three California community initiatives represents that "evaluation should be conducted in a linguistically appropriate manner attending to the nuances of languages used among those from different geographic areas, ethnic and socio-economic backgrounds, and age groups" (Clayson, Castaneda, Sanchez, & Brindis, 2002, p. 41). This study implies that language is an important factor affecting evaluation in the sense that it is a culturally and socially constructed symbolic meaning system. In other words, one's social class has almost exclusive power to decide the contextual meaning of terms and concepts that describe social problems (Madison, 2000).

Gosling (2000) suggests that the 'language' is a critical issue for unequal power relations between evaluation participants. He explores the factors affecting the Habermassian 'ideal

speech situation' by examining the participants' experiences of negotiated assessment of two courses, a Postgraduate Certificate program and an MA program in Learning and Teaching in Higher Education. This study demonstrates that some participants, who do not have sufficient experience teaching in higher education, and consequently, are very unfamiliar with the jargon, become silent during the evaluation process. This study shows how the language being used in a certain field can produce unequal power relations between stakeholders. Accordingly, it is necessary for evaluation participants to agree upon the terms or jargon used in evaluation so that they can offer their own ideas in the evaluation process.

Second, developing a program theory and criteria for an evaluation goes through a political process. Program theory means the "set of assumptions about the relationships between the strategy and tactics the program has adopted and the social benefits it is expected to produce" (Rossi, Freeman, & Lipsey, 1999, p. 98). It is, in other words, a framework of how the program is expected to work and how its activities and functions are connected with its outcomes. Program theory also provides a guide for selection of methods for data collection and data analysis (Chen & Rossi, 1992).

The essential ingredient of the politics of program theory for evaluation is that program theory is constructed in different ways based upon different perspectives, and therefore, the selection of a particular version of program theory for evaluation is inevitably bound to be value laden (Chen & Rossi, 1992). Chen (1990) also argues that it is desirable to construct program theory that can take stakeholders' view into consideration. In particular, although developing program theory requires a clear definition of which components, activities, objectives and target populations are encompassed in the program, there is usually no correct definition of them (Rossi, Freeman, & Lipsey, 1999). In this situation, the "evaluator must be prepared to negotiate

a program definition agreeable to the evaluation sponsor and key stakeholders and be flexible about modifications" (p. 162).

Similarly, evaluation criteria can also be considered as factors influencing evaluation practice. Palumbo (1987) maintains that since the subjects of evaluation are human-beings who are inevitably value-committed actors, there is no objective evaluation and it is impossible to guarantee scientific evaluation, that is to say, value-neutral evaluation. Hence, classifying and categorizing with the criteria are subjective. In a similar vein, Greene (1997) points out that evaluation approaches are importantly distinguished by whose criteria and questions are addressed. Evaluation criteria can never be neutral; they serve a dominant group in an organization. Many critical social theorists argue that a dominant discourse or ideology plays the role of a systematic controller that ensures that people accept certain knowledge which has been declared legitimate by those who exercise power. That is to say, a dominant stakeholder group's interest can become the criteria for interpreting data as good/bad, true/false, or effective/ineffective. Therefore, the question, 'Whose interests affect establishing the criteria for evaluation?' is critical for understanding the features of the process.

Evaluation Outcomes

Just as most programs generate outcomes, so too does evaluation. Program outcomes are viewed as "changes in the social conditions the program addresses that are presumed to result from program actions but are not themselves the program actions" (Rossi, Freeman, & Lipsey, 1999, p. 220). Likewise, evaluation outcomes are looked upon as changes at the individual or societal levels stemming from evaluation actions and its findings. In other words, one of the basic assumptions of evaluation is that it is done in order to change something or someone (Burnham, 1995). Indeed, change is acknowledged as an expected outcome of evaluation.

Change as an ultimate evaluation outcome can be divided into two domains: program and stakeholder. First, outcomes of the program domain refer to any impact on the program. This type of outcomes involves the use of evaluation findings. Patton (1997) distinguished three types of findings use: making overall judgments, facilitating improvement, and generating knowledge. Making overall judgments is concerned about judging the overall effectiveness of a program and making decisions about continuing or terminating a program. Facilitating improvement involves making a program better. Information and knowledge resulting from evaluation are geared into improving and innovating on-going programs. Both judgment-oriented and improvement-oriented uses of findings involve the instrumental use in that they impact on direct action such as making particular decisions about a program (Alkin & Taut, 2003). On the other hand, generating knowledge is regarded as conceptual use of evaluation findings in that no decision or action is expected. Instead, the evaluation findings contribute by increasing knowledge (Patton, 1997). This type of the use of findings can produce outcomes whereby particular conceptual understandings are modified, relating to changes in the way users think about particular aspects of a program (Alkin & Taut, 2003). By using evaluation findings in three ways, the decision could be made whether a program would be continued or terminated (judgment-oriented), a modified program can be operated (improvement-oriented), or useful information and lessons for further program implementation can be obtained (generating knowledge). These outcomes in terms of the program domain are political because it is inevitably value-laden. The value-driven outcomes are mediated by the findings resulting from the evaluation process, which is political. That is to say, it is impossible to generate value-neutral knowledge because of the embedded values reflecting asymmetrical power relations and context-boundness of evaluation. Evaluations

will not result in a "correct" finding over different social and political contexts (Guba & Lincoln, 1989; Palumbo, 1987; Patton, 1997).

Second, the stakeholder domain is concerned about outcomes that derive from stakeholders' experiences while going through the evaluation process. If stakeholders participate in the evaluation process, change can occur at stakeholders' behaviors, attitudes, and knowledge levels. Outcomes in terms of the stakeholder domain pertain to the concept of process use. Process use is evidenced by the statement, "the impact on our program came not just from the findings but from going through the thinking process that the evaluation required" (Patton, 1997, p. 90). Process use reflects constructivist learning theory in that it focuses on how groups of people make meaning as they conduct an evaluation (Preskill, Zuckerman, & Matthews, 2003). In brief, the outcome of the stakeholder domain encompasses people's behavioral, cognitive, and affective changes as a result of evaluation experiences.

For example, empowerment of people can be considered as an outcome of evaluation in terms of the stakeholder domain. Fetterman's empowerment evaluation (1996, 1997) provides a pertinent framework to show the aspect of evaluation outcomes in terms of empowerment of people. Empowerment evaluation is the "use of evaluation concepts, techniques, and findings to foster improvement and self-determination" (Fetterman, 2002, p. 89). The key feature of empowerment evaluation is that "people empower themselves" (Fetterman, 1996, p. 5) as the result of evaluation. In other words, evaluation is designed and conducted to enable stakeholders to help themselves and to improve their programs through self-evaluation and reflection. In principle, Fetterman views evaluation as a collaborative practice between the evaluator and stakeholders, and consequently the relationship between evaluators and stakeholders is characterized as a collaborative partnership. Emphasis on collaboration of empowerment

evaluation implies that stakeholders are not only involved in the process as partners of evaluators, but control the process responsibly. Fetterman (2002) provides empirical evidence that empowerment evaluation results in a culture of learning. Through empowerment evaluation, program participants build a culture of learning and evaluation within an organization or community. He claims that "this culture of learning in the form of empowerment evaluation has the power to unleash emancipatory powers within the individual, the group, the organization, and the community" (p. 101). In accordance with empowerment evaluation, people create a culture of learning for themselves through the evaluation process (Fetterman, 2002) as well as building their capacity to advocate for their own needs (Fetterman, 1997).

Summary

The function of HRD within the organization can be seen either as a dominance process of the managerial group over the worker group or as an empowering means for the worker group. In both cases, power cannot be eliminated. Power is embedded in every organization even if organizational structures may be altered as a result of HRD interventions. This chapter also addresses that the process and outcomes of evaluation of training programs are inherently political. Through the organizational power and politics lens, evaluation for HRD interventions is not only associated with assessing results and measuring organizational impacts, but that evaluation process is also an interpretive and collaborative process in which stakeholders and evaluators work together. Therefore, to achieve a successful evaluation practice, negotiation of diverse characteristics of stakeholders as well as acquisition of technical expertise is required. The recognition of politics of evaluation resulting from this literature review can provide us with substantial information that evaluating HRD interventions is technical and social alike. In terms

of its social characteristics, evaluation is seen as a practice that must be aligned with organizational power and politics.

CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this study is to understand how power and interests are negotiated by stakeholders in determining the merit and worth of a recurring training program. For this study, the following three research questions were examined:

1. What are the interests of the stakeholders affected by the training program?

2. How do power relations among the stakeholders affect the evaluation process?

3. How do power relations among the stakeholders affect the evaluation outcomes?

I adopted a qualitative case study design in order to examine these questions. This chapter outlines the overall research design, the case, the data collection, and data analysis methods that this study used. Furthermore, strategies that were used for ensuring the validity and reliability of the study are addressed. Finally some limitations of this study are addressed.

Research Design

Since this study employs the qualitative case study design, the theoretical background of case study design is overviewed at first. Yin (2003) states that the case study design is the preferred strategy "when how or why questions are being posed, when the investigator has little control over events, and when the focus is on a contemporary phenomenon within some real-life context" (p. 1). A case study method is useful to cover contextual conditions. In a similar vein, Patton (1987b) offers that case studies become particularly useful "where one needs to understand some particular problem or situation in great depth" (p. 19). Merriam (1998) addresses that the "single most defining characteristic of case study research lies in delimiting the object of study, the case" (p. 27). That is, a case is regarded as a single entity around which there are boundaries. Further, Stake (1994) emphasizes designing a case study "to optimize

understanding of the case rather than generalization beyond" (p. 236). The case study is conducted because the case itself is of interest in terms of its particularity or ordinariness. In sum, a case study is undertaken in some given context to help understand the case of interest without losing complex contextual influences on it. A case study, therefore, is appropriate when researchers seek to investigate the target event in a holistic and naturalistic way. A case is typically chosen not because it represents other similar cases but because the case per se is interesting. Hence, it is usually described in depth and in detail. A case for inquiry can be a person, an event, a program, a time period, a critical period, a critical incident, or an institution (Merriam, 1998; Patton, 1987b; Yin, 2003).

For this study, the main questions are what are the interests of stakeholders in the training program, how the evaluation process proceeds in which power relations are embedded, and how evaluation outcomes are shaped through this process mediated by negotiation of interests and power among stakeholders. Therefore, the case study design is pertinent for this study because the interest of a case study is "in process rather than outcomes, in context rather than a specific variable, in discovery rather than confirmation" (Merriam, 1998, p. 19).

The crucial consideration in a case study is the case, not the methods for the study. In this sense, Merriam (1998) highlights that "case study does not claim any particular methods for data collection or data analysis" (p. 28). Stake (1994) also suggests that "as a form of research, case study is defined by interest in individual cases, not by the methods of inquiry used" (p. 236). In short, the main idea is that case study research is not a methodological choice, but a choice of object to be studied. In order to conduct a case study, we don't have to limit ourselves to any particular methods. Accordingly, as far as the methodological choice is concerned, either the qualitative method or the quantitative method does not quite matter for the case study. It is

common that a case study can be based on any mix of quantitative and qualitative evidence (Yin, 2003). Particularly for this study, a qualitative case study design seems to be more relevant than the quantitative case study because this study is concerned with the evaluation process for generating the outcomes that were evaluated. Patton (2002) explains several reasons why qualitative research methods are pertinent for studying a "process." First, a process suggests fluid and dynamic phenomena. Describing a process enables researchers to discover key elements that contribute to program successes and failures. Second, individuals typically experience a process differently. An inductive, naturalistic approach allows researchers to reveal varied perspectives within the process. Third, depicting a process requires detailed description. Qualitative research methods are helpful to portray a process in as much detail as possible.

Case Selection

The selection of cases to study is a unique aspect of case study (Stake, 1994). For the case study to be employed, it was necessary not only to select the target case but also to select individuals who were members of stakeholder groups in the case. Therefore, sampling for this study occurred at two levels. This section provides a detailed description of case selection and participant selection for the study.

First, convenience sampling strategy was used for selecting the target case. It involves the selection of a sample based on time, money, location, and the availability of sites or respondents (Merriam, 1998). Amongst possible training programs for the case of this study, the researcher chose a training program that met the following three criteria: (a) the training program was underway, (b) evaluation for the program was conducted by either internal evaluators or external evaluators, and (c) the results of training program evaluation was reported to and communicated with the higher management group. Based on these criteria, the case is a training program of a

Korean life insurance company, entitled "Manager Leadership Development Course (MLDC)."

The MLDC has been offered as an in-house training program once every year since 2002. The

program evaluation was conducted in December, 2003 after finishing the training program. The

next MLDC is scheduled to be implemented on the second half of 2004.

The second level of sampling involves selecting participants. Once the target case was

selected, individual participants who represent various stakeholder groups needed to be chosen

for conducting in-depth interviews. Five stakeholder groups were identified around the MLDC:

HRD practitioner group, higher management group, learner group, instructor group, and

learner's colleague group. In order to identify and select important participants to conduct

interviews within the case, the researcher used the snowball sampling approach. Snowball

sampling is used to discover the members of a group of individuals not otherwise easily

identified by starting with someone in the know and asking for referrals to other knowledgeable

individuals (Krathwohl, 1998). Snowball sampling was an appropriate method for this study

because the researcher had only limited information about what the program evaluation targeted

and who was involved in the MLDC. By employing the snowball sampling method, the

researcher was able to find not only those who participate directly in evaluation meetings but

also those who did not show up to the meetings although they had substantive interests in the

MLDC. A total of eight participants were collected for this study. One HRD manager and two

HRD assistant managers participated in the interviews representing the HRD practitioner group.

They were the only people who conducted evaluation meetings. One senior manager of the HR

and personnel unit participated in the study as a representative of higher management. I assumed

that the senior manager represented corporate management because he is not only a member of

the board of directors but he also regularly communicated with other members and the CEO.

Furthermore, he is the top person to receive the final evaluation report. One learner was

interviewed for the study. The reason why only one learner participated from a total of 15

learners is that it was difficult for me to contact these learners after the program. This was a

problem because three months it had already passed since the end of the program when I

attempted to contact them, and also because the learners in the MLDC came from various units

of the host organization. Some learners whom I contacted worked at branch offices of the host

organization that were located far from Seoul. Moreover, the most common reason why they

refused to participate in the study was that they were too busy to participate in the interview. The

two instructors who facilitated the program and the co-worker of the learner were also

participants in the interviews.

<div align="center">Data Collection</div>

Methodologically, a case study can present evidence from multiple sources of data. The

current study used three forms of data collection methods (a) interviews with program

stakeholders and HRD practitioners, (b) observation of a meeting of the HRD practitioners, and

(c) analysis of related documents. However, the data gained through interviewing was the

primary source for the study. Data from interviews was triangulated with the data that had been

obtained through observation and with relevant documents. This section delineates how the data

were collected by the three methods.

Interviews

As "guided conversations rather than structured queries" (Yin, 2003, p. 89) or

"conversation with a purpose" (Dexter, 1970, cited in Merriam 1998, p. 71), interviewing is one

of the most popular methods in the qualitative research tradition. Interviewing has a wide variety

of forms. The most common type of interviewing is individual, face-to-face verbal interchange,

but it can also take the form of group interviewing, mailed or self-administered questionnaires, and telephone surveys (Fontana & Frey, 2000). Through interviewing, an interviewer is able to glean information that he or she cannot directly observe (Merriam, 1998). An interviewee's feelings, thoughts and opinions, and past events that are impossible to replicate can be discovered only through interviewing. Interviews can provide opportunities to investigate an interviewee's feelings, views or perceptions on the topic. Kvale (1996) points out that the purpose of qualitative research interviews is "to understand themes of the lived daily world from the subjects' own perspectives" (p. 27). Likewise, the interview method assumes that what interviewees present to interviewers has meaningful properties for exploring the research questions.

The face-to-face, open-ended interviews were a primary method for collecting data in this study. All interviews were conducted with stakeholders of the MLDC who were introduced in the previous section. All interviews were conducted in Korea between March and May of 2004. Most interview questions that were drawn from the research questions were asked in an open-ended form on the basis of the interview guide. The interview guide was originally developed in English (see Appendix C), but it was translated into Korean because the research setting was a Korean insurance company (see Appendix D). However, this original version of the interview guide was used for only HRD practitioners and a senior manager. The original interview guide included questions about the experiences of the evaluation meeting. However, when interviewing with the HRD practitioners, I realized that only three HRD practitioners (one HRD manager, two HRD assistant managers) had attended the meeting, and the evaluation results were reported to a senior manager of the HR and personnel unit. In terms of this situation, some interview questions were modified or additionally asked due to different aspects of stakeholders' involvement in

evaluation. I asked if those absent stakeholders such as instructors, learners, and learners' co-workers had communicated with the HRD practitioners, what issues they had raised, and how they had communicated their own concerns with them (see Appendix F). To help English readers, I have attached the English version of the modified interview guide as well (see Appendix E). Table 1 shows the positions and roles of the eight participants. Eight face-to-face interviews were conducted in various places depending upon participants' preference. All eight interviews began with reviewing the consent form. The consent form was initially developed in English (Appendix A) and translated into Korean for actual use (see Appendix B).

Table 1

Interview Participants

Name (Pseudonym)	Position	Role within the Program
Andy	External Consultant	Instructor (Action learning)
Barry	External Consultant	Instructor (Coaching)
Charlie	General Manager	Learner
Danny	HRD Assistant Manager	HRD Practitioner
Greg	HRD Manager	HRD Practitioner
Joey	HRD Assistant Manager	HRD Practitioner
Harry	Senior Manager	Management
Ted	Manager	Co-worker of Learner

Interviews with the HRD manager and the HRD assistant managers took place at a conference room in the company. The interview with the senior manager was conducted in his office. For the learner and his colleague, interviews took place at their office, which is located in the headquarters of the company. For one instructor, the interview took place at his office, whereas for the other instructor, who had facilitated the action learning component, the interview

was conducted at a guest lounge of a hotel where he were facilitating action learning for another company. All interviews were conducted in Korean, which is the first language of both the interviewer and the interviewees. Each interview lasted approximately one hour, and pseudonyms were given to all interview participants. All interviews were audio tape-recorded except for that with the senior manager, who refused to have his remarks tape recorded. Hence, I took notes while interviewing him. All interviews were transcribed in Korean.

Observations

Observations are also popular as a qualitative research method. The primary purpose of observational data is "to describe the setting that was observed, the activities that took place in that setting, the people who participated in those activities, and the meanings of what was observed from the perspectives of those observed" (Patton, 2002, p. 262). In fact, observations involve real-life or natural settings in which various social phenomena occur and people perform activities. Interview methods assume that information or knowledge for the research is constructed through the conversation process (Kvale, 1996), whereas observation methods are based on the premise that natural settings and situations "reveal data" and the researcher becomes an interpreter or a "knower" of such data (Mason, 2002).

For this study, a staff meeting of the three members was observed. Since the program evaluation for the MLDC 2003 had ended when I entered the setting, this meeting did not directly deal with the program. Rather, one of the key topics of the meeting was to discuss how to design and develop the MLDC 2004 based on the results of the evaluation that had been produced. The half-hour meeting was observed by I in order to achieve two purposes. First, I aimed to understand the patterns of interactions among the HRD practitioners. By observing the meeting, I was better able to understand how they interplayed with each other and to capture the

organizational context within which people interact (Patton, 2002; Yin, 2003). Second, I

observed the meeting to understand how evaluation outcomes could be used for the next program.

Since outcomes of an evaluation are often used to comprehend aspects of evaluated programs

and then to improve future programs by providing substantive information (Patton, 1997), I was

able to recognize the connection between the evaluation outcomes and the features of the next

program. During the observation, I took detailed field notes describing the physical settings,

what people said, and their behavior patterns as ways of nonverbal communication. Field notes

were also taken in Korean. However, when I analyzed the data, observation data was not used

because it did not supply substantive evidence for understanding the relationship among the

HRD practitioners while evaluating the MLDC; rather it helped me understand the overall aspect

of communication among the HRD practitioners.

Documents

Documents refer to "a wide range of written, visual, and physical material relevant to the

study at hand" (Merriam, 1998, p. 112). As a source of data, documents are of importance for

qualitative research because access to them can be easy and at a low cost, and because the

information provided may differ from and may not be available in spoken form (Hodder, 1998).

Meanwhile, the stability of data is also considered a merit of documents. Because of the stability

of documents, not only does the presence of investigators not alter what is being found

(Merriam, 1998), but also data can be reviewed repeatedly (Yin, 2003). Compared with other

forms of data in the qualitative research tradition, documents are an 'objective' source of data. In

this manner, the term 'unobtrusive' is used as a key descriptor of the characteristic of

documentary data (Merriam, 1998; Patton, 2002).

Various types of documents were collected for this study. First, the documents that provide a description of a variety of features of the training program were gleaned. I collected (a) a proposal of the program, which included program objectives, number of participants, session schedules, timetable for each week, estimated costs, and the introduction of related agencies; (b) five summarized reports of learners' reaction and feedback. These reports, which were created at the end of every week, addressed participants' reaction and feedback about activities and courses that they took in the week; (c) a report that encompassed the personal criticism of the program participants prepared by HRD practitioners; and (d) a copy of the final program evaluation report submitted to the senior manager. The final program evaluation report covered the general overview of the program and the following: (a) quantified learners' satisfaction with the program content and instructors; (b) some quotations of learners' reaction and feedback; (c) what had been done and what had not been done; (d) comments and opinions of HRD practitioners in terms of the results; (e) comparison of estimated costs and actual costs; and (f) participants' list.

Second, the documents that inform the organizational context also needed to be collected. The gathered documents encompassed (a) an advertising brochure describing CEO messages, the mission and vision of the company, the historical statistics, and brief summary of operation in 2002; (b) a newsletter issued by the HRD department; and (c) the web pages of the company. While examining these document sources, I was able to understand clearly the overall organizational climate and situation within which the MLDC took place. However, although most of these document data were examined and analyzed to generate findings, information from summarized report of learners' reaction and feedback and the final program evaluation report was quoted to represent the findings as evidence.

Data Analysis

Wolcott (1994) proposes two definitions of data analysis at two levels. In a broad sense, Wolcott maintains that data analysis is transforming data. As a data transformation process, data analysis refers to "virtually anything one does in the management and reporting of data" (p. 24). On the other hand, he also addresses three types of data transformations: description, analysis, and interpretation. As one of the categories of data transformation, he defines analysis more specifically as the "systematic procedures followed in order to identify essential features and relationships" (p. 24). Miles and Huberman (1994) suggest that the definition of data analysis contains three linked sub-processes: data reduction, data display, and conclusion drawing/verification. According to them, data reduction involves condensing the data in an "anticipatory way as the researcher chooses a conceptual framework, research questions, cases, and instruments" (p. 429). Data display is the process of organizing and compressing the data in order to establish a basis for thinking about its meanings. Finally, conclusion drawing and verification indicates the researcher's interpretation that involves drawing meaning from displayed data. Merriam (1998) articulates that data analysis is the "process of making sense out of the data" (p. 178). It is a complex process to construct meanings in the form of descriptive accounts, categories, or themes that cut across the data. The process can be enhanced by adopting techniques that have helped such as data displays (Merriam, 1998).

This study aims to explore how stakeholders' different interests and power are negotiated in determining the merit and worth of a recurring training program. In terms of this research purpose, the result of data analysis is a thorough description of the case and an understanding of the political nature of the evaluation process and outcomes involving a variety of constituencies. My analysis of the data was accomplished through constant comparative analysis of data as it

was collected from interviews, observation, and documents. It involves comparing and contrasting techniques of categories, concepts, and properties (Ryan & Bernard, 2000). Because the basic strategy of the constant comparative method is compatible with the inductive, concept-building orientation of all qualitative research, the constant comparative method of data analysis has been used by researchers who are not seeking to build substantive theory in spite of its origination from the grounded theory tradition (Merriam, 1998). For the data analysis of this study, I generally followed the procedure that Merriam (1998) suggests.

First of all, I prepared and organized data. This involves transcribing interviews, optically scanning material, typing up field notes, or sorting and arranging the data into different types depending upon the sources of information (Creswell, 2003). As soon as I completed each interview, I typed transcripts in Korea leaving a right margin for coding. While transcribing interviews, I noted ideas and thoughts that came up in my mind as an initial analysis into a different document file. Doing interview transcriptions provides an opportunity to get immersed in the data, an experience that usually generates emergent insights (Patton, 2002). Returning to America, I started to read through all the transcripts. First, I read Joey's transcript, which was the first interview I had conducted, and wrote down some notes about a general sense of information Joey had expressed on a separate sheet of paper as a memo. It helped me to avoid losing my general impression of the overall transcription. Then, I read Joey's transcript in detail to generate codes. It was an "open" coding process in that I engaged in exploration of the data without making any prior assumptions about what I might discover (Strauss & Corbin, 1998). I coded line by line, and labeled those codes with a term per code in the right margin. With these codes, I created some rough categories of Joey's transcript. It went through constant comparison *within* the transcript to sort codes and categorize them into meaningful categories. This was carried out

in terms of an axial coding process that facilitated building connections within categories - that is, between categories and sub-categories (Strauss & Corbin, 1998). When I generated categories of Joey's transcript tentatively, I kept in mind the research questions to construct conceptually congruent categories in terms of my study purpose. While categorizing each code, I also put some notes on a separate paper. These notes were also compared with the memos that I had made when transcribing and initially reading the transcript. By doing so, I was able to obtain an extensive, clear list of concepts emerging from Joey's data. Additionally, although the original transcript and memo were in Korean, every category constructed was labeled in English.

After completing the analysis of Joey's transcript, I turned to Greg's transcript. Greg's transcript went through the same process as Joey's. I read through the whole transcript while jotting down some notes, then read carefully to open code. Through constant comparison within the transcript, every code was categorized into some tentative categories of Greg's transcript. Of course, I wrote a memo addressing my ideas and thoughts during the coding process. However, from the analysis of the second transcript, I began to compare categories of Greg's transcript with those of Joey's transcript to see if categories of one transcript were also present in the other transcript and to find out similarities and differences *between* categories of each transcript. For example, while comparing Greg's categories with Joey's, categories regarding Joey's interest in "intending to see positive program results" and Greg's interest in "maximizing the effectiveness of learning" were grouped together as a new abstraction, "maximizing the program effectiveness." Furthermore, in the case of Joey's transcript, another interest in "enhancing his competence as an HRD professional" remained as a freestanding category because no similar categories were discovered in the other transcript. However, both newly emerged categories and freestanding categories were still open to comparison with other transcripts. In the meantime,

memos I created for each transcript were also compared with one another, and then merged into one master list of concepts derived from both sets of data. I repeated the same procedure for the rest of the transcripts. This process continued until I felt that the entire data were saturated. Throughout the course of categorizing, I kept in mind the research question because "categories should reflect the purpose of the research" (Merriam, 1998, p. 183). In so doing, I was able to generate substantive, meaningful themes.

Finally, I read the entire transcripts again to find out the actual statements that were connected with generated themes. In order to represent findings that I found, the most popular way is to use a narrative passage to convey the findings of the analysis (Creswell, 2003). I, therefore, returned to the original transcripts then read them on the computer checking hard copies of transcripts that contain codes and categories in the margins. Then, I produced a document file by cutting and pasting statements that belonged to the same categories on the computer. I used this document file to produce English narrative passages for displaying findings. Translation was a challenging issue for this study because although most of the data were collected in Korean, the findings are represented in English. Since I had plentiful materials ranging from interview transcripts and field notes to related documents, I translated selected statements and passages that would be used to represent findings instead of translating the entire data set. While translating each passage, I typed English translations just after the original Korean passages to ensure efficient translation. In order to prevent inconsistency between the data collected in Korean and the results displayed in English, peer examination, which asks "colleagues to comment on the findings as they emerge" (Merriam, 1998, p. 204), was used as a strategy. I asked a person who speaks both Korean and English to check if there was any critical meaning gap between both sets of the data. He examined the original passages and the translated

ones together, and he generally acknowledged that the content of translation was accurate. In order to secure lived, vivid translation, he and I discussed and negotiated some differences between the original expressions and the translated expressions, for the most part, focusing on the nuance of those expressions. He sometimes provided some alternate translated expressions that I could consider, and I finally chose one in reference to his suggestions.

<div align="center">Reliability and Validity</div>

Both quantitative and qualitative researches are concerned with enhancing trustworthiness of their results. Trustworthiness of research results is associated with the extent to which there has been some accounting for their validity and reliability (Merriam, 1998). In this section, I will describe some strategies that help to increase reliability, internal and external validity all of which contribute to ensure trustworthiness of the study.

By definition, reliability is the "extent to which research findings can be replicated" (Merriam, 1998, p. 205). Since the assumptions of qualitative research are different from that of traditional experimental research from which the original concept of reliability arose, it is imperative to think about it differently. In this sense, Lincoln and Guba (1985) suggest thinking about the "dependability" or "consistency" of the results obtained from the data. This means that instead of demanding that outsiders get the same results, a researcher wishes outsiders to concur that, given the data collected, the results make sense. Yet, the rising question then is whether the results are consistent with the data collected (Merriam, 1998). To enhance the reliability, I used a triangulation technique adopting multiple methods of data collection: interviews, observation, and documents. I also informed used investigator's position by explaining the assumption and theory behind the study, my position vis-à-vis the group being studied (Merriam, 1998).

There are two types of validity: internal validity and external validity. First internal validity pertains to the question of how research findings are congruent with reality (Merriam, 1998). In the qualitative research tradition, reality is holistic, multidimensional, and ever-changing, and it is a pervasive belief in the tradition that reality can only be assessed by interpretation about data that is presumed to represent reality. Therefore, when it comes to internal validity, it is necessary to consider human beings as the primary instrument of data collection and analysis (Merriam, 1998). Accordingly, I described my biases and assumptions in the following section to inform readers about my perspective and orientation to the research. Moreover, to guarantee internal validity, I also employed a methods triangulation strategy. Each method of data collection has unique merits to investigate some aspects of the reality, yet no single method can fully provide explanation about the phenomenon (Denzin, 1978). Thus, in order for me to avoid the possibility of rendering biased results that derived from using only the interview data, I triangulated them with the data from observation and documents analysis. By means of multiple methods, I was able to build on the strengths of each type of data while reducing the weaknesses of any single method.

External validity or generalizability of the findings is concerned with the extent to which the findings of one study can be applied to other situations (Merriam, 1998). As is the case of the concepts of reliability and internal validity, external validity is taken into different consideration because of the assumptions of qualitative research. In the qualitative research tradition, generalization of a study is accomplished by readers not by the researcher. Whereas researchers expect generalization by applying standard sampling procedure (e.g. random sampling) in quantitative research, researchers of qualitative research expect it by providing readers with thick, rich description. Detailed description of the study enables readers to compare the "fit" with

their situations (Merriam, 1998). In this sense, Maxwell (2002) argues that "validity refers primarily to accounts, not to data or methods" (p. 42). In order to ensure external validity, I provided rich, thick description of what really happened within an evaluation process for the training program. Based on comprehensive description, readers will be able to "determine how closely their situations match the research situation, and hence whether findings can be transferred" (Merriam, 1998, p. 211).

<div align="center">Researcher's Bias and Assumptions</div>

An ethically challenging issue, which is pervasive in most qualitative research, is the researcher's biases and assumptions stemming from his/her subjectivity in the sense that the fundamental assumption of qualitative research is that reality is constructed and interpreted by the researcher. Peshkin (1988) stresses that while research is actively in progress, researchers should systematically seek out their subjectivity. This section serves to address the roots of my assumptions on the topic, as the researcher, to help readers understand the manner in which the study was interpreted.

First of all, I, the researcher, initially learned the concepts of HRD in the late of 1990's when the structure of the Korean national economy was in crisis. It was a rampant phenomenon that the development of human resources as a solution was emphasized throughout Korean society. However, the mainstream of HRD in both academic and practical fields was attuned to unleashing human expertise and, consequently, to maximizing the human performance level on the job. Training and learning in the workplace were carried out to cultivate human potential for the purpose of increasing productivity at the organizational level. Having majored in education in college, I believed that educational practice should strive to help individuals' growth and development for their own sake. However, that was not the case of the mainstream of HRD in

Korea. Although it seemed to be imperative for each business organization to cultivate its productivity by unleashing people's potential, education and learning in the workplace should not ignore the respect for people.

In terms of epistemology, I believe there are multiple realities that are perceived differently by every individual. The meaning of an object is often confined in terms of an individual's context. Moreover, I consider myself as a constructionist holding the viewpoint that what we call knowledge is generated through the collective, interpretive process of meaning making in which people who have different perspectives are involved together. Several experiences have affected the evolution of my viewpoint. Experiences as a research fellow in an institute for continuing education allowed me to consider program evaluation as a social process. Every semester, there were staff meetings in which all staff members took part. During the meeting, we discussed issues regarding not only institute administration (e.g. budget, instructional facility management, advertisement) but also program management (e.g. planning, design, implementation, evaluation). I participated in the meeting regularly and carried out evaluation for several continuing professional training programs as well as planning them. Working with other researchers and staff members, I vividly realized that there were often multiple perspectives even on the same agenda, and that these differing perspectives resulted from differences of age, gender, expertise, and role status. It was necessary for us to spend considerable time on negotiating and reconciling different thoughts and ideas, and then generating official outcomes.

I had another experience as a part-time instructor in a community college. In the college, there were various students ranging from adults who already had their own jobs to young students who were studying to get jobs after graduation. I was aware that each student had a

different motivation for participation and different motivation levels. The difference in motivation was closely related to the students' learning attitudes, and consequently, to their learning effectiveness. Therefore, although I delivered the same content to all students, the extent to which they understood was varied. At that time, I learned the relativity of learning experiences, which means that every student learns different content in terms of his or her situation even if they are in the same class together. My "constructionist" world view stemming from these life experiences governs every step of this inquiry through framing the problems, collecting data, analyzing data, and discussing findings.

<p style="text-align:center">Summary</p>

In this chapter, I described the qualitative case study design that was used for this study. In order to collect data, I conducted interviews and observations, and analyzed related documents. These data were analyzed by the constant comparative analysis method. In addition, since most data were collected and analyzed in Korean, it was necessary for me to translate them into English without losing meanings. This chapter also addresses some strategies that were used in this study to ensure issues of reliability and validity. This chapter closed by delineating the researcher's bias and the assumptions that govern this study.

CHAPTER FOUR

FINDINGS

The purpose of this study was to understand how power and interests are negotiated by stakeholders in determining the merit and worth of a recurring training program. For this study, the following three research questions were examined:

1. What are the interests of the stakeholders affected by the training program?

2. How do power relations among the stakeholders affect the evaluation process?

3. How do power relations among the stakeholders affect the evaluation outcomes?

Before presenting the findings, I provide a description of the case to help readers understand the case context. Then, in the following sections, the findings derived from data analysis for each question are addressed.

Description of the Case

In this section, the Managerial Leadership Development Course (MLDC), the case for this study is described in detail focusing on its historical and organizational context, instructional format, content, audience, and the evaluations conducted.

General Background

The host organization of this program is a Korean life insurance company, one of the largest insurance companies in South Korea. It provides its customers with financial protection and wealth accumulation solutions. Facing the ever-changing market environments and the pressure of global competition, the organization has a vision to reshape its business by 2010 to emerge as one of the largest integrated financial companies that operate in Asia. In terms of this vision, the company initiated a three-year project to reform and to restructure its management system in 2002. The MLDC was initially planned in 2002 as a part of this project to contribute to

what the project targeted in terms of training interventions. Along with restructuring its system, the company had realized that it was critical to increase the capacity of general managers, especially for leading their business units and managing projects. When the organization planned this three-year project, HRD professionals in the company had diagnosed that one of the critical problems in transforming the host organization into a global company had been people, particularly those who had held manager positions. Since they have substantial power to shape work processes and guide recurring work patterns of their units, it is imperative to change their mindset and attitudes for obtaining the intended organizational reform. However, it was evident that the managers had had only limited scope of perspectives on their work, and in turn, they had not been informed about global work standards, management trends, and newly emerging issues. Hence, the main audience of the MLDC was considered those who held positions of general managers, or managers who were going to be promoted to general manager positions in the near future. As the three-year project began in 2002, the MLDC was also launched in 2002 as a strategic solution for the development of key leaders for the future within the organization.

The general purpose of the MLDC is twofold: (a) Learners obtain key management knowledge and human relation skills, and acquire problem-solving skills through action learning; (b) Learners develop leadership skills required as either individual or team leaders while conducting team projects on the basis of "learning and reflection." In this regard, the MLDC ultimately strives to attain three program objectives: developing individual leadership skills, developing managing skills for project teams, and providing solutions to actual organizational problems. The action learning method is the primary instructional format of the MLDC to accomplish the objectives. In HRD, action learning is an emerging instructional format for helping various types of organizations through such ways as solving problems, building effective

teams, developing leaders, and transforming organizations into learning organizations (Marquardt, 2004).

The MLDC 2003

The plan of MLDC 2003, the case training program for this study, was proposed in September 2003, and the program was implemented for a five-week duration in early November through mid December in 2003. For the MLDC 2003, the participants in the program were selected among managers of the entire organization by the recommendation of their senior managers. Initially, once the program was ready to be operated, the HRD department asked other business units to recommend a person who seemed to be appropriate for the program in their units. Then, the participants selected received an official five-week leave to take the MLDC. Interestingly, during interviews with the researcher, HRD practitioners and a co-worker of a learner together pointed out that each selected participant was regarded by his co-workers as a key person who showed high performance on the job, and was likely to be promoted to a higher position. In other words, the participants were perceived as members of the potential core leader group of the company. A total of 15 male learners participated in the MLDC 2003. All came from different business units.

To optimize the impact of action learning, the MLDC was originally designed in 2002 to include in-class training sessions before the action learning session. Without any structural adjustment, the MLDC 2003 was conducted with the same frame. In the first week, learners acquired knowledge about coaching skills, shared values, self-leadership and project management skills through the lectures. While taking lectures, participants also took part in role-playing based on customized scenarios, and shared their reflections in terms of the lecture content. By doing so, they were expected to not only gain pertinent knowledge and skills that

would be used to work on projects but they also had an opportunity to critically reflect on desirable behaviors and attitudes in communicating with other team members at action learning.

The in-class training session was followed by a four-week action learning session. For doing group projects, all 15 learners were divided into four teams (three four-learner teams, one three-learner team), and each team was assigned to one project that was brought by one of the team members. The projects were real, significant and urgent problems on the job. In weeks 2 and 3, learners themselves did various activities as a group such as interviews, surveys, case studies, and reading related books and articles dealing with the assigned project. Furthermore, since colleagues of the learners on the job were a sponsor group who provided data, information, and any type of help that might be requested by the learners for the project, the learners communicated with their colleagues. While working as a team, the learners were encouraged to apply skills, knowledge, and behaviors obtained in week 1 from instructors and HRD practitioners who served as facilitators. Adjourning after every small session, participants spent time reflecting on what they had done and giving feedback to one another. At the end of the whole five-week program, each team was supposed to present a solution for the project as a final product.

The one-week overseas field trip to America was scheduled in week 4. The purpose of the field trip was to benchmark American insurance companies. All learners and the three HRD practitioners (one manager, two assistant managers) visited Limousine International, which is located in Windsor, Connecticut and the headquarters of Merit Company and Perfect Company in New York. Limousine International is an organization that provides its member companies involved in marketing annuity, disability, health, life, mutual fund, and retirement savings products with research, consulting, and training services. The Korean company is a member

company of Limousine International. Arriving in America, the learners took the leadership

training program of Limousine International. Then they visited the headquarters of Merit

Company and Perfect Company to benchmark their practices, and glean information that would

be used for conducting projects. In addition to the explicit purposes, an HRD assistant manager

noted that the field trip was also implicitly intended to help learners enhance their global outlook

by experiencing foreign culture and systems.

In week 5, the final week, the learners came back to Korea and prepared the final project

report for presentation. Every team summed up all gathered data, discussed some contending

issues, organized the findings, and wrote the project report. After all projects were presented, the

MLDC 2003 ended with a reflection on the whole program.

Several types of evaluation of the MLDC were conducted. First, learners' reactions were

gathered and assessed. Learners provided not only weekly reactions about activities and sub-

courses during the program but also general comments on the whole program after the program.

Second, learners were also asked to give feedback and share it with each other regarding their

group work. "What was done well," "what needed to be improved," and "what should be done"

were typical elements of feedback. Feedback was provided at three different levels: individual,

team, and project content. Learners' behaviors and performance during the program were also

assessed by HRD practitioners as a form of "personal criticism." Based on the observations

about the learners while facilitating their learning activities, HRD practitioners briefly described

the characteristics of each learner in three or four sentences focusing on how they worked, what

their merits were, and what their shortcomings were. Yet, it should be noted that the learners

never received the content of personal criticism.

Evaluation at the program level was conducted by HRD practitioners. A great deal of information based on the reaction of the learners, brief comments of the instructors, and HRD practitioners' reflection on their program operation was gathered for evaluating the entire program. The three HRD practitioners had evaluation meetings and assessed the quality and worth of the program. Then, they prepared a draft of an evaluation report that was supposed to be reviewed by a senior manager in charge of the HR unit of the company. HRD practitioners and the senior manager had a meeting to discuss some issues and finalize the report. After the senior manager's review, the HRD practitioners developed the final evaluation report of the MLDC, and then officially reported it to the senior manager.

Among many constituencies of this case program, eight stakeholders representing five stakeholder groups were chosen and participated in the study. First, three HRD practitioners, Greg, Joey, and Danny were interviewed. Greg was an HRD manager who was in charge of planning, designing, implementing and evaluating the MLDC, and Joey and Danny worked together as HRD assistant managers. Second, as a representative of the corporate management, Harry who held a senior management position in the HR and personnel unit participated in this study. Third, two instructors, Andy who facilitated the whole action learning session and Barry who facilitated development of coaching skills, were also interviewed. Fourth, Charlie who was a general manager of the Strategic Planning Division was interviewed as a representative of the 15 learners of the MLDC 2003. Finally, Ted, a co-worker who had worked together with Charlie, participated in this study. In the following three sections, I present the findings about the stakeholders' interests, the impacts of the organizational power relations on the evaluation process and on its outcomes respectively.

Interests of Stakeholders

This section presents the answer to the first research question, "What are the interests of stakeholders affected by the training program?" Table 2 shows a summary of expressed interests of each stakeholder group. In this study, interests are defined as a "complex set of dispositions, goals, values, desires, and expectations that lead people to act in certain ways" (Cervero & Wilson, 1994, p. 122). More specifically, Cervero and Wilson (1994) suggest that stakeholders have three types of interests. Expressed interests mean "revealed preferences" (p. 124) that are actually held and recognized by stakeholders. Ideal interests, on the other hand, involve a "person's ethical beliefs about "what forms of social life are just and morally legitimate" (p. 124) whether he or she recognizes them or not. This type of interest can be seen as the interest to which people should ascribe their practice. Real interests refer to the "norms, values, and purposes implicit in what people do" (p. 125). Real interests are different from ideal interests in the sense that they govern the actual exercise of power in practice. This section focuses on delineating expressed interests in the program that were revealed through the interviews.

HRD Practitioners: Demonstrating the Impact of HRD Interventions on Job Performance

The first stakeholder group was the HRD practitioner group. This group was in charge of the operation of the program encompassing planning, design, implementation and evaluation. Three participants, Greg, Danny, and Joey, expressed five interests related to the training program. These interests were characterized as "demonstrating the impact of HRD interventions on the job performance."

Table 2

Stakeholders' Expressed Interests in the Training Program

HRD Practitioners: Demonstrating the impact of HRD interventions on job performance

1. Linking program to organizational needs

2. Enhancing their own competence

3. Attaining the intended learning objectives

4. Maximizing program effectiveness

5. Changing organizational culture

Management: Receiving positive feedback

1. Receiving positive reactions from learners

2. Receiving feedback about the impact of learning on the job

3. Developing HRD practitioner's competence

Learners: Improving one's capacity to work effectively

1. Having opportunity for individual development

2. Obtaining pertinent skills, knowledge, attitude for the job

Instructors: Sustaining a relationship with the company

1. Maximizing the effectiveness of learning

2. Receiving positive reactions from learners

3. Meeting organizational needs

Co-workers of Learners: Accruing dual benefits of training

1. Having positive impact of learner's changed performance on one's work

2. Having personal learning experiences on the job

Linking program to organizational needs. First of all, as organizational members, HRD practitioners ultimately had the job of connecting HRD interventions with the organizational strategic needs. These participants commonly asked themselves, "What should be the ultimate goal of HRD functions in terms of organizational environment?" In this sense, Danny stated,

> It was time for our company to change. Our company stood at the crossroads as to whether we could become a global organization or not, and because of this, since 2000, the change management project has been stressed within the whole company. In accordance with environment of the organization, we asked, "Why on earth hasn't our company changed properly?" and in this sense, "What position does HRD really take part in it?"

Under the imperative of survival in a competitive, ever-changing global market, HRD functions should demonstrate the substantial linkage of training and development on strategic organizational needs; otherwise, the role of HRD within the company could turn out to be meaningless, or as Joey said, "It was just regarded as an expense not an investment." Understanding and acting in accordance with organizational strategic needs was uncovered as one of critical interests of the HRD practitioner group. For the most part, this interest was derived from the position and role status within the company. As training professionals, they were responsible for developing training programs that could be useful for the organizational needs.

This interest resulted in the launch of the MLDC focusing on developing managerial leadership. This was evident in the following statement by Danny:

> We concluded that one of biggest problems [for organizational transformation] was closely related to the leaders. Truly, the leaders within our company had never had any

relevant leadership training, and they had not even recognized properly the necessity of

such leadership skills and knowledge.

It was required that the HRD department offer educational programs to help the organization's

transformation into a global organization by improving its managers' leadership skills,

knowledge, and confidence. Danny's statements indicated that the MLDC was developed for the

sake of meeting the organizational needs.

Enhancing one's own competence. Joey, an HRD assistant manager, explicitly stated an

interest in enhancing his own competence as an HRD professional. Since the primary

instructional format of the MLDC was action learning, which was relatively new to the HRD

members of the company, they obviously needed to learn the action learning method and then

improve their capacity to handle action learning properly. Moreover, they also intended to

implement action learning for themselves in the future without any help from external

professionals. Joey remarked,

Furthermore, we had kind of an ambition to be able to conduct and facilitate action

learning without inviting any external action learning expert. So, we were encouraging

ourselves, "Let's learn what action learning is, how action learning is implemented." At

that time, we needed to invite an action learning expert. However, we expected, "for

2004, why don't we implement action learning for ourselves as facilitators of action

learning?"

For the MLDC to be carried out successfully, these HRD practitioners were dependent upon an

outside action learning professional, Andy, due to their lack of competence in the action learning

instructional format. However, it was necessary for the HRD practitioners to increase their

competence in terms of action learning because they intended to develop a customized action

learning program, and to implement it for themselves later. Greg, an HRD manager, confirmed

that they were developing an action learning program that fitted into their company's context. He

said, "Based on facilitating experiences in this program, we will develop a customized action

learning program for the company."

The interest was also associated with the development of their career within the

organization. Career interest is related to the aspirations and visions organizational members

bring to the workplace regarding what their future may hold (Morgan, 1998). Joey said, "The

more skills and knowledge I acquire as an HRD professional while working, the deeper my

career in my organization will be guaranteed." Joey's comment indicated that HRD practitioners'

interest in improving their own competence was connected to their career-related interests.

Attaining the intended learning objectives. The HRD practitioners also placed priority on

attaining the intended learning objectives while operating the program. As educational

professionals in the organization, all the HRD practitioners stressed that training as one of HRD

interventions should result in intended outcomes. For example, Greg explained how he strongly

believed that HRD functions should contribute directly to the improvement of performance:

> I believe learning should take place in terms of learning objectives that we established in
>
> advance. In so doing, I think we [HRD professionals] can ensure the connection between
>
> training and performance. I mean, improved performance can be determined by learners'
>
> changed behavior which is supposed to derive from the training program.

From the HRD practitioners' perspective, the successful implementation of any training program

should be determined by the extent to which intended, expected learning objectives are

accomplished. This was very important for them because, if desirable learning outcomes could

neither be expected nor achieved by deliberate interventions of HRD, HRD interventions were

likely to be perceived as helpless. In accordance with the behavioral learning theory, Greg put it,

"Education should produce outcomes in terms of intended learning objectives or goals; otherwise

it can no longer be education." Identifying themselves as educational experts within the

organization, the HRD practitioners all agreed that they should demonstrate their capability to

control the linkage between performance improvement and training interventions. In this vein,

desirable learning and training outcomes should be not only connected with performance change

but also should result from their deliberate efforts.

   Maximizing learning effectiveness. The HRD practitioner group was attentive to

maximizing the learning effectiveness. As educational professionals in the organization, they

believed that they should not only develop good training programs but also facilitate effective

program implementation. Particularly, their need to assure learning effectiveness became critical

in accordance with the program situation whereby the instructors were all outside people. Since

the instructors came from outside the organization, they were not knowledgeable about the

organizational needs and context. They were just invited to the program because of their

specialized skills and knowledge in certain areas. Such limitations on the part of the instructors

required the HRD practitioners to accommodate the program content to the organizational

context. Greg stated,

> When a session finished, I organized and summarized what the instructors taught because,
>
> instructors are mostly content experts rather than delivery experts. I mean, they were
>
> invited not because they had good teaching skills but because they had quite relevant
>
> knowledge or information.

Similarly, Danny also maintained that while seeking the optimal impact of learning on the job,

they reviewed the content of each session with learners:

Since the instructors provide a variety of information on the subject, there could be
another problem: "how that information is connected." I mean, learners needed to know
"So what?" So we reviewed what instructors taught after each session. By doing so, we
can obviously expect more effective, powerful learning of learners.

In order to enhance the effectiveness of learning, it is imperative for the HRD practitioners to
review the content of sessions. That is to say, their activities involved meaning making activities
for training content. Reflecting why the content was so critical in terms of their organization and
how the content might be used for conducting action learning projects allowed learners to
consider their learning experiences as meaningful, and it also enabled the HRD practitioners to
expect maximized learning effectiveness.

Changing organizational culture. The HRD practitioners perceived that the mainstream
culture of their organization was not too supportive of learning. Throughout the interviews, all
three HRD practitioners expressed that the corporate management group largely ignored the
nature of training and learning interventions, which often take a relatively long time to be
transformed into performance. In the meantime, the management group usually wanted to see a
visible meaningful short-term change that resulted from the training. The HRD practitioners
stressed that such unrealistic expectations of the corporate management group made themselves
to be embarrassed. Greg stated,

As you know, results of training, particularly of the subject of leadership, can not be
identified explicitly in a short period. However, they (corporate management) always
assumed that learning occurred when training was finished. They simply treated learners
as though they had learned, and they expected immediate visible change from learners.

While recognizing that this kind of organizational expectation was related to misunderstanding of the characteristic of learning, Greg was very cynical and stated "It was almost disastrous!"

However, when the HRD practitioners planned this program, whose main audience was managers of the company, they hoped that by attending the program the participants could understand learning correctly and have a positive attitude toward it. Danny described what he had hoped in implementing the MLDC.

> If individuals who realized the importance and effectiveness of training after taking the course are promoted to critical positions or even become the CEO within the company, then the CEO might be interested in and understand the HRD function. So we planned, designed, and implemented this course hoping that if these kinds of people become popular and dominate in the top management, then, the organizational culture of our company will be more learning supportive one.

The HRD practitioners addressed that although the impact on current organizational culture was not a direct aim, they sought to realize some degree of its impact in the long run. According to Danny, as the number of higher managers who went though positive experiences attending this kind of training programs increases, the company is more likely to transform the culture into learning-oriented.

Management: Receiving Positive Feedback

The second stakeholder group was the management group. Because of their position in the organization hierarchy, this group had authority to privilege organizational needs and to ask the HRD department to develop pertinent training programs. As a representative of the corporate management group, Harry, who was a senior manager of the HR and personnel unit, was interviewed. Although he did not participate in the actual program planning, implementation, and

evaluation, he was a key decision maker about the entire direction of the MLDC. It was to Harry, therefore, that Greg, an HRD manager, reported the results of the program. He was placed on the highest position in this case in that he was the top person to receive the final evaluation report.

Receiving positive reactions from learners. Harry expressed an interest in obtaining positive reactions from the participants. He clearly described what he ultimately sought in the program. For him, a paramount issue that he wanted to see, particularly, in the program evaluation report was how learners felt about the overall program. He considered the nature of the learners' reactions as a fundamental criterion for determining the impact of this program. Therefore, if possible, he preferred to see learners' positive feedback in order to determine the program as successful. As Harry said, "I believe the positive feedback from the program participants usually implies successful implementation of training programs." In this vein, it was a common perception of the three HRD practitioners that Harry's primary concern was learners' feedback. For example, Joey recalled how Harry had commented on the overseas field trip session at an informal gathering:

> So, Harry had remarked "no matter what experiences they might have during travel, it was really meaningful [for learners] to travel to other countries and experience other cultures directly wasn't it?" He told us that he was glad to see they enjoyed the overseas field trip and they thought it was great.

Apparently, Joey's statements pointed out that Harry's concern was not whether learners had gained substantial knowledge and skills as prescribed in terms of the purpose of the overseas field trip. Instead, he was very concerned about what learners' felt about the activity.

Harry's concern about desirable outcomes clearly contrasted with the HRD practitioners' concerns. As noted earlier, the HRD practitioners claimed that the primary outcomes of training

and learning should be related to intended goals and objectives. Greg identified different ideas about the nature of outcomes between Harry and himself. He stated:

> [Harry argued that] leaders needed to know about American culture because most of their subordinates had experienced or were familiar with American culture. So, for him, learners' experiencing American culture itself was a very meaningful outcome of this program. (…) However, [from my standpoint,] the overseas field trip should have been implemented for a purpose. Although it was just a one-week field trip, the learning outcomes should be purposefully attained.

Harry just considered experiencing foreign culture as meaningful although it might not show any solid evidence of correlation with performance improvement. Greg, however, firmly opposed his standpoint because experiencing foreign culture itself was not the aim of the program. This conflict situation will be articulated in the following section.

Receiving feedback about the impact of learning on the job. During the interview, Harry remarked explicitly that he also was interested in seeing learners' positive, meaningful impact on the job as well as their feelings about the program experiences. He was willing to listen to the positive comments of the learners' co-workers about learners' changed performance after attending the program. Harry explained,

> I am highly interested in listening to personal criticism of the learners' co-workers because, for the most part, the impact of training and education, especially of leadership skills, can hardly be identified explicitly in a short term. I mean, we [HRD professionals] can hardly see the gradual change of learners' behaviors and attitudes on the job. (…) I usually hear about learners in several informal ways, especially about their work attitudes and behaviors when they returned to the job.

In addition to seeing learners' reactions to each component of the MLDC, Harry intended to see their co-workers' thoughts about the impact of learning outcomes on the job. Although he did not attempt to obtain these thoughts or opinions officially, as he said, he always "opened my ears to capture various comments about the HR functions in the company."

Both the interests he expressed, receiving the positive reactions from learners and receiving positive feedback about the impact of learning on the job from learners' co-workers, seemed to resonate with his role status in the company. Since Harry was in charge of the entire function of HR and personnel unit including the HRD function, it was not surprising that he was eager to glean evidence of the success of the MLDC by which the success of an HRD intervention was represented.

Developing HRD practitioner's competence. As the leader of the HR unit, Harry had the goal of improving his organizational members' performance level, so called competence. He remarked that he wanted HRD practitioners to have opportunities for enhancing their competence while actual designing, implementing, and evaluating the program. Quoting a well-known phrase of John Dewey, "learning by doing," he expected HRD practitioners to be able to become skilled, knowledgeable about the program, and to expand the scope of their perspectives on HRD functions. In other words, the more expertise the HRD practitioners gained by operating the program, the higher the probability of successful implementation of other HRD interventions he could expect. There was no doubt that the increasing number of high performers in Harry's own unit indicated his outstanding leadership for his organizational members. In addition, it should be noted that this interest was consistent with an HRD practitioners' interest in enhancing their own competence.

Learners: Improving One's Capacity to Work Effectively

As a representative of the learner group, one general manager of the Strategic Planning Division, Charlie, addressed his interests through an open-ended interview. He was a manager when he attended the MLDC, and he was promoted to a general manager after the training program. He noted two interests in the program as follows.

Having opportunity for individual development. First of all, Charlie stated that having the opportunity for individual development was his primary interest. He perceived that the MLDC was not aimed at his job, or task related needs. He viewed the content and activities of the program as appropriate for cultivating himself, but not necessarily related to his job. He stated,

> I expected it would be a great opportunity to develop myself, and hence I was sort of positive about the program. Well, you know, as a businessman, it is really difficult to spend the whole five-week period on developing myself and my leadership skills, which are not closely related to current my work and job expertise, isn't it? Moreover, another good thing was that it was provided by our company. I thought it would be such a nice opportunity for me to change and develop myself for the future.

In reality, since it was difficult for him to spend time on training that was not necessarily associated with his job, attending the MLDC seemed to be helpful to meet his interest in individual development. He expected that although the content was not associated with his current job directly, it might be useful for his future work. For Charlie, moreover, participating in the program signaled a positive meaning not only because it was a good chance to develop himself but also because this opportunity was offered by the company. The latter seemed to be important in a symbolic way because it meant he obtained organizational support. Reflecting on precedents of his company, he regarded this type of organizational support as "relatively rare."

Obtaining pertinent skills, knowledge, attitude for the job. Charlie was also very concerned about obtaining relevant skills, knowledge, and attitude for his performance improvement on the job. This interest was connected to the purposes of action learning, which was a key instructional format of the MLDC. The purpose of the action learning method was not only focused on learning how to exert leadership while carrying out the project as a team, but also on learning how to solve the problem as a team, allowing learners to reflect critically on their own activities. Thus, by participating in action learning, Charlie was able to learn how to approach organizational problems, how to communicate with other team members, and how to obtain proper resources for the project. He stated,

> Participating in the program, I felt like it would be helpful in knowing how and what leadership I could exert in a specific job situation. [Also], I could learn how to approach problems, and how to obtain relevant resources while conducting the project. In short, how to work smartly with peers would be key to the program that I was expected to experience and learn, I think.

It is important to note that Charlie did not know clearly what action learning was and how it might be implemented before attending the program. He recounted that initially he just expected that the MLDC seemed to be an "American style of the training program," which he had never taken before. While attending the action learning component, and recognizing the characteristics of action learning, he became aware that he could obtain skills, knowledge, and a new attitude as learning outcomes.

Instructors: Sustaining a Relationship with the Company

Three interests of the instructor group were revealed through interviews with two instructors, Andy and Barry. Andy was an instructor who facilitated the whole action learning

session of this program, whereas Barry was one of instructors who taught in-class training sessions. In particular, he facilitated the course, "Developing Coaching Skills." Both instructors participated in the MLDC 2002 for the same title session, and received positive reactions from the learners. Instead of joining in the program under the organizational mandate, both of them, who came from outside the organization, participated in the program by request.

Maximizing the effectiveness of learning. A major interest Andy and Barry expressed was improving the benefits resulting from effective learning. They believed that effective learning could be achieved by effective instructors. Andy, for example, described what should be regarded as an ideal role of an instructor:

> I looked upon instructors as playing the role of breaking some fixed idea of the learners. Of course, it is critical to deliver any content, but to maximize the outcomes of action learning, instructors should provide learners with opportunities to move beyond assumptions embedded in learners' mind either by asking questions or by allowing critical reflection time. The instructor of action learning should be a coach or facilitator for [learners'] critical thinking.

Andy recognized that an instructor should help learners to overcome what they took for granted. By the same token, Barry described how he facilitated the coaching course:

> Learners understood the process of coaching at first, and then applied what they learned to some cases. I adopted the role playing method for studying cases. They played, and then reflected on roles they had played in the cases. I encouraged them to role play more feelingly to be assimilated to the assigned role. However, in principle, you know it is very common that role playing itself is not so familiar to the learners, so some felt awkward and did it in a passive manner. I attempted to prevent this kind of situation.

Both Andy's and Barry's statements stressed their efforts to facilitate an effective learning

process and to create desirable learning outcomes. Their statements evidenced that they did not

neglect their roles and responsibilities as instructors and, consequently, maximized learning

effectiveness can be expected as a result of such efforts.

Receiving positive reactions from learners. Apparently, instructors emphasized that they

had been eager to earn positive reactions about their facilitation in each session from the

participants. Barry said that learners' satisfaction was the "most important criterion." Reflecting

on his involvement in the MLDC 2002, Barry fully ascribed the inclusion of the coaching session

in the MLDC 2003 to learners' satisfaction with the course content and his facilitation skills in

2002. He stated:

> By the way, since the overall feedback from the participants was positive, it [the coaching
>
> course] was able to be maintained; otherwise this course could not have remained in the
>
> MLDC program, and I might have been replaced with another instructor or even the
>
> course itself might have been eliminated.

In terms of a given structural relationship between external instructors and the host

organization, Barry's inference resonates with his concern about sustaining the connection with

the host organization. In the field of training and development in Korea, the relationship between

external instructors and the company is characterized as a provider-client relationship. Since

there were numerous training provider firms that were very competitive in the training market, it

was critical for Barry, a training provider specializing in coaching, to maintain a good

relationship with companies.

Meeting organizational needs. Like the HRD practitioner group, the instructors made

clear their interest in meeting the organizational needs. They claimed that they were expected to

organize the content of training sessions in terms of what the host organization needed to fulfill by the MLDC program. In addition to the needs assessment by the HRD practitioners, both Andy and Barry assessed organizational needs individually. For example, Andy mentioned his understanding of organizational needs:

> I realized there were three needs. One was at the individual level, another was at the team level, and the other was at the organization-wide level. For the individual level, developing individual leadership skills mattered. For team level, they would like to learn how to communicate and collaborate with the team members to enhance the effectiveness of the team-level project, and finally, from the organization-wide perspective, creating solutions for actual organization-wide problems through action learning was identified. Based on these three needs, I designed and facilitated the action learning project.

> In a similar vein, Barry also explained his reasoning for the causes of organizational

needs in training coaching skills:

> As the company has changed, I think that kind of need [the need for training coaching skills] has emerged. Due to the ever-changing organizational environment and the restructuring of the company, there has emerged a kind of consensus throughout the company that the traditional organizational system is no longer relevant. So they [HRD practitioners of the host organization] acknowledge that new leadership styles are required to deal with the challenges responsibly.

As a result of their needs assessment, they realized what content, format, and materials should be prepared. This needs assessment was important symbolically because information resulting from the needs assessment contributed to justifying the training sessions as relevant to organizational needs.

Co-Worker: Accruing Dual Benefits of Training

Ted was invited to this case study as a colleague of Charlie, who was a learner in this program. Presumably, Ted would be affected by Charlie's changed behavior. Throughout the whole interview, he repeatedly showed his lack of information and opinions about the program, and also constantly considered himself as one of the least relevant people to be included in the evaluation. Although he still had some substantial interests in Charlie's changed behavior and attitude on the job resulting from the program, his interests were largely omitted by the HRD practitioners.

Having positive impact of learner's changed performance on one's work. Ted seemed to like seeing Charlie's improved performance because of the potential impact of Charlie's performance on Ted's work. His interest in Charlie's performance on the job was related to his concern about its impact on Ted's job. Since Ted and Charlie had worked in the same department for a long time, Ted's and Charlie's jobs were intertwined. In this sense, Ted believed that Charlie's improved performance on the job would positively influence his job. He noted that "it was really good for me to work with a smart person."

This type of interest that is tied to his practical needs on the job is differentiated from interests of other stakeholder groups. His comments about what he had actually expected showed this point:

Actually, I did not expect any big change in either his performance or attitude on the job, I didn't… But, you know, I might say, of course, it would be important what they [learners] learned, what they felt, but, this kind of issue might be of more interest to learners or training professionals. For me, however, I was more interested in, if any, how he worked here than what he learned there.

Instead of putting emphasis on training itself, Ted placed his priority on the aspect of training transfer. In fact, Charlie's good experience, satisfaction and the extent to which the intended objectives were accomplished did not matter to him. Rather, Ted was more concerned about how Charlie changed his behavior and attitude, how Charlie applied what he learned on the job, and then how Charlie's changed performance affected his co-worker's jobs.

Having personal learning experiences on the job. Ted also addressed a benefit stemming from having an opportunity to deal with Charlie's job. As he put it:

> For me, his leave can be a wonderful chance to deal with his work officially. Of course, it is some sort of pressure to work on behalf of Charlie. It is a short period though. At any rate, I can experience and understand his job, which would be my job in the future, in advance.

It was very interesting for me to listen to Ted's words because I assumed that Ted would be unhappy at having to deal with Charlie's tasks, which would mean additional work without any additional reward. However, although Ted agreed, he explicitly stressed that Charlie's leave had a special advantage because he could learn Charlie's job, which he would take over some time later. Ted's interest in having such a learning experience seemed to reflect his career interest in the sense that it involved his outlook for his future in the company. These two interests, having positive impact of learner's changed performance and having personal learning experiences, were converged into accruing dual benefits of Charlie's training. Charlie's training participation could benefit Ted in two ways: first, Ted's work performance to which Charlie's improved performance was interrelated, and second, he also sought to learn potential tasks that would be necessary to develop his career within the company.

Power Relations and the Evaluation Process

This section addresses the second research question of the study: "How do power relations among stakeholders affect the evaluation process?" The analysis of the evaluation process for the case program revealed that the evaluation was inevitably affected by structurally asymmetrical power relationships within the organization. I have found four themes regarding the impact of power relations on the evaluation process. Those findings are briefly listed in Table 3. This section presents them in rich detail.

Table 3

The Impact of Power Relations on the Evaluation Process

---

1. Organizational demands in evaluation reproduce power relations of the planning stage

2. HRD practitioners function as gatekeepers for evaluation input

3. The HRD manager uses his position to advocate a dominant paradigm in HRD

4. HRD practitioners privilege learners' reactions among evaluation input

---

Organizational Demands in Evaluation Reproduce Power Relations of the Planning Stage

While going through the process of evaluating every component of the MLDC, the HRD practitioners needed to conduct the evaluation within the existing power relations of the organization. During the interviews, all three HRD practitioners highlighted some frustrating experiences at the program planning stage. When they had planned and designed the program, they were asked by the senior manager to include some in-class courses because of organizational needs. Joey reported that they had to insert the "Shared Value" topic as a part of an in-class course. He described how this topic was included in the program:

We absolutely needed the critical support of this class (management) to carry out our job.
Indeed, we needed [the managerial support]. However, while providing the support, they
suggested, "such and such type of people should take this training program and such and
such type of training should be offered." In this context, this program was also
influenced. For example, we dealt with the "Shared Value," about the shared values of
our company. They claimed that since our organization has shared values such as
honesty, diligence, trust, and something like that, these values must be taught in this
program.

Greg also reiterated his unpleasant feelings about his experiences at the planning stage. When the
HRD practitioners had developed the program, the senior manager had requested that they
include some business administration courses such as "personnel management" and "strategic
management" on behalf of the corporate management. Describing this case, he said, "I put them
in the program because they (management group) imposed them." He added, "I could not
motivate myself in facilitating these courses because I didn't like them." It was interesting that
Andy, an outside person in the program, had also realized that the program was planned within
the political relations of the organization. He explicitly expressed his perception of the
organizational context of program planning mentioning "political dynamics existed among the
organizational members."

In addition to his observation on organizational politics, Andy himself had tangled with
organizational politics, too. Since Andy was widely regarded as an action learning expert, the
HRD practitioners had requested his advice in designing the action learning component. Instead
of only taking the Limousine's training programs, Andy suggested that the HRD practitioners
could consider various routes for overseas field trips. For instance, Andy expressed he had

suggested that they would have invited a professor of an American university as a coordinator. In Andy's opinion, there were many alternative ways to implement overseas field trips. Greg expressed that he agreed with Andy and thought Andy's suggestion seemed to be relevant. In spite of this consensus between Andy and Greg, Andy's suggestion was not accepted by the corporate management. Andy reflected on why his idea had not been considered:

> If the [training] participants visited an institution, the company could establish and sustain the relationship with the institution. That is to say, by sustaining the relationship, the company can share that institution's managerial information, policies, and knowledge, which were kinds of additional benefits earned from the overseas field trip. (…) The HRD practitioners might think of benefits at the program level, whereas the top management of the company might be more concerned about benefits at a higher level that involved sustaining good relationship with the institution.

These statements clearly show that there were different views between corporate management and the HRD practitioners, and yet the managerial concerns were given more priority in the design and development of the program than the HRD practitioners and the instructor's concerns. It was a duty to obey that the HRD practitioners must develop the program while including the Limousine's leadership training sessions. Greg admitted, "It was not optional but necessary to take the training programs of Limousine to sustain a good cooperative relationship with it in terms of sales." Likewise, planning the program, the HRD practitioners had to consider managerial concerns regardless of their preferences and concerns. This dynamics between the HRD practitioners and the corporate management reflected the asymmetrical power relationship between them.

The asymmetrical power relationship at the evaluation stage mirrored exactly the power relationship at the planning stage. As mentioned above, in this program evaluation, assessment of each component of the program was conducted solely by the three HRD practitioners. Yet, the senior manager influenced the evaluation process as a key decision maker to whom the progress of evaluation was reported rather than a staff member who joined directly in assessing the worth of program components. Hence, the unequal power relations in the evaluation process were unveiled at the point whereby the HRD practitioners presented evaluation findings in terms of the organizational expectations and values. Joey described a dialogue when the three HRD practitioners wrote up the evaluation report:

> [When we had a meeting,] we agreed with each other. Greg said, "Aha, it didn't work. We cannot lead the field trip literally applying the knowledge we learned in textbooks." We can never write such problematic issues. (…) When we actually reported it to the top management, we couldn't say like, "This was so bad. This didn't work as it was intended." We definitely couldn't say it like that; instead we reported "participants went through global experiences and learned global knowledge through this session." We had to respond this way, because they don't spend money on activities that don't produce desirable results.

Joey's statements indicated that the power inequity explicitly affected the HRD practitioners' development of the evaluation report. They recognized that their interest in assessing the program performance in terms of learning objectives conflicted with the management's interest in receiving positive reactions about the program. At the same time they realized that their interest was surely outweighed by the senior manager's interest. Consequently, the HRD practitioners attempted to reformulate their interest in order to avoid struggles at the

evaluation stage. The reformulation of their interest resulted in the emphasis on the positive side

of the program, which was the managerial concern. This showed that the power relations from

the program planning also affected the evaluation. Furthermore, the reformulation of their

interest that seemed to be incompatible with the senior manager's interest revealed that the HRD

practitioners' real interest in the program evaluation was related to securing their role status

within the host organization. Through conducting the evaluation, they intended to sustain a

harmonious and close connection with the corporate management.

Why, then, were the power relations in planning directly reproduced in the evaluation? In

terms of organizational power, this can be explained in two ways. First, it should be noted that

the MLDC was an organizational mandate. Since it was launched as a part of the three-year

project for organizational reform, the MLDC needed to be conducted in conjunction with the

overall progress of the three-year project. The outcomes of the MLDC had to be determined as

meaningful in accordance with the purpose of the project, which clearly reflected the

organizational strategic needs. The close connection of the outcomes with the project reified the

validity of the HRD function. Therefore, the HRD practitioners had to continuously keep in mind

the broader organizational context while evaluating various outcomes of the MLDC. In this

sense, Joey recounted,

> I got to know a kind of big picture or the mainstream of our company's development
>
> direction while watching an intra-network TV program that aired CEO's annual public
>
> speech. Sometimes, I was able to realize the overall mood of the company from
>
> forwarded reports and documents from department to department. (…) When we develop
>
> any programs, it is very typical to put this kind of organizational context in the beginning

[of the program proposal]. So we need to recognize it. We need to make an effort to

know it.

Attention needed to be paid to the overall organizational trends to know what types of needs the

company had, what content should be stressed, and what goals should be targeted. Otherwise, the

educational intervention was unlikely to be perceived as useful for the organizational reform

project. That organizational mandate forced the HRD practitioners to accept managerial requests

from planning to evaluation.

Second, structurally given positions and roles of the stakeholders were maintained from

planning to evaluation. For this case program, the relationship between the HRD practitioners

and the corporate management was structurally determined regardless of whether both groups

were involved in planning or evaluation. In other words, since neither actor can alter their roles

or positions willfully, they interacted with each other according to where they were placed within

the company's authority structure. In this organizational authority structure, it was the HRD

practitioners' responsibility to facilitate effective implementation of the MLDC, and

consequently to prove the significance of learning in terms of organizational needs. Meanwhile,

it was the corporate management's responsibility to support the successful program

implementation and to appreciate the outcomes of the program in terms of the strategic needs. As

seen in the previous section, these responsibilities of both groups were expressed as each of their

interests. Without great transformation of the organizational structure of authority, the HRD

practitioners were always dependent upon support of the corporate management. Therefore, with

such interests in the MLDC, the corporate management dominated the HRD practitioner group

though the organizational authority system that existed at the evaluation stage as well as the

planning stage.

HRD Practitioners Function as Gatekeepers for Evaluation Input

In order to achieve plausible evaluation for the training program, it is often necessary to collaborate with varied stakeholders and represent their concerns, thoughts, and interests. As Danny put it, the evaluation for this program was conducted exclusively by three HRD practitioners because they were perceived as "HRD guys who are responsible for every part of the program." More simply, Joey said, "Because it was primarily our job." For the MLDC to be evaluated, Greg, Joey, and Danny used their positions as HRD professionals in the organization to represent stakeholders' input that they had collected through either informal talks or formal assessment. Based on the collected information from stakeholder groups, specifically from learners, instructors, senior managers, and co-workers, they examined and determined the worth of the MLDC. This role of the HRD practitioners signaled that they exercised power to control stakeholders' input in terms of the validity of the input and, therefore, to shape the nature of the evaluation findings constructed by their collaborative work. For example, as noted in the previous section, there were some in-class courses that were required by the corporate management in the MLDC. From the HRD practitioners' perspective, these courses seemed to be irrelevant and to have little impact on each participant's performance improvement. As they anticipated, when the HRD practitioners gleaned the participants' feedback about the courses, the voices of participants were, for the most part, fairly negative. Greg made cynical remarks on why negative voices were dominant in the learners' feedback:

By the way, it was not surprising [for us] to see negative reactions. How could we expect positive reactions about, "Does it make sense to you to deal with "strategic management" only for three hours?" (laughs) What a stupid idea it was! It was supposed to be a course that needed at least a semester. Within three hours, we can only transmit some key

concepts. (…) Moreover, we, facilitators also disliked the courses. So, not only were the

learners not motivated well but we ourselves were not motivated either. (…) If the

courses that the facilitators considered critical, relevant and so on had been included and

taught, it would have been different.

On this occasion, it was apparent that the HRD practitioners did not attempt to examine the

courses in terms of initially developed objectives in spite of their expressed interest in "attaining

the intended learning objectives." Rather, they emphasized learners' negative feedback and used

it as evidence for challenging the courses' continuation. In other words, instead of examining

whether these in-class courses met the learning objectives, they adopted learners' negative

feedback about the courses as a vital reference to advocate their intention, which was to

eliminate these courses or to reorganize them.

What, then, enabled the HRD practitioners to exercise power as gatekeepers? Although

they took over the role of gatekeepers for evaluation input due to their positions, the power they

held stemmed from their expertise rather than merely from their positions within the

organization. Danny stated,

[The reason why we took over this job was that] we are the best. (laughs). We are the

most familiar with those works in our company. Even our [senior] manager was not

involved in [actual evaluation] either. Because we are the primary actors in operating this

program, our senior manager only received the report we prepared. After our work, the

personnel division used it as a kind of data for appreciating personnel.

Danny's identity as a gatekeeper for evaluation input was caused not by his position in

the organizational hierarchy but by his recognized expertise. Similarly, Greg highlighted the

significance of his expertise in relation to this type of training program in terms of the

organizational circumstance wherein so called "genuine HRD people" were rare:

> In our company, it has not been easy to find genuine HRD people who can handle
>
> strategic training programs like this [the MLDC]. That is why I have participated in this
>
> program. Actually, most of the HRD people in the company are inadequate in that they
>
> are oriented to sales training. I mean, they are mostly skewed toward training financing
>
> consultants in the field.

Recognition of their expertise over other organizational members was Danny and Greg's chief

source of power, and consequently it formed the basis for justifying their gatekeeping role in the

evaluation process.

In addition to their expertise, it was also critical to consider the historically constructed

relationship between the HRD professionals and other stakeholders to understand the aspect of

power linked with the role of a gatekeeper. This structural relationship was important in that all

stakeholders including the HRD practitioners acted as expected in terms of their positions within

the relationship. In particular, having worked in the field of corporate training and learning for a

considerable period, the HRD practitioners settled naturally into the structurally given

relationship, which indicated that they fully accepted their dominance over other stakeholder

groups in terms of evaluating training and learning in the workplace. In this program evaluation,

as a case in point, the instructors were largely ignored because they were perceived as "the

outside people" by the HRD practitioners. Joey's remarks show the pervasive beliefs about each

role of stakeholders around training programs:

> Well, when we conduct any program evaluation, the exclusion of the outside people is
>
> usually taken for granted. (…) That person (Andy) was the outside person who was

invited by us. So, his job was only to facilitate the action learning session he was

assigned, and the rest of the stuff such as summarizing and assessing results was our

responsibility.

The HRD practitioners did not consider the instructors as necessary constituencies for successful

program evaluation. At a glance, it can be inferred that the outside people were not considered as

those who might share organizational information because of confidentiality issues. Moreover,

the marginalization of the instructors in this program evaluation resulted from the HRD

practitioners' preconceived idea that outside people's input was often unrealistic in terms of the

organizational situation. According to Danny,

Well, we have requested numerous consulting services, and whenever we got consulting

services of consultants like McKenzie or Anderson we strongly felt they actually could

not touch what we really needed. The final result of their diagnosis and analysis was

always ideal. Likewise, since we have experiences like that, his [Andy] suggestion also

seemed to be very routine and just the best way we might aim.

From the HRD practitioners' viewpoint, people who came from outside the organization were

not good at accounting for the organizational circumstance. Therefore, their input and

suggestions were unlikely to be treated as relevant. By the same token, the instructors also

considered themselves as a marginalized stakeholder group who was involved in evaluation. As

Barry put it,

Since, as a way of investing in training and learning, companies spent money to

outsource training programs they needed, it was reasonable for them to think, "If we had

good outcomes after evaluating training programs, then we would keep them; otherwise,

we didn't need [to spend money on that programs]." Truly, it is because they viewed it

from the customer's perspective. It is a traditional mindset [of host companies].

Like the HRD practitioners, the instructors also fully admitted that the exclusion of

instructors' voices from the evaluation process and its outcomes was taken for granted, and

identifying the nature of the field as a "customer-oriented business" was pervasive in the

corporate training field of Korea. In brief, they were alienated from the whole program

evaluation while positioning themselves as just training providers in the corporate training

market.

The input of the learners' co-workers was also neglected in the evaluation because of

their position in the structural relationships of the program. The HRD practitioners encouraged

co-workers to communicate with the learners in providing pertinent data and information for the

learners to carry out action learning projects. Nevertheless, the HRD practitioners did not seek

the co-workers' opinions and thoughts as Ted, Charlie's co-worker, explained:

> Overall, there was no chance to talk with HRD people about this program. The only
>
> chance I had was a brief survey for Charlie's co-workers when Charlie's participation in
>
> the program was finally decided. I recall it was a questionnaire asking co-workers about
>
> their perceptions of Charlie. So, I answered that questionnaire. Other than that, I did not
>
> have any chance to express my ideas to them. Well, in reality, we could not have enough
>
> time even to meet each other.

This comment evidenced that the HRD practitioners had overlooked substantial inclusion of co-

workers' interests and concerns in the program evaluation. However, Ted was not really

concerned about that issue in spite of his silenced voice. As much as the instructors did, Ted

approved the exclusion of his voice from the evaluation without any challenge. Ted presented his

opinion about why his voice was silenced:

> … Because [they considered that] I was not relevant. From their viewpoints, I was not
>
> familiar with the program, and definitely, I was not an expert in the training and learning
>
> area. I think they would expect that if evaluation was conducted by individuals who were
>
> very familiar with the program, and whose job was to handle it, then valid and precise
>
> evaluation could be ensured. Yeah! It really is [reasonable to expect like that], indeed.

He did not challenge his status, which was marginalized in the evaluation, but accommodated

himself to such a structurally restricted condition. As Ted explicitly said, this attitude stemmed

from his lack of expertise in training and learning. That is to say, the HRD practitioners were

empowered in the evaluation process because of their expertise, whereas the co-worker was

disenfranchised in the same process because of lack of expertise. The structural relationships of

stakeholder groups in the field of Korean corporate training enabled the HRD practitioners to

legitimate their role of as gatekeepers due to "expertise." Yet the structural relationships also

disabled the instructors and the co-worker from actively participating in the process of the

evaluation, and compelled them to go through gatekeepers to suggest their concerns.

The HRD Manager Uses His Position to Advocate a Dominant Paradigm in HRD

Power relationships also shaped aspects of negotiations among the HRD practitioners and

the senior manager during the evaluation. As mentioned above, the evaluation was mostly

conducted just by three HRD practitioners, Greg, Danny, and Joey. The evaluation results were,

then, reported to Harry, the senior manager of the HR and personnel business unit. The

interviews with these people uncovered the influence of power relationships on their interactions

during the process. Above all, different perspectives on desirable and meaningful training

outcomes, particularly for the overseas field trip, existed among these people. Explaining their viewpoints on the outcomes of the overseas field trip session, the three HRD practitioners remarked that they had different attitudes on the overseas field trip, which they had to negotiate while assessing the field trip.

The major issue for assessing the value of the overseas field trip session was that although it was not properly implemented as it was originally planned, the surveyed reactions of the learners after the session revealed that the learners were very satisfied with it. Greg, who led the overall evaluation process, strongly believed that evaluation for HRD interventions, like the MLDC, should demonstrate the linkage between intended objectives and results of interventions. As quoted in the section for the research question one, Greg maintained that the meaningfulness of outcomes of HRD interventions should be determined by whether those outcomes were intended when the program was originally designed or not. For him, the primary target of training program evaluation should be objective-related outcomes or outputs. In this manner, while focusing on the gap between intended objectives and actual implementation, Greg judged it as a total failure saying, "I might grade it with zero points." He was very disappointed and disgruntled at actual facilitation of the overseas field trip. He described how the session was supposed to be carried out, and how it really had been carried out in detail:

When we planned and organized the session, I clearly told Joey and Danny, "If we visit Merit Company, a representative of Merit Company should present their works, and a Q &A time for that presentation should be prepared." By doing so, we can expect that our learners can acquire useful information and knowledge. Right? In the meantime, I also asked them, "In order for the learners to apply what they learn to their projects, the questions and answers should be related to their needs for information. So we need to get

some questions from the learners, and forward those questions to the Merit Company

representative so that he can prepare answers for those questions in advance." But it

didn't work. [when we visited Merit Company], we just saw a big conference room.

(Laughs Cynically) We did not even meet the representative of Merit Company.

The purpose of the overseas field trip was to benchmark American insurance companies, and

collect data for the learners' action learning projects. From Greg's viewpoint, the learners' visit

to the American insurance companies should be linked to their action learning projects. That is to

say, by visiting the American companies, the learners should have gleaned pertinent data in

terms of their projects.

Furthermore, regarding the training session offered by Limousine International, Greg

continuously expressed he had been very upset about the session because it turned out to be as an

irrelevant training session in terms of the intended learning objectives as he explained:

Similarly, training of Limousine was not quite relevant and it was not properly

customized as we had requested. It only covered very general and broad content, it was,

like, it delivered very routine content that anybody who had a little experience knew.

Moreover, in the case of group discussion, there were no guidelines or adequate

facilitation.

Greg received a setback because the Limousine's leadership training did not cover substantive

issues and information. In sum, the primary concern of Greg was that the overseas field trip was

not relevantly designed and implemented in light of the learning objectives.

On the other hand, though Danny and Joey, assistant managers of HRD, generally agreed

with Greg's opinion, they had a slightly different view on the notion of meaningful outcomes.

Instead of identifying meaningful outcomes in a strict manner, they preferred to view desirable

outcomes somewhat flexibly because of the uncertainty of outcomes. As Joey said,

> Frankly speaking, we were not quite sure of whether the participants had learned as we
>
> had designed. We thought, "Did they learn everything we expected?" Did they go
>
> through every task in the program successfully without any complaints?" "Maybe or
>
> maybe not." (…) Later on, seeing what they performed in the program, I was certainly
>
> aware of their potential.

From their perspective, outcomes that were not closely relevant for the direct program goals

would be meaningful in the long run. The two assistant managers believed that learning and

development of the learners could not be limited to specific skills or competencies for specific

tasks. In this sense, Joey and Danny commonly pointed out that participants' enhanced self-

esteem could be an important outcome although it was not intended or expected. For example,

Joey stated,

> In one sense, such an experience itself leads people to move their confidence up a level.
>
> It, also, really motivated them. They thought it was a very precious experience in their
>
> own careers. As they put it, "When can I walk down Wall Street? When can I take
>
> training courses in America once again?"

Danny and Joey expected that such enhanced self-esteem stemming from direct experiences of

American culture could help the learners to achieve their fullest potential in the long run.

Accordingly, Joey noted that the field trip helped the learners enhance their global outlook.

While considering positive reactions as important, Danny and Joey ascribed the positive

reactions of the participants to enhanced self-esteem in the course of the overseas field trip

session. However, for Greg, positive reactions maybe nourish the learners to high levels of

performance on the job, but those reactions from the participants could not guarantee the successful implementation of the program and improved performance.

The three HRD practitioners negotiated to reach a compromise on the value of the overseas field trip. For the most part, the priority was given to Greg's thoughts over Danny and Joey's ideas, and as a result, the overseas field trip was determined problematic; it needed extensive revision for implementing in 2004. While describing the interaction with Greg for this issue, Joey mourned, "I said nothing." He expressed that although he had different opinions, he did not, in his words, "open my own thoughts." That is to say, he did not allow himself to share his ideas, which were in conflict with Greg's. In a similar vein, Danny also did not challenge Greg but approved Greg's privilege in assessing the program components. Taking for granted Greg's authority, Danny said, "He was committed to adjusting our different ideas and concerns." The asymmetrical relationship among them was confirmed by Greg's remark, "I put almost every issue I wanted to include in the evaluation report."

The predominance of Greg's concerns over Danny's and Joey's in the evaluation seemed to be upheld by two types of power. First, Greg drew upon the organizational power that stemmed from his position and working experiences. This power served to hinder pertinent negotiation between them in that Greg was their direct supervisor. Indeed, Danny and Joey could neither alter nor escape from this organizationally structured power relationship. Second, and more importantly, the fact that Greg's arguments were based on the performance-oriented paradigm, which is overwhelmingly considered as a strategically desirable paradigm in the field of HRD, forced Danny and Joey to uncritically accept Greg's idea. As HRD professionals, they were aware of the so called "mainstream" paradigm, which they could never overlook. In other words, in order to maintain their professionalism, it was necessary for them to claim a common

set of ideas, tasks, and traditions of the HRD community in Korea. Since the emphasis on performance was so pervasive throughout the HRD community, they felt obliged to stress performance improvement by HRD interventions. Danny and Joey clearly understood that they had an ethical obligation to ensure organizational performance goals. This type of power was ideological in the sense that the performance-focused paradigm was largely accepted as desirable in the HRD community, and consequently, it governed and shaped the practices of the community's members including Danny and Joey, through an implicit mechanism.

HRD Practitioners Privilege Learners' Reactions Among Evaluation Input

In spite of Greg's focusing on performance improvement as an ultimate intended outcome resulting from the program activities, the learners' satisfaction with the program components was considered important. Throughout the whole program implementation, the feedback acquired from the participants about the program content, the quality of instructors, and the organization of the program components was given primacy by the HRD practitioners in facilitating the program and assessing the program quality in a formative manner. Joey recalled what he thought while collecting feedback:

> We were usually so sensitive to their satisfaction in that we tried to catch even faint changes in their voice tone, nuances, and facial expression. Since we lived together with the participants for five weeks in full, it was not difficult to perceive some subtle changes in their behaviors and attitudes. So, [if we perceived those changes, then] we realized, "Ah! These people are not satisfied with the session." Then we thought, "Why on earth are they unsatisfied?" After that, we conjectured, "They are unsatisfied because of such and such reasons." Later on, we critically considered those findings when facilitating subsequent sessions.

Similarly, as described in the section for research question one, Harry, the senior manager, and the instructors also explicitly recounted their substantial interest in receiving positive feedback from the learners. The common interest of these three groups allowed learners' reaction or feedback to be the paramount data over others without any explicit conflict.

The interviews with these stakeholders showed that fundamentally there was a shared and real interest among these constituencies regardless of their different backgrounds: Justification of each role and upholding one's interests. In particular, for the HRD practitioners, the positive learners' reactions can be critical evidence to uphold their positions and efforts. For example, Danny expressed, "In some degree, I felt safe once the participants' were satisfied with the activities." Furthermore, learners' satisfaction was seen as a very powerful weapon for the HRD practitioners to overcome conflicting ideas and to lead a consensus. Joey highlighted an important characteristic of learners' reactions:

> The most important part when we examined [the program] was learners' reaction. Yes! Learners' reaction, it was. Well, although there would be various opinions among the reactions, if we analyzed and revealed them, like, "See! Their reactions are like this," then nobody can criticize that. All conflicting ideas and opinions became silenced.

Secondly, as described earlier, the senior manager firmly believed that positive reactions were a fundamental criterion for examining the program impact. In considering the senior manager's role status as the top leader of the HR and personnel unit, therefore, the positive reactions of the participants meant the successful function of his unit. Thirdly, the instructors also stated they sought positive feedback so that they could be rehired for the next MLDC program. For the instructors, the aspect of learners' reaction was critical in maintaining a good relationship with the host organization. In accordance with these interests and the organizational context, the

acquisition of positive learners' reactions was seen as a critical vehicle to justify one's role in and around the program. Essentially, although learners' reactions could not refer to objective, specific performance outcomes, it was a politically powerful measure to advocate each stakeholder group's interests.

Along with the mechanism through which emphasis was given to the learners' reactions by various stakeholders, we need to understand how these learners' reactions were privileged during the evaluation process. As noted, in the case of the evaluation for the MLDC, the substantial evaluation process was carried out by only the HRD practitioners. This situation was legitimized and considered as unproblematic by all stakeholder groups because of not only the HRD practitioners' expertise in training and learning, but also other stakeholders' identities that restricted their active participation in evaluation. While holding power to control the whole evaluation process, the HRD practitioners played the role of the gatekeepers for evaluation input. They determined whether information was considered relevant for evaluating the program or not. Based on this type of power, the HRD practitioners privileged learners' reactions and used them as leverage for advocating what they suggested in a political way. For example, as addressed before, Greg suggested that some in-class courses such as "strategic management" and "personnel management" should be eliminated because of the learners' negative feedback. For Greg who had disputed the relevance of these courses, the dissatisfaction of the participants could be purposefully served to sustain his argument. Moreover, as Joey mentioned, in considering the symbolic power of learners' reactions to resolve any conflicting opinions, the reactions of the learners helped the HRD practitioners to be convinced of the evaluation outcomes as long as the reactions were consistent with their interests.

Yet other stakeholder groups did not challenge this privileging of the reactions of learners. Again, the evaluation for the MLDC was conducted by only the three HRD practitioners, and a variety of input from stakeholder groups was filtered and controlled by the practitioners. In fact, due to the structural relationship between the HRD practitioners and other stakeholder groups, these stakeholder groups considered themselves that they were not likely to contribute to the evaluation. They took for granted that evaluation for the program should be conducted by just the HRD practitioners, and in turn, the stakeholders identified themselves as marginalized constituencies. Hence, with such self-identities, the stakeholders were oppressed to influence or challenge the privilege of learners' reactions as the HRD practitioners maintained.

Power Relations and the Evaluation Outcomes

Since the evaluation process for the MLDC was closely connected to complex power relations among stakeholders, the power inequity shaped various aspects of the evaluation process. In turn, outcomes that were produced through that process were inevitably also political by nature. This section, therefore, is devoted to understanding, how power relationships among stakeholders affect the evaluation outcomes, the third research question. For a better understanding of the nature of evaluation outcomes, I identified the outcomes in two distinct domains: the stakeholder domain and the program domain. Table 4 shows a summary of findings in terms of the two domains for research question 3.

The stakeholder domain encompassed outcomes that stemmed from stakeholders' experiences while going through the evaluation process. This type of outcome involved how power relations influenced stakeholders' behaviors, attitudes, and identities during the program evaluation. The huge impact of organizational culture on the HRD practitioners was considered one of the stakeholder outcomes. The range of evaluation users was also delimited by the

influence of power relations. On the other hand, the program domain covered findings about the program as a consequence of the evaluation. This type of outcome involved how power relations shaped or distorted the nature of program information. In this study, it encompassed both the inclusion of only positive learners' reactions in the final evaluation report and the exclusion of substantial negative findings from the report.

Table 4

The Impact of Power Relations on the Evaluation Outcomes

Stakeholder Domain

1. HRD practitioners acquiesce to organizational culture in evaluation

2. The range of the evaluation user group was delimited

Program Domain

3. The content of the evaluation report is positively skewed

Stakeholder Domain

As mentioned, the stakeholder domain pertained to any influence of the evaluation experiences on the stakeholders. The outcomes in this domain could be detected, above all, in the HRD practitioners' experiences. The substantial evaluation for the MLDC was primarily conducted by three HRD practitioners (Greg, Danny, and Joey).

They had exclusive control throughout the entire evaluation process to access information. Indeed, their dominant power was legitimized and taken for granted by other stakeholder groups mainly because of their "expertise." Even though other stakeholder groups perceived the HRD practitioners to have power throughout the process, the HRD practitioners themselves still felt powerless. In the course of evaluation, the HRD practitioners frequently felt

at odds with the managerial concerns. The corporate management interests and expectations overwhelmingly constrained the HRD practitioners' evaluation through the organizational culture which was an implicit mechanism. During the interviews, they frequently used expressions and terms revealing their powerlessness against the organizational culture. For example, while explaining his difficulty in communication with the management, Danny stated, "I couldn't persuade them. There always existed something that I couldn't negotiate about. I think that was our limitation." Similarly, describing his reflection on experiences at the end of the evaluation, Joey said, "We always have been placed under such great pressure that we must show remarkable benefits in terms of the organizational standpoint." Greg also repeatedly used expressions referring to his lack of power. He was disgruntled at the organizational culture that was unfavorable to training and learning, and vividly expressed his frustration, "I went almost crazy. I was stuck!" And he also said, "We can never require or even expect their [managerial] commitment."

These negative feelings heavily affected their evaluation practice and became even more prominent throughout the evaluation. The sense of being powerless was reproduced in accordance with the organizational context in which they perceived they did not have enough managerial support; moreover, they could not alter that situation although the HRD practitioners needed managerial support to accomplish a strategically successful program ranging from planning to evaluation. They contended that the management tended to be indifferent to the HRD efforts, and this indifference really enervated them in doing their tasks. From their point of view, this was chiefly attributed to the dominant organizational culture, which was strongly oriented to an emphasis on performance. In this organizational culture, good work must present meaningful outcomes immediately and visibly. Likewise, the focus on training and development of the

company had been brought, for the most part, to "sales person training" that just dealt with

interpersonal skills used directly in interacting with customers and information about varied

types of insurance policies. The HRD practitioners, particularly Greg, attributed the nature of this

organizational culture in which such emphasis was placed on immediate, specific performance to

the historical development of the organization:

> Based on my experiences in the company, it is because of our organizational culture, that
>
> is, sales-oriented culture. Selling many insurance policies has been, indeed, still is the
>
> momentum for our company's rapid development (…) The nature of sales training is that,
>
> apparently, we can see immediate changes. We can easily see the increasing number of
>
> insurance policies each financial consultant [sales person] sells after attending training
>
> programs, can't we? Definitely, they [management] consider that [increased number of
>
> insurance policies sold] as performance. They are greatly oriented to this kind of mindset.

Greg's understanding of the organizational culture was confirmed by Charlie, who held a general

manager position in the organization as well as being involved in the program as a learner.

Charlie also identified the culture as "improvement-oriented," and said, "High performance was

always considered a virtue." For Greg, HRD interventions were more than financial consultant

training. The HRD function should not only increase the productivity of salespeople, but it

should also be linked to emergent organizational needs, and, he said, "We should and must

provide strategically relevant solutions" for those needs. However, the focus on the immediate,

visible improvement of job performance undermined the HRD functions. Yet Greg was

concerned about the almost imperceptible impact of training and learning. He skeptically stated,

"Nobody in the corporate management can trust performance improvement in the future." That is

to say, from the corporate management's viewpoint, performance improvement in the future

could only be hoped for; it might not be realized. Because of this organizational culture, many types of HRD interventions were likely to be underrated and misunderstood as worthless.

Danny also reflected the evaluation experiences being at odds with the management. The low level of expectation of the management led him to work in an adaptive way. He stated,

I heard [how the management thought about training], "It's just training." They [management] seemed not to expect too much. Seeing this kind of response, we also cannot help being reactive rather than proactive because our proactive efforts were likely to be overlooked. (…) We also did not expect too much either. Rather, in the long run, we just hoped these managers who had a positive attitude toward training and learning could be promoted to higher positions as soon as possible.

Danny believed that instead of hoping to obtain current management's support, the HRD practitioners should focus on developing future managers who will be able to critically contribute to organizational reform, and, by doing so, they hoped to innovate the organizational perspective on HRD functions later on. Danny's attitudes signaled that he had a sense of powerlessness because he could not work actively to influence the current corporate management's mindsets but hoped for potential change of the management in the future. He mourned, "It is really HRD practitioners' grief to work only with that kind of hope or dream." He identified those problems that were almost impossible for him to alter, and therefore he just dreamed about future changes as a result of the MLDC. Thus, all three HRD practitioners experienced powerlessness while conducting the evaluation for the MLDC due to the invisible influence of the organizational culture. No doubt, the sense of powerlessness forced them to adapt themselves to the overwhelming organizational culture although they disagreed with its

nature. In other words, they could do nothing but work within the existing culture in which the functions of the HRD were continuously marginalized.

However, the organizational circumstances around the HRD practitioners endorsed their role as the major players throughout the evaluation process: (a) the HRD practitioners were largely recognized as "training professionals," (b) most information used for determining the merit or worth of the program was collected and filtered by the HRD practitioners, and (c) the content of the final evaluation report was developed solely by the HRD practitioners. Their dominance in the course of the evaluation also limited the range of the user groups for the evaluation results. As a matter of fact, the evaluation results were produced by the HRD practitioners and used only for themselves. The evaluation results were used instrumentally to develop the MLDC 2004, and used conceptually to report information about the program to Harry, the senior manager. In this sense, all stakeholders, except the senior manager who received the final evaluation report, remarked that they were not informed about the evaluation results to say nothing of the use of those results. For example, Andy who provided information that was useful to develop the action learning component, and who facilitated it explicitly maintained he did not receive any specific evaluation results:

> I have not received any specific results [of the evaluation] from them. I just briefly talked about that over the phone. (…) I'm sorry. Since I just briefly got some information over the phone, I do not know specifically what was going on. I'm sorry I can't tell you [interviewer] about that right now.

In a similar vein, Charlie, a learner, recounted that he had only received a summary of feedback from co-participants, but he obtained no evaluation results at the program level. Ted, a co-worker of Charlie, who had not been asked for any input by the HRD practitioners, was also not

informed of the evaluation results. What was worse was that Ted did not even expect to be informed of such results.

Assuming that knowing information was a necessary condition for using information, the power relations in this program evaluation severely restricted the span of the evaluation user groups by making information accessible only to the HRD practitioners and the corporate management. This was another evaluation outcome in terms of the stakeholder domain in that the learner group, instructor group, and learners' co-worker group were neglected as evaluation users by the unequal power relations within the program evaluation.

Program Domain

At the end of the program operation, the HRD practitioners reported the final and comprehensive evaluation results to prove their accountability, notably for the corporate management. In this program, the final evaluation results were reported to Harry, the senior manager, who was the highest person. In planning the MLDC, he had brought input reflecting the interests of the corporate management in the program. Furthermore, as mentioned before, he also had substantive interests in the program as the leader of the HR and personnel unit. In terms of his position, Harry explained that the final evaluation reports had contained information that had helped him to judge whether the MLDC attained its goals, whether the HRD practitioners' efforts worked, and ultimately, whether the program was on the right track in accordance with strategic organizational needs.

Evidently, the final evaluation report was the product of the structural power relationship in the company. There is usually lots of room for debate on the worth of the program depending upon one's values and interests. However, in this study, since the HRD practitioners held organizational recognition as "training professionals," they also held legitimate power to control

the evaluation process and the responsibility for developing the final evaluation report.

Consequently, the merit and worth of the MLDC were largely shaped by them. More specifically,

while they concealed negative reactions and feedback from the learners, they could manipulate

the tone of the evaluation report. In the final evaluation report, there was a section that included

learners' feedback about the whole program. Six comments were introduced as exemplars and all

the comments contained the positive feedback. The selected six comments were as follows:

It was *a great opportunity to challenge and change myself*, and I *can be confident to apply leadership skills* on the job as one of the leaders of the company.

I *can learn what to know and how to work as a genuine leader* on the job while implementing the team project. Of course, I *can acquire various skills that can be used directly on the job*.

While carrying out the action learning project, *I learned for the first time how to solve the problems*, and *I will definitely practice it* when I return to the job.

Various feedback that I have received from the co-participants during the five week full time training, *helped me to break my existing self-consciousness and to reflect on myself*.

It was the most memorable training that I have gotten in the last 15 years, and in this manner, *I want the company to develop and expand this program* for the future of our organization.

For me, it was a great honor to participate in and finish this program, and *I really appreciate that the company provided such a wonderful opportunity for my individual development*.

The italicized emphases of each comment were added by the HRD practitioners. Regardless of

preponderance of the positive statements included in the evaluation report, truly, there was also

much negative feedback among the learners' reactions. In fact, the summarized reports of learners' reaction and feedback that were produced at the end of each week included vivid negative voices of the learners about each week's sessions. The following quotes are some exemplars of negative feedback about specific learning activities that the learners made in an open-ended manner at the end of each week.

> I did not feel motivated about the course of "strategic management," which I had never heard about that before the class, and moreover, one-way lecturing was so boring and tedious. (Week 1)

> Due to the time constraints, not only could we (team members) not interview leaders on the job but we also could not reflect or examine the cases fully; I consider our team project has not been done substantively. (Week 2)

> Some irrelevant interviewees for our team project! (Week 3)

> When we visited Merit Company, there was no interpretation, and, personally, this (visiting the headquarters of Merit Company) seemed to be irrelevant and unhelpful. (Week 4)

> I was disappointed when our visit to Merit Company turned out to be just a facility tour. (Week 4)

During the interviews, the HRD practitioners had reported considerable negative feedback as well. For example, Joey illustrated what he had heard:

> Some learners remarked that the content of Limousine was so flat that they could not learn any substantial information but some introductory lessons that they had already known. For them, it seemed like the course of "Introduction to Business Administration" for college freshmen.

Greg also mentioned the negative feedback of the learners. He commented,

> As I told you before, many participants commented, "It was too project oriented. I still can't understand what on earth action learning was." I mean, action learning was supposed to stress learning, and projects should be a medium to produce individual and team learning. But as expressed, they seemed to do just the projects.

In spite of the existence of both positive and negative feedback, the final evaluation report included only the positive feedback, and in addition, the HRD practitioners added some emphases on the statements that could confirm the participants' satisfaction with the content, the learning format, and the program's impact on their jobs. Such deliberate distortion and emphasis of the HRD practitioners connoted their power to shape the nature of the evaluation report for the sake of their interest in demonstrating the impact of HRD interventions.

In addition, the HRD practitioners used their exclusive legitimate power to eliminate some negative evaluation results in developing the report. As described in the previous section, Joey regarded the evaluation report he and other HRD practitioners had developed as superficial. It seemed to be superficial for him in that the content of the report covered positive results that met the intended program purposes and negative results that were manipulated into minimizing those negative aspects. For example, Greg Joey, and Danny described some problematic issues regarding the overseas field trip session. As described in the previous section, Greg judged the overseas field trip session as zero point graded training because it was not implemented as it had originally been planned. Meanwhile, while agreeing with Greg overall, Joey and Danny had a somewhat different idea: although the field trip had not been implemented as it had been intended, the participants benefited from enhancing their self-esteem, which was considered a meaningful outcome from their viewpoints. These different ideas were negotiated but Greg's

opinion was given the priority over Danny and Joey's concerns. The results generated through

this negotiation were put in the final evaluation report. However, the content regarding this issue

became so brief that the majority of ideas they discussed and negotiated were concealed. In the

evaluation report, they put it as a recommendation of the HRD practitioners:

> To prevent confusing, disorganized overseas field trip sessions, it is necessary to develop
>
> an "Overseas Field Trip Manual."
>
> > - In order to build a "know how" data base for the overseas field trip and to facilitate
> >
> > training properly in the field, a customized global material manual needs to be
> >
> > developed.

Again, it can be recognized that a good deal of negative information about the messy

implementation of the overseas field trip addressed by Greg in the interview was eliminated from

the evaluation report. Failing to include any substantial information, the HRD practitioners just

briefly presented their recommendations in two simple sentences.

However, it is interesting that the process of finalizing the evaluation results in the report

involved not only the HRD practitioners but also the senior manager. Before producing the final

report, evaluation findings were shared and reviewed by the senior manager. Greg stated,

> We usually shared findings that were supposed to be in the report in advance. For
>
> example, I often reported "some were successful, and some were discovered as problems.
>
> So I will put such things in the report." As a response, he commented on that.

Before finalizing the report, the HRD practitioners informally presented their tentative findings,

and discussed, for the most part, the negative aspects of the program with the senior manager,

and invited his comments. Greg reflected on that Harry's comments tended to focus on positive

aspects of issues. For example, as described in the previous sections, Greg was so disgruntled at

the overseas field trip session because it was not implemented as it was planned, and achieved its learning objectives. In contrast, Harry considered the session as meaningful in the sense that the learners could experience American culture. Although Harry transmitted the organizational needs and requirements to the HRD practitioners, he was also concerned about the negative results due to his position as the leader of HR and personnel unit. For him, negative results could be harmful to his reputation in the host organization because the evidence of malfunction of the HRD unit could also indicate that he did not attend to his division's work performance. Because of this situation, the meeting between the HRD practitioners and the senior manager ended up with the final evaluation reports that contained mostly positive findings and only minimal negative findings.

Two characteristics of the final evaluation report, the inclusion of the positive reactions from the learners and the exclusion of the substantial negative information can be seen as the evaluation outcomes in terms of the program domain. These two outcomes resulted in the evaluation report that was skewed in a positive direction. These were produced by the HRD practitioners' power deriving from their expertise. Now that the practitioners and the senior manager shared the same interest in developing the final evaluation report, the senior manager also supported those characteristics. However, the power of the HRD practitioners was constrained by the organizational needs and values. Instead of direct pressure by the organizational mandate, they themselves examined the content of the evaluation report to determine whether the report was consistent with the organizational strategic needs and values. In particular, the organizational context in which the HRD practitioners perceived themselves as powerless compelled them to generate positive results from the program implementation in order to maintain their status within the organization. For this reason, they needed to present positive

evidence that demonstrated the critical linkage between the MLDC and the organizational needs in the evaluation report. However, as shown above, the HRD practitioners recognized that their role as HRD professionals had continuously become marginalized because of the performance-oriented organizational culture. Unless they could demonstrate a clear and immediate impact of the program intervention, their work was likely to be perceived of little value in this organizational culture, and consequently, they became marginalized. Greg said, "As long as the organizational focus is placed on the present, training will constantly be neglected."

<div style="text-align:center">Summary</div>

This chapter addresses the historical, organizational context, instructional format, audience, and evaluations for the MLDC. Moreover, three emerging findings in terms of the research questions were presented. First, the five stakeholder groups had different interests in the MLDC. Although each stakeholder group expressed interests that were largely consistent with their role status and positions, some stakeholders were revealed to have interests that differed from their expressed interests.

This chapter also addresses four themes that represent the power relations among the stakeholders who were involved in the evaluation process. First, organizationally structured power relations were reproduced from the planning table to the evaluation table. Second, since the HRD practitioners were extensively recognized as experts in training and development, they could play a gatekeeper role for evaluation input. Third, in the course of generating the evaluation findings, the HRD manager's ideas and beliefs were directly imposed on the HRD assistant managers, who were his subordinates. Fourth, in terms of the structurally unequal relationship between the HRD unit and the management, the HRD practitioners needed to explicitly cast their efforts in a favorable light to the corporate management.

This chapter, finally, addresses the impact of power relationships, particularly between the HRD practitioners and others, on the evaluation outcomes. Since the case program evaluation was conducted exclusively by the three HRD practitioners, the HRD practitioners' real interests governed the nature of the evaluation outcomes. Hence, the evaluation report was produced and reported emphasizing the positive results of the MLDC, and the evaluation findings served only the HRD practitioners' use. However, they carried out the evaluation in terms of the organizational strategic needs and expectations. While evaluating the MLDC, they readily deferred to the organizational needs and expectations.

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, DISCUSSION, AND IMPLICATIONS

The phenomenon of power and politics within organizations is a critical factor that affects the evaluation of training programs because it structures organizational processes. In considering this phenomenon, this study centered on the impact of power and politics permeating a Korean business organization's training program evaluation. I begin this final chapter with a summary of the study. Then, I discuss the main conclusions in terms of the research body of related fields. Finally, I close this chapter with the implications of this case study for future HRD practice and research.

Summary of the Study

In the field of HRD, it has been regarded as critical to demonstrate the linkage between HRD interventions and performance improvement at either individual or organizational levels. In this context, evaluation of training programs has become an important vehicle to justify the HRD roles in terms of organizational goals. In spite of its political nature, understanding evaluation that is enmeshed in organizational power and politics has been less common in HRD research and practice. Hence, the purpose of this study was to understand how organizational power and interests are negotiated by stakeholders in determining the merit and worth of a recurring training program. For this purpose, the Managerial Leadership Development Course (MLDC) of a Korean insurance company was chosen as the case training program. This training program was started by organizational mandates.

A qualitative case study design was used to understand the influence of power relations among stakeholders on the evaluation process and its outcomes. Data collection for this study was conducted in Korea, and the primary data were gathered through open-ended, face-to-face,

in-depth interviews in Korean. A total of eight program stakeholders who represented five main stakeholder groups participated in this study: HRD practitioners, corporate management, instructors, learners, and learners' co-workers. The interviews were mostly devoted to discovering what interests each stakeholder group had, how they interacted with each other during the evaluation process, and what types of outcomes were generated. The data gleaned were analyzed in terms of the following three research questions:

      1. What are the interests of the stakeholders affected by the training program?

      2. How do power relations among the stakeholders affect the evaluation process?

      3. How do power relations among the stakeholders affect the evaluation outcomes?

Using the constant comparative analysis method, I generated a number of findings in terms of these questions.

      The first set of findings involves the major expressed interests of the stakeholder groups. The HRD practitioners who were responsible for conducting the evaluation were primarily interested in demonstrating the impact of the training program on the job. The senior manager representing the management group, who took the part of supporting the optimal implementation of the MLDC, sought to receive positive feedback about the program and the work of the HRD practitioners. The learners' priority was mostly focused on improving their capacity to work effectively on the job. The instructors who came from outside the organization expressed their interest in sustaining a good relationship with the company. Finally, the co-worker of the learners had an interest in accruing the dual benefits of training from the learners' changed behaviors and attitudes. However, in examining the data regarding their actual practice during the evaluation, I found that some stakeholders retained real interests different from their expressed interests. Particularly, both the HRD practitioners and the senior manager ultimately sought to secure and

advocate their positions and roles in the host organization by generating evidence that the HRD

effort was consistent with the organizational strategic needs. Such evidence would greatly

contribute to attaining the organizational mission, which is reforming its management systems

into that of a global organization.

The second set of findings involves the influence of power relations among stakeholders

on the evaluation process. This study addresses four themes that represent the impact of power

relations among the stakeholders who were involved in the evaluation process. First, the

organizationally structured power relations were reproduced from the planning table to the

evaluation table. Since the MLDC was an organizational mandate, it was necessary for the HRD

practitioners not only to plan the MLDC but also to demonstrate the outcomes of the MLDC in

accordance with the organizational standards and expectations. Moreover, in the organization's

authority structure, the HRD practitioners were dependent upon the support of the corporate

management at both the planning and evaluation stages. Second, the HRD practitioners played a

gatekeeper role for evaluation input because of their organization-wide recognition as experts in

training and development. The chief source of their power as gatekeepers came mostly from their

self-identities as training professionals in the organization. Furthermore, their dominant role

within the program evaluation was also legitimized by other stakeholders' recognition of the

HRD practitioners as training experts. Third, in the course of determining the worth of the

training program sessions, the HRD manager's ideas and beliefs were directly imposed on the

HRD assistant managers, who were his subordinates. Asymmetrical power relations in terms of

the organizational hierarchical structure were manifested as a major element of organizational

power to thwart different ideas and concerns. This phenomenon also showed that as a normative

assumption for HRD professionals, the dominant paradigm of Korean HRD community, which

stresses performance rather than informal learning, forced the HRD assistant managers to be

silenced in negotiating different ideas with the HRD manager. Fourth, learners' reactions were

privileged among the various types of evaluation input by the HRD practitioners. Since the HRD

practitioners needed to advocate their efforts explicitly to the corporate management to gain the

constant support of the management, it was imperative for them to demonstrate what the

corporate management wanted to see: positive learners' reactions.

Finally, the third set of findings involves an inquiry into the impact of power

relationships, especially between the HRD practitioners and others, on the evaluation outcomes.

The MLDC evaluation was conducted exclusively by the three HRD practitioners. Thus the HRD

practitioners' real interests in securing their status within the organization were uncovered as

dominant over other interests in shaping the evaluation outcomes. In terms of their real interests,

the content of the evaluation report produced was mostly skewed in a positive direction.

Moreover, the exclusive control of the HRD practitioners throughout the evaluation rendered the

evaluation findings relevant only for them; consequently, other stakeholders could not receive

relevant information about the program in terms of their needs. Nonetheless, while going through

the evaluation, the HRD practitioners felt constrained in terms of the organizational strategic

needs and expectations, both of which pertain to the characteristics of the organizational culture.

However, they made no attempt to alter the dominant organizational culture.

Conclusions and Discussion

Overall, this qualitative case study of a managerial leadership training program in a

Korean company reflects that the evaluation activities for the training program are enmeshed in

politics. As Weiss (1987, 1990, 1998, 2004) has repeatedly asserted, program evaluation is

political in three different senses: (a) programs are brought into being through a political process,

(b) evaluation results feed decision making and compete with other perspectives in the political process, and (c) evaluation is inherently political by its nature because of the conclusions it reaches. This study reflects these three characteristics. First, as shown in the chapter on findings, the MLDC was launched by an organizational mandate. Thus the needs and interests of the organizational management played a dominant role in the establishment and implementation of the program. Second, the evaluation report of the MLDC contained, for the most part, positive information about the program on behalf of the HRD practitioners' and the senior manager's interests. Accordingly, the consequences of the evaluation not only generated information or knowledge that might be useful in the configuration of the next program, but they also shaped the way that stakeholders think about the program in a positive way. Third, in a similar vein, the evaluation of the MLDC itself had a political stance. This suggests that the MLDC was generally consistent with the organizational strategic needs. In addition, by representing the HRD practitioners' real interest during the evaluation, the evaluation showed only the positive aspects of the HRD effort to implement the program. Indeed, "evaluation gives an aura of legitimacy to the enterprise" (Weiss, 2004, p. 158).

In line with this, from this study, three main conclusions about the impact of organizational power and politics on training program evaluation are drawn:

1. Both practical and structural forms of organizational power affect the process and outcomes of training program evaluation.

2. Organizational power affects the process and outcomes of the training program evaluation through stakeholders' self-regulation in accordance with organizational norms, standards, and expectations.

    3.   Organizational power relations drive HRD professionals to emphasize reaction

        measures.

I discuss these conclusions in terms of the existing literature in adult education, HRD,

organizational power and politics, and program evaluation. First, forms of power, in both a

practical sense and a structural sense, are discussed. I extensively discuss how unpacking power

has been conceptualized in the existing literature. Second, particularly in focusing on structural

power and politics, the mechanism of this form of power and politics is articulated. I suggest

how this type of power is mobilized during the course of the program evaluation. Third, the

politics of reaction measures is also discussed. In terms of the pervasive use of reaction measures

in HRD practice, I discuss why reaction measures are privileged and used in spite of severe

criticism.

Forms of Power: Practical and Structural

This study's findings show that varied forms of organizational power affect in either a

facilitating or inhibiting way the HRD practitioners' evaluation for training programs. In

particular, the aspects of power and politics are revealed as twofold. First, as educational

professionals in the workplace, the HRD practitioners exercised their power, which mainly

results from their *expertise* in training and development, in order to control the evaluation

process and the nature of the evaluation outcomes. This form of organizational power is practical

in that it involves the ability to get things done for the goals that the actors' attempt to meet

(Cervero & Wilson, 2001). Politics, the exercise of power, in the practical sense assumes "the

existing relations of power in the organizational or social setting as acceptable, or at least

unchangeable" (p. 6). Yet the concept of organizational power and politics is narrowly limited to

the interpersonal level in the organizational setting. This form of power can also be called functional because it is usually exercised in terms of the question, "how to."

In the case of the evaluation for the leadership development training program in a Korean company, the HRD practitioners exclusively conducted the evaluation due to their widely acknowledged training and development expertise in the organization. Furthermore, it was also evident that the HRD practitioners' *position and role status* within the organizational structure were major factors that conveyed their expertise. Expertise in training and development is conferred through the existing organization's bureaucratic, hierarchical structure in which the HRD practitioners occupy the position of educational professionals. For this reason, they were, therefore, legitimized to play a gatekeeping role for evaluation input while judging solely by themselves which information should be included or excluded in determining the merit and worth of the program. The politics of expertise of the HRD practitioners is practical because their expertise was used to filter the other stakeholders' input, and consequently, to generate positively skewed findings for the sake of their own interests. In addition, their expertise was regarded as legitimate within the existing organizational setting.

Now that this form of organizational power and politics mostly focuses on the exercise of power at the individual level, it seems to resonate with one-dimensional and two-dimensional views of power (Lukes, 1974). The one-dimensional view of power, which pertains to who influences the outcome of the decision making process and how power is exercised when conflict is observed in the process, illuminates the dominant power of the HRD practitioners throughout the evaluation process. Consequently, it also explains their huge influence on the evaluation outcomes while other stakeholders' voices are silenced. Furthermore, the HRD practitioners' gatekeeping work for evaluation input exhibits the two-dimensional view of power as well,

which involves their power to control access to the evaluation. The HRD practitioners' control of

channels for evaluation input indicates that their power "stands close to action, using the bases of

power to prevent access to the decision making arena and hence to ensure compliance" (Hardy &

Leiba-O'Sullivan, 1998, p. 455). Accordingly, the HRD practitioners not only excluded negative

information about the program, but also confined the evaluation agenda to relatively safe

questions.

Second, in the evaluation of the MLDC, the HRD practitioners were constrained by the

organizational strategic needs, expectations, and values that reflect, for the most part,

management interests and concerns. Interestingly, although the HRD practitioners were

recognized as power holders controlling the evaluation process and its outcomes by other

stakeholders, they perceived themselves as powerless. Their powerlessness in evaluating the

program is connected to the structural strand of organizational power and politics. In viewing the

HRD practitioners as social actors who are oppressed by structured power relations and politics

embedded in the organization's hierarchical system, the structural power and politics pertain to

the operation, exercise, and distribution of power within the social structure along various

positionality lines (Cervero & Wilson, 2001). This form of power is exercised through socially,

organizationally constructed meanings of an actor's positionality. More specifically, the politics

of the structural strand tends to be determined by an actor's positionality, the meaning and value

of which are constructed in terms of social relationships with others' positionality. Yet the

inequitable power relationship along one's positionality renders a certain group's interests to be

dominant over others in many organizational practices, and the hegemonic group's oppression is

invisibly legitimized in terms of meanings of positionality within the wider social relations. In

fact, power that is mobilized through structurally given asymmetrical relationships is ideological

and in turn hegemonic. Lukes (1974) articulates this ideological form of power:

> Power is often used to shape peoples' perceptions, cognitions, and preferences in such a
>
> way that they accept their role in the existing order of things, either because they can see
>
> or imagine no alternative to it, or because they view it as natural and unchangeable, or
>
> because they value it as divinely ordained and beneficial. (p. 24)

Many adult education scholars who view workplace learning from the critical perspective

(Cunningham, 2000; Fenwick, 2001; Newman, 1994; Schied, 2001; Solomon, 2001) have

focused on this form of power in the workplace in conjunction with the recurring question, "what

for."

In this study, deeply internalized in the HRD practitioners' minds, the organizational

strategic needs became a critical source of organizational power for their evaluation work. It was

repressive because the HRD practitioners were required to demonstrate a close linkage between

the training intervention results and the organizational needs in order to prevent marginalization

of HRD functions. What is more repressive to the HRD practitioners' evaluation is that the

MLDC was launched as an organizational mandate. This power is structural because the unequal

relationship between the HRD practitioners and the management is determined by their

relationship in the organizational structure. Hence, as organizational members, the HRD

practitioners are obligated to conduct the evaluation in terms of the organizational needs as

evaluation criteria. Repressive power of organizational strategic needs is not surprising in terms

of the strategic role of HRD. Several scholars, who suggest strategic HRD point out that an HRD

unit should be able to feed information or knowledge, offer and implement effective training

programs and facilitate organizational change in light of the requirement of the host organization

(Gilley & Maycunich, 2000; Rothwell & Kazanas, 1994; Swanson & Holton, 2001; Walton, 1999). Indeed, a sense of duty to be strategic governs the mindset of the HRD practitioners.

The two forms of power and politics, practical and structural, explain how the HRD practitioners become both dominant and marginalized at the same time. This phenomenon resonates with polyrhythmic realities referring to "how a person can be privileged by one characteristic and at the same time not be privileged by virtue of another" (Rocco & West, 1998, p. 173). In this sense, the experience of the HRD practitioners in this study is consistent with that of facilitators of practitioner inquiry groups in Drennon and Cervero's study (2002). While discussing facilitators' struggle around their own identity, Drennon and Cervero suggest that "facilitators occupy a privileged position in the hierarchy of organizationally-structured power relations; they are leaders. In spite of leadership status, however, facilitators may be lower-rung occupants in the social hierarchy based on identity characteristics including race, class, and sexual orientation" (p. 206). Although there are different causes of politics from this study, the reality of actors of two studies, the HRD practitioners in evaluating the training program and facilitators in supporting practitioner inquiry, is exactly the same: "constantly shifting identity" (Drennon & Cervero, 2002, p. 206).

Since they felt the organizational culture—which tended to be indifferent and skeptical toward HRD contribution to the organizational goals—prevented them from conducting an effective evaluation for the MLDC, the HRD practitioners perceived themselves as victims of organizational culture. The organizational strategic needs, values, and expectations shaped their evaluation practices and the evaluation outcomes in a hidden, repressive way. In the meantime, however, the findings reveal that the HRD practitioners played the role of gatekeepers for evaluation input throughout the evaluation process and when they produced the final evaluation

report. They exclusively judged which data were relevant for evaluation, what the data meant, how those data were analyzed, and in what ways they should be reported. Explicitly, such dominant control over the evaluation process and its outcomes greatly served their own real interests, which involved securing and advocating HRD roles and status within the host organization. Therefore, no matter what type of identity they maintained, either as the powerful or as the powerless, due to the impact of two different, but closely interrelated forms of power, it is evident that the HRD practitioners were *actually* the dominant players in evaluating the program.

These two forms of organizational power and politics do not exist separately but are interrelated. More specifically, the relationship between structural power and practical power is reciprocal as is the relationship between power and adult education. Cervero and Wilson (2001) suggest that power relations provide the grounds for actions in adult education; meanwhile power relations are also always acted on by adult education. Correspondingly, the practical strand of power and politics is mediated through the structural power relations of the organization, and the structural strand of power and politics is maintained and reproduced by organizational members' exercise of power. This study's findings illustrate this reciprocal relationship of two forms of power. On the one hand, in order for the HRD practitioners' expertise to become power, their expertise should be acknowledged as contextually pertinent, necessary, and valuable in terms of the dominant organizational value system. The organizational value system that reflects the organizationally structured power relationship legitimizes the HRD practitioners' expertise by forcing other organizational members to regard it as relevant. In doing so, the HRD practitioners can signal that they are professional in that the meaning of profession is dependent upon "the extent to which public and political authorities accept its credential as

necessary to provide a specific type of service" (Cervero, 1988, p. 10). In other words, it would not be sufficient just to hold expertise for exercising power; they should also be identified and perceived by other stakeholders as professionals in the training and development area. On the other hand, the structural power relations are maintained and reproduced by organizational members' practice. By using their power, the HRD practitioners deliberately generated findings that justify the organizational strategic needs and naturalize the current management practice. The expertise of the HRD practitioners served to justify the MLDC that was implemented as an organizational mandate by generating positively skewed findings in terms of organizational needs and expectations.

Mechanism of Power: Disciplinary Power

Throughout the evaluation of the MLDC, the structural strand of power and politics circulates in most stakeholders' activities. Taking for granted the power inequity that accompanies the positionality of each stakeholder group, stakeholders play their roles as they are expected in terms of their positions in the organization and their role status within the program evaluation. This form of power is ideological in the sense that stakeholders have already internalized socially constructed expectations and assumptions of their positions and roles, in turn, those internalized beliefs shape their practices invisibly.

The HRD practitioners readily conducted the evaluation in accordance with the organizational strategic needs. The organizationally imposed needs conveyed the power to make the HRD practitioners generate desirable and positive information about the program as a result of the evaluation. This organizational imposition produces apparent consensus and acquiescence on the part of the HRD practitioners by confining what is desirable, what is needed, and what is legitimate. Since they internalized such organizational needs, expectations, and values, the

ideological power of these elements became prominent tools for shaping the HRD practices. Instead of appealing to visible controls, these normative assumptions of the organization subjugate them as hidden cultural forms of domination (Hardy & Leiba-O'Sullivan, 1998). Thus, as an impact of this domination, the HRD practitioners felt powerless throughout the evaluation process. This sense of powerlessness became salient when it came to the nature of organizational culture, which was largely skeptical of training and learning. Although they were explicitly aware of the continuous marginalization of training efforts and its impact in this organizational culture, the HRD practitioners did not challenge their unprivileged positions. Rather, they took the nature of the organizational culture for granted while accepting that they did not have alternatives and that they must just obey the unfavorable culture to HRD functions. In consequence, the domination of managerial interests over HRD functions as the cultural form was maintained and reproduced.

The instructors also fully admitted their exclusion from the evaluation process and accepted their silenced voices in the evaluation outcomes in reference to the customer-oriented culture in the corporate training field of Korea. While identifying themselves as just training providers in the corporate training market, the instructors believed that it was natural for external instructors to be alienated from the program evaluation. Because of such identity constructed in terms of the cultural norms of corporate training market in Korea, the instructors did not challenge their disadvantage; in consequence, they could not use evaluation results at all.

The learners and their co-workers together unconsciously regarded their limited participation in the evaluation as acceptable. The learner in this study recalled that he had only received a summary of feedback about his activities and performance during the five-week program, but he did not receive any information about the overall program results. Similarly, the

learner's co-worker was not asked by the HRD practitioners to address any ideas, concerns, and opinions about the learner's attitude and behavior on the job. However, neither the learner nor his co-worker resisted this disenfranchised situation; rather they largely approved the situation because of their identity as non-professional people in training and development.

These illustrations of structural power relations inherent in the stakeholders' practice highlight that this form of power is exercised in a repressive way. That is to say, due to this power, most stakeholders in this program evaluation are likely to be prevented from full participation in the evaluation rather than be encouraged. Yet in terms of the subject of this power, it seems to be unclear who exercises this power, and more specifically, who manipulates the nature of the evaluation practice with this power. Critical theorists, in this regard, argue that ideological power serves to prevent overt conflict and to produce the acquiescence of the dominated on behalf of the dominant group's interests. Power is exercised to legitimate the status-quo trappings of current society's structures, rules, class mechanisms, and cultures (Hardy & Leiba-O'Sullivan, 1998). This critical theory perspective on power assumes that some appear as oppressors, and the others as the oppressed; power is exercised by an oppressor group against the oppressed through an integrated system of cultural and normative assumptions. In this vein, a good deal of research adopting the critical perspective to workplace learning argues that learning in the workplace is geared greatly toward silencing employees' voices while serving managerial needs (Carter, Howell, & Schied, 2001; Schied, Carter, Preston, & Howell, 1998; Schied, 2001; Schied, Carter, & Howell, 2001).

However, instead of endorsing the pervasive arguments in the area of critical workplace learning, this study's findings suggest that disciplinary power is the dominant form of power exercised in this study's setting. As Foucault (1980) articulates, this structurally mobilizing

power is never localized here or there, never in corporate management's hands, and never appropriated by a certain dominant group. Instead, this power was mobilized as a form of disciplinary power, a "type of power which is constantly exercised by means of surveillance" (Foucault, 1980, p. 104). Particularly, disciplinary power is exercised through self-surveillance. Disciplinary power is exercised less through the imposition of external, physical force than through its ability to bring about conformity through self-regulation because the mechanism of disciplinary power is ultimately grounded in the creation of disciplined subjects as individuals conforming to certain standards of competence, health, and intelligence (McKinlay & Starkey, 1998). Foucault asserts that these standards are implemented through power relations in the production of discourse of truth. That is to say, the system of right and the domain of the law, are permanent agents of the relations of domination and the polymorphous techniques of subjugation (Foucault, 1980).

When it comes to evaluation of the program, the HRD practitioners disciplined themselves about the organizational needs, expectations, and values through their organizational experiences, and examined why the MLDC operated in terms of these needs, how the program was supposed to be implemented, and what kind of results the organization might expect. Since they had already been fully assimilated into the organizational culture, there was no need for an external, coercive mechanism to force them to do so. They continuously watched themselves to see if they were on the right track in terms of the organizational culture comprising norms, values, and expectations. In addition, as shown in the case of negotiating the worth of the overseas field trip between the HRD manager and the two assistant managers, *the performance-oriented paradigm of the HRD community* in Korea became another important type of norm to which the HRD practitioners should refer in their mind for their practices.

In this study, the relationship between supervisors and subordinates, which reflects the rampant *Confucian cultural norms* of Korean society (Lee, 2001), appeared as one of the key sources of disciplinary power. When negotiating different ideas about the meaning of the field trip, the two assistant managers did not challenge the manager's arguments; rather they accepted those arguments while silencing their own voices. The predominance of the HRD manager's concerns over the assistant managers' stemmed from his position and work experiences. The position and work experience of the HRD manager can be transformed into power in terms of the broader Korean culture, which greatly mirrors Confucian thought. As a fundamental principle that rules the overall social order of Korean society, Confucianism suggests that there are some important ethical values that both superiors and subordinates should adopt together: (a) reciprocal ethical values between them are ritual, righteousness, faithfulness, and sincerity; (b) subordinates' ethical values are loyalty, filial piety, and respect; and (c) superiors' ethical values are forgiveness, benevolence, wisdom, and rectification (Lee, 2001). These ethical values not only justify the hierarchical relationship between supervisors and subordinates on an organizational level but also sustain sociopolitical order on a societal level. In this sense, Confucianism was played out as a governing cultural norm that reinforces the organizational code of ethics, and subsequently, the conduct of both the HRD manager and the assistant managers.

In addition, the male dominant composition of the learner group whose positions within the host organization were managers or higher managers seems to be also a reflection of patriarchy, which is closely connected to Confucian thought. Patriarchy is defined as a social structure and system of customs where the male, superior in hierarchy, dominates, oppresses, and exploits the female (Walby, 1990). It is a critical source of gender-based structural power. In

terms of Confucianism, it determines the unequal status of males and females in various sites of society ranging from the family to the workplace. In the context of the workplace, particularly, Jang and Merriam (2004) report that even though the number of women in the workplace has continuously increased in Korea, most of them are employed as sales or service "pink collar" workers. In this sense, it is not surprising to observe that all the learners were men because the main audience of the MLDC was the managerial group of the host organization. This case exactly represents the workplace circumstances in Korea that have been maintained and reproduced because of patriarchy.

In the case of the instructors, a dominant cultural norm of Korean HRD training market, *customer-oriented business culture*, determined and legitimized the asymmetrical relationship between the host organization and external instructors. This culture sets the norm of the Korean HRD training market on which disciplinary power is exercised. Similarly, the learner and the learner's co-worker were also made to internalize the discourse of *professionalism* that assumes a generally positive force of profession. The notion of profession is traditionally defined by virtue of the execution and effectiveness of expertise, assessing needs, designing instruction, planning programs, evaluating efforts, and the various other procedural activities that can be part of the professional identity of educators (Wilson, 2001). The learner and his co-worker considered alike that they do not have enough expertise to be regarded as training experts. Hence, norms underlying the discourse of professionalism affect their identity construction thereby both of them conceived themselves as irrelevant constituencies to participate in actual evaluation for the training program. In sum, disciplinary power was exercised on the learner and his co-worker who identified themselves as those who lacked expertise in terms of professionalism.

Politics of Reaction Measures

One interesting finding of this study is that learners' reactions were privileged among various types of evaluation input. In this research setting, the HRD practitioners, the senior manager, and the instructors were highly interested in the nature of learners' reactions. Although the HRD practitioners believed that learners' positive reactions could not guarantee the causal relationship between training results and performance improvement, they gave priority to such reaction measures as critical input for the evaluation, especially when developing the evaluation report. This phenomenon gives us a very important clue regarding why numerous HRD professionals emphasized and used reaction measures despite the severe criticism of such measures.

In terms of evaluation research in HRD, Kirkpatrick's four-level evaluation framework has been criticized because of its lack of causal relationship among each level (Holton, 1996). As a matter of fact, Kirkpartick (1998) argues that it is important not only to get a reaction but to get a positive reaction because the future of a training program depends upon positive reactions. In addition, he also insists there is a close relationship between reaction and learning in the sense that "if participants do not react favorably, they probably will not be motivated to learn" (p. 20). However, a good deal of research has shown that reaction measures have nearly no correlation with learning or performance outcome measures (Alliger & Janak, 1989; Holton, 1996; Swanson & Holton, 2001). For example, Alliger and Janak note that only 12 articles reported correlations between levels in training programs out of 203 articles that reported any type of evaluation results. In spite of the lack of empirical evidence for the causal relationship between reaction measures and other measures, however, many HRD professionals are still likely to conduct evaluation at the reaction level. This case study's practitioners were no exception.

Why, then, do HRD professionals look upon the learners' reactions as the paramount measures? This study offers a significant answer to this question. It suggests that reaction measures become political leverage to endorse the validity of HRD to the corporate management. In this sense, the following comments highlight this point:

> Measuring reaction is important and easy to do. It is important because the decisions of top management may be based on what they have heard about the training program. It is important to have tangible data that reactions are favorable. It is important also because the interests, attention, and motivation of participants have much to do with the learning that occurs. Still another reason why it is important is that trainees are customers, and customer satisfaction has a lot to do with repeat business. (Kirkpatrick, 1998, p. 38)

As expressed by the senior manager, the management is often interested in receiving positive reactions from learners. Since the management considered positive reactions of the learners as a critical component of a successful training program, it was necessary for the HRD practitioners to offer information that met the management's priority for assessing the program. Hence, the emphasis on reaction measures is evidently political in that the HRD practitioners accepted the management's interest instead of their own interest in evaluating the program in terms of the intended learning objectives. They included learners' reactions in the evaluation report because they seemed to be valued by the corporate management. In sum, in the field of HRD, although they do not indicate direct relationships with learning and performance outcomes, reaction measures are of importance because they are what the management strives to see and what the management uses to judge the worth of the training program. By providing positive reactions, therefore, HRD professionals can find a place to bargain with the management for ensuring the HRD status in the organization.

In a similar vein, why evaluations at the levels of learning, behavior, and organizational results were largely overlooked in practice could also be explained. In this case study, it is interesting that most HRD practitioners in the host organization were very knowledgeable about the state-of-the-art information and skills in the HRD field. Some of the HRD practitioners annually attend the American Society for Training and Development (ASTD) conference to obtain updated knowledge and skills. Hence, they knew what new skills and expertise are helpful and what they were supposed to do in order to attain higher levels of evaluation as professional HRD practitioners. However, in practice, they largely failed to apply these updated knowledge and skills to their evaluation practices. They did not appropriately assess the worth of the MLDC in terms of its impact on the learners' behavior change and on the organizational improvement. This paradox can be explained by the notion of theories of action (Argyris & Schön, 1974). Argyris and Schön make a distinction between two contrasting theories of action: espoused theory and theory-in-use. Espoused theories pertain to what we are supposed to do, whereas theories-in-use are the theories of action that govern actual behavior. As they put it,

> When someone is asked how he would behave under certain circumstances, the answer he usually gives is his espoused theory of action for that situation. This is the theory of action to which he gives allegiance, which, upon request, he communicates to others. However, the theory that actually governs his actions is this theory-in-use. (Argyris & Schön, 1974, pp. 6-7)

The disparity between their espoused theory and theory-in-use was dramatically depicted in the HRD practitioners' attempt to reformulate their interest. They expressed their interest in demonstrating the impact of HRD interventions on job performance in accordance with their espoused theory. However, in reality, the HRD practitioners' evaluation process and its

outcomes were unveiled to serve not their expressed interests but their real interest, which was securing their role status within the host organization in terms of their theory-in-use. While recognizing that their espoused interests conflicted with the management's interest, the HRD practitioners negotiated their interest with the management's interest, and reformulated their own interest to avoid any possible struggle. This study's findings show that organizational power relations of the HRD practitioners resulted in the conflict between the HRD practitioners' espoused theory and their theory-in-use. Consequently the HRD practitioners were compelled to focus on reaction measures while ignoring other levels of evaluation measures against their espoused theory.

In conclusion, this case study shows that there are asymmetrical power relations resulting from several forms of organizational power among stakeholders. The organizational power disseminated in this research setting was grounded in the HRD practitioners' expertise and the stakeholders' positions and roles in and around the program evaluation. Moreover, this study shows that the internalized cultural values of the organization, the cultural assumptions of the relationship between the host organization and external instructors in the HRD community of Korea, and professionalism were also influential on the stakeholders' practices during the evaluation in a hidden way. This form of power was circulated in this program evaluation setting through a mechanism of actors' self-regulation rather than through designed manipulation of some dominant parts within the organization. These ideological factors were revealed as critical to shape the stakeholders' perceptions, attitudes, and behaviors. In turn, both the evaluation process and its outcomes are identified as constructions of these organizational power relations.

Implications for Research and Practice

In adopting the theoretical framework of power and politics that delineates how social actors are constrained or enabled by their own interests and by the power relationships in their settings (Cervero & Wilson, 1994, 2001), this study is devoted to analyzing how the embedded and manifold power relationships among stakeholders affect the evaluation process of a leadership training program and its outcomes. By analyzing data using constant comparative analysis, a popular qualitative data analysis method, how organizational power relations and politics affect both the evaluation process and its outcomes are critically examined. This study has shown that the organizational power permeating this case program evaluation setting was exercised in terms of the HRD practitioners' expertise and the stakeholders' positions and roles in and around the program evaluation. In addition, the cultural values of the organization and the dominant discourses in the HRD community of Korea were captured as critical, invisible vehicles to shape the stakeholders' attitudes and activities during the evaluation for the training program.

This study offers some implications for training evaluation in HRD research and practice. In reflecting the stakeholders' experiences, this study describes how each organizational member works together during the evaluation for the training program through the lens of organizational power and politics. As a result, this study suggests that evaluation of training programs is inherently a political process in which HRD practitioners are mostly involved in fulfilling their interests under certain individual and organizational constraints. So far, most of the contemporary studies of training program evaluation have been conducted in a prescriptive way. For example, what types of factors we should consider in developing plausible evaluation models, and how, as HRD professionals, we should carry out evaluation for training programs

have been the primary issues. In addition to these studies, more studies are still needed to understand stakeholders' experiences during training evaluation in the field of HRD. Several questions need further inquiries: (a) how stakeholders interact with each other in assessing training program results, (b) how various types of organizational factors affect each actor's evaluation practice either positively or negatively, and (c) how evaluation results of training programs are used in developing next programs. By suggesting more knowledge about the stakeholders' experiences from their own perspective, descriptive studies can contribute to the development of more plausible, realistic training evaluation models. Organizational power and politics can appropriately frame these inquiries, which have tended to be descriptive.

Furthermore, more studies are needed to examine different aspects of evaluation processes and outcomes depending upon the characteristics of programs and the organizational context. This study has been designed as a single case study to provide a rich description and interpretation of the multifaceted power relations in the case program evaluation context. However, in order to examine what factors are influential and how those factors shape the aspects of program evaluation spontaneously, cross case, comparative case studies are needed. By looking at a range of similar and contrasting cases, we can understand how and where, and if possible, why certain factors matter (Merriam, 1998).

In terms of practice, this study suggests that HRD professionals should be aware of power inequity among stakeholders when implementing evaluations of HRD programs. Although they still cannot escape from the discursive network of power throughout organizational practices, they can conduct evaluation responsibly while recognizing that structurally asymmetrical power relations among stakeholders not only hinder the democratic evaluation process but also distort its outcomes. Recognizing HRD practitioners' role as political

actors within organizations is critical to ensuring appropriate HRD evaluations for all possible stakeholders' needs. Considering that they hold dominant power throughout the evaluation as gatekeepers, it is essential for HRD professionals to recognize the influence of organizational power and politics on HRD evaluations. Particularly, instead of exercising their power to keep stakeholders distant from the evaluation table and to control stakeholders' input deliberately, HRD professionals should exercise power to encourage and secure continuous communication with the program stakeholders from the stage of program needs assessment to the stage of the evaluation report. In so doing, they could continually examine the direction and method of evaluation of training programs in order to avoid politically biased evaluation. Politically slanted evaluation results constrains of not only the extent to which possible stakeholders actively participate in the evaluation process but also limit the range of evaluation users to HRD professionals only. HRD professionals can generate findings that are relevant conceptually, instrumentally, or symbolically only by guaranteeing inclusion of all stakeholders' interests and needs. Furthermore, facilitating democratic interactions between HRD professionals and stakeholders during the evaluation process can also help process use to be optimized because process use can be achieved by collaboration among participants focusing on their intended use of evaluation.

In brief, stakeholders' participation in the evaluation not only enhances the validity of evaluation results for all stakeholder groups but also guarantees the benefits of all stakeholder groups resulting from the process of evaluation. In this sense, while dealing with power and politics responsibly, HRD professionals can foster the utilization of both the evaluation process and the findings.

This study, by stressing stakeholder inclusion and the impact of power relations on HRD evaluations, also suggests that cooperation with stakeholders is critical to enhancing socially conscious HRD. Defining socially conscious HRD as a practice that "serves an educative and supportive role to help organizations use their resources to benefit their stakeholders" (p. 377), Bierema and D'Abundo (2004) suggest that socially conscious HRD requires that organizational practices be implemented democratically and involve a diverse range of stakeholders. Likewise, evaluations for various HRD interventions that draw on a stakeholder perspective can also be a vital vehicle for ensuring HRD responsibility for social issues and expectations. Indeed, stakeholder-based HRD evaluation serves to generate relevant, profitable knowledge and information that is geared toward enhancing organizational consciousness of its responsibility to the broader society. At the same time, such evaluation provides opportunities for stakeholders and HRD professionals to reflect their sense of duty not only at the organizational level, but also at the societal level.

REFERENCES

Abma, T. A., & Stake, R. E. (2001). Stake's responsive evaluation: Core ideas and evolution. In J. C. Greene & T. A. Abma (Eds.) *Responsive evaluation* (pp. 7-21). New Directions for Evaluation, No. 92. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Alkin, M. C., & Taut, S. M. (2003). Unbundling evaluation use. *Studies in Educational Evaluation, 29*, 1-12.

Alliger, G. M., & Janak, E. A. (1989). Kirkpatrick's levels of training criteria: Thirty years later. *Personal Psychology, 42*, 331-340.

Argyris, C., & Schön, D. A. (1974). Theory in practice: Increasing professional effectiveness. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bandura, A. (1995). Exercise of personal and collective efficacy in changing societies. In A. Bandura (Ed.), *Self-efficacy in changing societies* (pp. 1-45). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Bierema, L. L., & D'Abundo, M. L. (2004). HRD with a conscience: practicing socially responsible HRD. *International Journal of Lifelong Education, 23*(5), 371-386.

Brinkerhoff, R. O. (1987). *Achieving results from training*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Brinkerhoff, R. O., & Apking, A. M. (2001). *High-impact learning: Strategies for leveraging business results from training*. Cambridge, MA : Perseus.

Brookfield, S. (2001). Unmasking power: Foucault and adult learning. *Canadian Journal for Study of Adult Education, 15*(1), 1-23.

Brooks, A. K. (1994). Power and the production of knowledge: Collective team learning in work organization. *Human Resource Development Quarterly, 5*(3), 213-235.

Burnham, B. R. (1995). *Evaluating human resources, programs, and organizations*. Malabar, FL: Krieger.

Burrell, G. (1998). Modernism, postmodernism, and organizational analysis: The contribution of Michel Foucault. In A. McKinlay & K. Starkey (Eds.), *Foucault, management, and organization theory* (pp.14-28). London: Sage.

Carter, V. K., Howell, S. L., & Schied, F. M. (2001). *Education as function of productivity: An hermeneutic study of standards on ethics and integrity in human resource development texts*. Paper presented at the 42nd Adult Education Research Conference. East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University.

Cervero, R. M. (1988). *Effective continuing education for professionals*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Cervero, R. M., & Wilson, A. L. (1994). *Planning responsibly for adult education: A guide to negotiating power and interests*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Cervero, R. M., & Wilson, A. L. (2001). At the heart of practice: The struggle for knowledge and power. In R. M. Cervero, A. L. Wilson, & Associates, *Power in practice: Adult education and the struggle for knowledge and power in society* (pp. 1-20). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Chen, H. (1990). *Theory-driven evaluation*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Chen, H., & Rossi, P. H. (1992). Integrating theory into evaluation practice. In H. Chen & P. H. Rossi (Eds.), *Using theory to improve program and policy evaluations* (pp. 1-11). Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Clegg, S. R. (1989). Radical revisions: Power, discipline, and organizations. *Organizational Studies, 10*(1), 97-105.

Clegg, S. R. (1998). Foucault, power, and organizations. In A. McKinlay & K. Starkey (Eds.),
Foucault, management, and organization theory (pp. 29-48). London: Sage.

Conrad, C. (1983). Organizational power: Faces and symbolic forms. In L. Putnam & M.
Pacanowsky (Eds.), *Communication and organizations: An interpretive approach* (pp. 173-194). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Clayson, Z., Castaneda, X., Sanchez, E., & Brindis, C. (2002). Unequal power-changing
landscapes: Negotiations between evaluation stakeholders in Latino communities. *American Journal of Evaluation, 23*(1), 33-44.

Creswell, J. W. (2003). *Research design* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Cronbach, L. J. (1980). *Toward reform of program evaluation*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Crotty, M. (1998). *The foundations of social research*. London: Sage.

Crozier, M. (1973). The problem of power. *Social Research, 40*, 211-228.

Cunningham, P. M. (2000). A sociology of adult education. In A. L. Wilson & E. R. Hayes
(Eds.), *Handbook of adult and continuing education: New edition* (pp. 573-591). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Deetz, S., & Mumby, D. K. (1990). Power, discourse, and the workplace: Reclaiming the critical
tradition. *Communication* Yearbook, 13, 18-47.

Denzin, N. K. (1978). *The research act: A theoretical introduction to sociological methods*. New
York: McGraw-Hill.

Drennon, C. E., & Cervero, R. M. (2002). The politics of facilitation in practitioner inquiry
groups. *Adult Education Quarterly, 52*(3), 193-209.

Fenwick, T. (2001). Tides of change: New themes and questions in workplace learning. In T.

    Fenwick (Ed.), *Sociocultural perspectives on learning through work* (pp. 3-17). New

    Directions for Adult and Continuing Education, No. 92. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Ferris, G. R., & Kacmar, K. M. (1992). Perceptions of organizational politics. *Journal of*

    Management, 18(1), 93-116.

Fetterman, D. M. (1996). Empowerment evaluation: An introduction to theory and practice. In

    D. M. Fetterman, S. Kaftarian, & A. Wandersman (Eds.), *Empowerment evaluation:*

    Knowledge and tools for self-assessment and accountability. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Fetterman, D. M. (1997). Empowerment evaluation: A response to Patton and Scriven.

    Evaluation Practice, 18(3), 253-266.

Fetterman, D. M. (2002). Empowerment evaluation: Building communities of practice and a

    culture of learning. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 30*(1), 89-102.

Fontana, A., & Frey, J. H. (2000). The interview: From structured questions to negotiated text. In

    N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.) *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed.) (pp. 645-

    672). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Foucault, M. (1977). *Discipline and punish: The birth of prison*. New York: Penguin.

Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings 1972-1977*. New

    York: Pantheon Books.

Forester, J. (1989). *Planning in the face of power*. Los Angeles: University of California Press.

French, J. R. P., & Raven, B. (2001). The bases of social power. In J. M. Shafritz & S. J. Ott

    (Eds.), Classics of organization theory (pp. 319-328). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth. (Reprinted

    from *Studies in social power*, pp. 150-167, by D. P. Cartwright, Ed., 1959, Ann Arbor, MI:

    The University of Michigan)

Garavan, T. N. (1995). HRD stakeholders: Their philosophies, values, expectations and evaluation criteria. *Journal of European Industrial Training 19*(10), 17-30.

Gilley, J. W., & Maycunich, A. (2000). *Organizational learning, performance and change*. Cambridge, MA: Perseus.

Gold, N. (1983). Stakeholders and program evaluation: Characterization and reflections. In A. S. Bryk (Ed.), *Stakeholder-based evaluation* (pp. 63-72) New Directions for Program Evaluation, No.14. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Gosling, D. (2000). Using Habermas to evaluate two approaches to negotiated assessment. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education, 25*(3), 293-305.

Greene, J. C. (1997). Evaluation as advocacy. *Evaluation Review, 18*, 25-35.

Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1989). *Fourth generation evaluation*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Hardy, C., & Clegg, S. R. (1996). Some dare call it power. In S. R. Clegg, C. Hardy, & W. R. Nord (Eds.), *Handbook of organization studies* (pp. 622-641). London: Sage.

Hardy, C., & Leiba-O'Sullivan, S. (1998). The power behind empowerment: Implications for research and practice. *Human Relations, 51*(4), 451-483.

Hickson, D. J., Hinings, C. R., Lee, C. A., Schneck, R. E., & Pennings, J. M. (1971). A strategic contingencies theory of intraorganizational power. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 17*, 216-229.

Hodder, I. (1998). The interpretation of documents and material culture. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Collecting and interpreting qualitative materials* (pp.110-129). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Holton, E. F. (1996). The flawed four-level evaluation model. *Human Resource Development Quarterly, 7*(1), 5-21.

House, E. R., & Howe, K. R. (2000a). Deliberative democratic evaluation. In K. Ryan & L. DeStefano (Eds.), *Evaluation as a democratic process: Promoting inclusion, dialogue, and deliberation* (pp. 3-12). New Directions for Evaluation, No. 85. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

House, E. R., & Howe, K. R. (2000b). Deliberative democratic evaluation in practice. In D. L. Stufflebeam, G. F. Madaus, & T. Kellaghan (Eds.), *Evaluation models: Viewpoints on educational and human services evaluation* (pp. 409-421). Boston: Kluwer Academic.

House, E. R. (2001). Responsive evaluation (and its influence on deliberative democratic evaluation). In J. C. Greene & T. A. Abma (Eds.) *Responsive evaluation* (pp. 23-30). New Directions for Evaluation, No. 92. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

House, E. R. (2003). Stakeholder bias. In C. A. Christie (Ed.), *The practice-theory relationship in evaluation* (pp. 53-56). New Directions for Evaluation, No. 97. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Inglis, T. (1997). Empowerment and emancipation. *Adult Education Quarterly, 48*(1), 3-17.

Jang, S. Y., & Merriam, S. (2004). Korean culture and the reentry motivations of university-graduated women. *Adult Education Quarterly, 54*(4), 273-290.

Lee, J. (2001). Confucian thoughts affecting leadership and organizational culture of Korean higher education. *Radical Pedagogy, 3*(1). Retrieved November 20, 2004, from http://radicalpedagogy.icaap.org/content/issue3_3/5-lee.html

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Kaufman, R., & Keller, J. M. (1994). Levels of evaluation: Beyond Kirkpatrick. *Human Resource Development Quarterly, 5*(4), 371-380.

Kirkpatrick, D. L. (1998). *Evaluating training programs: The four levels*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.

Krathwohl, D. R. (1998). *Methods of educational and social science research*. New York: Longman.

Kvale, S. (1996). *InterViews*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Lukes, S. (1974). *Power: A radical view*. London: Macmillan.

Madison, A. M. (2000). Language in defining social problems and in evaluating social programs. In R. K. Hopson (Ed.), *How and why language matters in evaluation* (pp. 55-67). New Directions for Evaluation, No. 86. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Marquardt, M. J. (2004). *Optimizing the power of action learning*. Palo Alto, CA: Davies-Black Publishing.

Mason, J. (2002). *Qualitative researching*. London: Sage.

Maxwell, J. A. (2002). Understanding and validity in qualitative research. In A. M. Huberman & M. B. Miles (Eds.), *The qualitative researcher's companion* (pp. 37-64). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

McKinlay, A., & Starkey. K. (1998). Managing Foucault: Foucault, management and organization theory. In A. McKinlay & K. Starkey (Eds.), *Foucault, management, and organization theory* (pp.1-13). London: Sage.

Merriam, S. B. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study application in education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Michalski, G. V., & Cousins, J. B. (2000). Differences in stakeholder perceptions about training evaluation: A concept mapping/pattern matching investigation. *Evaluation and Program Planning, 23*, 211-230.

Michalski, G. V., & Cousins, J. B. (2001). Multiple perspectives on training evaluation: Probing stakeholder perceptions in a global network development firm. *American Journal of Evaluation, 22*(1), 37-53.

Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Mintzberg, H. (1983). *Power in and around organizations*. Englewood, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Morgan, G. (1998). *Images of organization*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Mumby, D. K. (1988). *Communication and power in organizations: Discourse, ideology and domination*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Mumby, D. K. (2001). Power and politics. In F. M. Jablin & L. L. Putnam (Eds.). *The new handbook of organizational communication* (pp. 585-623). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Newcomer, K. E. (1997). Using performance measurement to improve programs. In K. E. Newcomer (Ed.), *Using performance measurement to improve public and nonprofit programs* (pp. 5-14). New Directions for Evaluation, No. 75. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Newman, M. (1994). *Defining the enemy: Adult education in social action*. Sydney, AU: Stewart Victor Publishing.

Palumbo, D. J. (1987). Politics and evaluation. In D. J. Palumbo (Ed.) *The politics of program evaluation* (pp. 12-46). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Patton, M. Q. (1987a). Evaluation's political inherency: Practical implications for design and use. In D. J. Palumbo (Ed.), *The politics of program evaluation* (pp. 100-145). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Patton, M. Q. (1987b). *How to use qualitative methods in evaluation*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Patton, M. Q. (1997). *Utilization-focused evaluation*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Patton, M. Q. (2000a). Utilization-focused evaluation. In D. L. Stufflebeam, G. F. Madaus, & T. Kellaghan (Eds.), *Evaluation models: Viewpoints on educational and human services evaluation* (pp. 425-438). Boston: Kluwer Academic.

Patton, M. Q. (2000b). Overview: Language matters. In R. K. Hopson (Ed.), *How and why language matters in evaluation* (pp. 5-16). New Directions for Evaluation. No. 86. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Peshkin, A. (1988). In search of subjectivity-one's own. *Educational Researcher, 17*(7), 17-21.

Pfeffer, J. (1981). *Power in organizations*. Marshfield, MA: Pitman.

Phillips, J. J. (1997). *Handbook of training evaluation and measurement methods* (3rd ed.). Houston, TX: Gulf Publishing.

Phillips, J. J. (2003). *Return on investment in training and performance improvement programs* (2nd ed.). Burlington, MA: Butterworth-Heinemann.

Phillips, J. J., & Stone, R. D. (2002). *How to measure training results*. New York: McGrow-Hill.

Potterfield, T. A. (1999). *The business of employee empowerment: Democracy and ideology in the workplace*. Westport, CT: Quorum.

Preskill, H., & Torres, R. T. (1999). *Evaluative inquiry for learning in organizations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Preskill, H., Zuckerman, B., & Matthews, B. (2003). An exploratory study of process use: Findings and implications for future research. *American Journal of Evaluation, 24*(4), 423-442.

Rossi, P. H., Freeman, H. E., & Lipsey, M. W. (1999). *Evaluation: A systematic approach* (6th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Rocco, T. S., & West, G. W. (1998). Deconstructing privilege: An examination of privilege in adult education. *Adult Education Quarterly, 48*(3), 171-184.

Rothwell, W. J., & Kazanas, H. C. (1994). *Human resource development: A strategic approach*. Amherst, MA: HRD Press.

Russ-Eft, D., & Preskill, H. (2001). *Evaluation in organizations*. Cambridge, MA: Perseus.

Ryan, G. W., & Bernard, H. R. (2000). Data management and analysis methods. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.) *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed.) (pp. 769-802). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Schied, F. M., Carter, V. K., Preston, J. A., & Howell, S. L. (1997). *The HRD factory: An historical inquiry into the production of control in the workplace*. Paper presented at the 27th Annual SCUTREA Conference. Birkbeck College at University of London.

Schied, F. M., Carter, V. K., Preston, J. A., & Howell, S. L. (1998). Complicity and control in the workplace: A critical case study of TQM, learning and the management of knowledge. *International Journal of Lifelong Education, 17*(3), 157-172.

Schied, F. M., Carter, V. K., & Howell, S. L. (2001). Silent power: HRD and the management of learning in the workplace. In R. M. Cervero, A. L. Wilson, & Associates. *Power in practice: Adult education and the struggle for knowledge and power in society* (pp. 42-59). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Schied, F. M. (2001). Struggling to learn, learning to struggle: Workers, workplace learning, and the emergence of human resource development. In V. Sheared & P. A. Sissel (Eds.),

Making space: Reframing theory and practice in adult education (pp. 124-137). New York: Greenwood.

Scott, J. (2001). *Power*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Solomon, N. (2001). Workplace learning as a cultural technology. In T. Fenwick (Ed.), *Sociocultural perspectives on learning through work* (pp. 41-51). New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education, No. 92. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Stake, R. E. (1975). To evaluate an arts program. In R. E. Stake (Ed.) *Evaluating the arts in education: A responsive approach* (pp. 13-32), Columbus, OH: Charles E. Merrill.

Stake, R. E. (1983). Stakeholder influence in the evaluation of cities-in-schools. In A. S. Bryk (Ed.), *Stakeholder-based evaluation* (pp. 15-30). New Directions for Program Evaluation, No.14. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Stake, R. E. (1994). Case study. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp.236-247). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Stake, R. E. (2000). Program evaluation, particularly responsive evaluation. In D. L. Stufflebeam, G. F. Madaus, & T. Kellaghan (Eds.), *Evaluation models: Viewpoints on educational and human services evaluation* (pp. 343-362). Boston: Kluwer Academic.

Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1998). *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Stufflebeam, D. L. (2001). Evaluation models. In D. L. Stufflebeam (Ed.) *Evaluation models* (pp. 7-98). New Directions for Evaluation, No. 89. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Swanson, R. A. (1989). Everything important in business and industry is evaluated. In R. O. Brinkerhoff (Ed.) *Evaluating training programs in business and industry* (pp. 71-82). New Directions for Program Evaluation, No. 44. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Swanson, R. A., & Holton, E. F. (2001). *Foundations of human resource development*. San

    Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.

Thomas, K. W., & Velthouse, B. A. (1990). Cognitive elements of empowerment: An

    'interpretive' model of intrinsic task motivation. *Academy of Management Review, 15*(4),

    666-681.

Walby, S. (1990). *Theorizing patriarchy*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.

Walton, J. (1999). *Strategic human resource development*. London: Prentice Hall.

Weiss, C. H. (1983a). The stakeholder approach to evaluation: Origins and promise. In A. S.

    Bryk (Ed.), *Stakeholder-based evaluation* (pp. 3-14). New Directions for Program

    Evaluation, No. 14. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Weiss, C. H. (1983b). Toward the future of stakeholder approaches in evaluation. In A. S. Bryk

    (Ed.), *Stakeholder-based evaluation* (pp. 83-96). New Directions for Program Evaluation,

    No.14. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Weiss, C. H. (1987). Where politics and evaluation research meet. In D. J. Palumbo (Ed.), *The

    politics of program evaluation* (pp. 47-72). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Weiss, C. H. (1990). Evaluation for decisions. In M. C. Alkin (Ed.), *Debates on evaluation* (pp.

    171-184). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Weiss, C. H. (1998). *Evaluation* (2nd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Weiss, C. H. (2004). Rooting for evaluation: A cliff notes version of my work. In M. C. Alkin

    (Ed.), *Evaluation roots* (pp. 153-168). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Wilson, A. L. (2001). Professionalization: A politics of identity. In C. A. Hansman & P. A.

    Sissel (Eds.), *Understanding and negotiating the political landscape of adult education* (pp.

73-83). New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education, No. 91. San Francisco: Jossey-

Bass.

Wolcott, H. F. (1994). *Transforming qualitative data*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Yin, R. K. (2003). *Case study research: Design and methods* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA:

Sage.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

CONSENT FORM (English)

I, _____, agree to participate in a research study titled "Politics of evaluation for training programs" conducted by Hanbyul Kim from the Department of Adult Education at the University of Georgia (1-706-355-9136 in US / 031-285-2050 in Korea) under the direction of Dr. Ronald M. Cervero, Department of Adult Education, University of Georgia (1-706-542-2221). I understand that my participation is voluntary. I can stop taking part without giving any reason, and without penalty. I can ask to have all of the information about me returned to me, removed from the research records, or destroyed. The reason for this study is to explore the influence of stakeholders on determining the merit and worth of an on going training program.

If I volunteer to take part in this study, I will be asked to do the following things:

1) Participate in an individual face-to-face interview, which will take 60-90 minutes to answer questions about my experiences with evaluation for a training program
2) Admit researcher's access to the evaluation meeting that I participate
3) My answers to the questions are being tape-recorded.
4) My answers with a pseudonym on the audio-tape and transcript will be stored until the end of study, December 31, 2004
5) Supply the researcher documents for this research study

From this research project, no risks are anticipated. I will be given an opportunity to reflect on my experiences and thoughts of the evaluation process for a training program that has been offered within my organization. Nevertheless, if I feel uncomfortable or experience stress, or I want to stop participating in this study, I am free to withdraw from the research project at any time without any penalty.

No information about me including my real name will be shared with other people without my written permission, except if required by law.

The researcher will contact at 1-706-355-9136 in US, 031-285-285-2050 in Korea or hanbyul@uga.edu, and answer any further questions about the research, now or during the course of the project.

I understand that I am agreeing by my signature on this form to take part in this research project and understand that I will receive a signed copy of this consent form for my records.

_____   _____   _____
Name of Researcher   *Signature*   *Date*

Telephone: _____

Email: _____

_____   _____   _____
Name of Participant   **Signature**   **Date**

Please sign both copies, keep one and return one to the researcher.
Additional questions or problems regarding your rights as a research participant should be addressed to Chris A. Joseph, Ph.D. Human Subjects Office, University of Georgia, 606A Boyd Graduate Studies Research Center, Athens, Georgia 30602-7411; Telephone 1-706-542-3199; E-Mail Address IRB@uga.edu

APPENDIX B

동 의 서 (Korean)

(   )은/는 미국 조지아 대학교 성인교육과 박사과정에 재학중인 김한별(미국 1-706-355-9136 / 한국 031-285-2050)이 Dr. Ronald M. Cervero(1-706-542-2221) 지도로 박사학위 청구논문으로 준비중인 Politics of evaluation for training programs 을 위한 연구참여에 동의합니다. 나는 본 연구에의 참여가 전적으로 자의에 의한 것임에 동의하며, 내가 원할 때면 언제든지 아무런 불이익 없이 참여를 중단할 수 있음을 확인합니다. 또한 본 연구에 제공되는 나와 관련된 모든 정보들에 대해서 회수 및 파기를 요구할 수 있는 권리가 있음을 확인합니다.

본 연구는 회사에서 진행중인 교육훈련 프로그램 평가에 이해 관계자들이 어떤 영향을 미치는지, 그에 따라서 평가과정 및 결과가 어떤 양상을 보이는지를 탐색할 목적으로 수행되고 있습니다.

본 연구에 참여하는 동안 나는 다음의 사항에 대해서 연구자에 협조할 의무를 가집니다.

1) 약 60-90분 정도 진행될 개별 인터뷰를 통해서 교육훈련 프로그램 평가와 관련된 나의 경험을 기술합니다.
2) 내가 참여하는 프로그램 평가회의에 연구자가 참관할 수 있도록 허가합니다.
3) 내가 인터뷰에서 기술하는 내용은 분석을 위해서 모두 녹음됩니다.
4) 인터뷰는 가명을 사용하여 진행되며 녹음된 인터뷰 자료는 본 연구가 종료되는 2004년 12월 31일까지 보관될 것입니다.
5) 연구자가 요청하는 기타 필요한 자료들을 제공합니다.

본 연구에 참여함으로써 나는 우리 회사에서 실시하고 있는 교육훈련 프로그램 평가를 수행하면서 가졌던 생각이나 경험들을 돌아 볼 수 있는 기회를 가질 수 있습니다. 따라서 연구에의 참여가 전반적으로 향후 프로그램 평가를 계획, 수행할 때 유용할 것으로 기대되기는 하나, 개인적 사정으로 참여를 중단하고자 할 경우에는 언제 어디서든지 어떤 불이익도 없이 그만둘 수 있습니다.

나의 실명을 비롯한 모든 개인적 정보는 내가 문서로 허가하지 않는 이상 연구자 이외의 타인에게 공개될 수 없습니다.

본 연구참여와 관련해서 의문사항이나 요구사항이 있을 경우에는 미국 1-706-355-9136, 한국 031-285-2050, 또는 이메일 hanbyul@uga.edu을 통해서 연구자와 연락할 수 있습니다.

본 동의서에 서명함으로써 연구참여를 확인하며, 서명한 동의서는 각 1 부씩 연구자와 본인이 갖습니다.

김한별

_____   _____   _____
연구자 이름   서 명   날 짜

031-285-2050/1-706-355-9136
_____
전화번호

hanbyul@uga.edu
_____
이메일

_____   _____   _____
연구 참여자   서 명   날 짜

APPENDIX C

Interview Guide (English)

(HRD practitioners & Management)

1. Tell me about your most recent or current experience with participation in the training

    program.

    - What were your initial expectations and interests in the training program?

    - What was your role in the training program?

    - Why did you participate in the training program?

2. Tell me about what you did during the program evaluation.

    - What were your feelings and thoughts about the evaluation process?

    - What were the issues that people disagreed about during the evaluation?

    - How did you react to the disagreement?

    - What were your feelings or thoughts about the disagreement?

3. Tell me about what the evaluation outcomes were.

    - What ideas or thoughts came up in your mind about the evaluation results?

    - Did you have any unexpected results as a consequence of the evaluation? If yes, what

      was that? And why did it happen?

    - How were your ideas about the evaluation results different from other people's?

    - How would you use the evaluation results?

4. Tell me about your overall feelings and concerns about the training program.

APEENDIX D

인터뷰 가이드 (Korean)
(교육훈련 담당자 및 관리자)

1. 귀하의 회사에서 최근 혹은 현재 실시하고 있는 교육훈련 프로그램에 대해서 말씀해주십시오.

   - 교육훈련 프로그램에 대해서 귀하께서 가졌던 처음에 가졌던 기대나 혹은 생각은 어떠했습니까?
   - 본 프로그램에 있어서 귀하는 어떤 역할을 하셨습니까?
   - 본 프로그램에 관여하게 된 동기나 이유는 무엇이었습니까?

2. 본 교육훈련 프로그램 평가과정 중에 귀하께서 하신 일들에 대해서 말씀해주십시오.

   - 본 프로그램의 평가과정에서 귀하께서 가졌던 생각이나 느낌은 어떠했습니까?
   - 평가과정 중에 참여자들 간에 의견차이를 보인 부분이 있었습니까? 주로 어떤 것들이었습니까?
   - 귀하께서는 이견이 있는 부분에 대해서 어떤 방식(행동)으로 대하셨습니까?
   - 귀하께서 이 때 가졌던 생각이나 느낌은 어떠했습니까?

3. 본 교육훈련 프로그램 평가를 통해서 나온 결과들에 대해서 말씀해주십시오.

   - 교육훈련 프로그램 평가결과에 대해서 귀하께서 가졌던 생각이나 느낌은 어떠했습니까?
   - 평가결과 가운데 의외라고 생각했던 것들이 있었습니까? 왜 그런 결과가 나왔다고 생각하십니까?
   - 평가결과에 대해서 다른 평가 참여자들과 시각차이는 없었습니까? 무엇이었습니까?
   - 평가결과가 귀하께 어떻게 활용될 수 있을 것이라고 생각하십니까?

4. 본 교육훈련 평가와 관련하여 귀하께서 아쉬웠던 사항, 힘들었던 점, 혹은 앞으로 개선해야 할 사항으로 생각되는 것들에 대해서 말씀해주십시오.

APPENDIX E

Interview Guide (English)

(Learners, Instructors, & Learners' Co-Workers)

1. Tell me about your most recent or current experience with participation in the training program.

    • What were your initial expectations and interests in the training program?

    • What was your role in the training program?

    • Why did you participate in the training program?

2. Tell me about your relationship with the HRD practitioners during the program evaluation.

    • In what ways did you communicate with the HRD practitioners?

    • Did you express your ideas and concerns about the program to the HRD practitioners?

    • (If yes) What ideas, concerns, and thoughts did you express? (If not) Why didn't you do that?

3. Tell me about what the evaluation results were.

    • What ideas or thoughts came up in your mind about the evaluation results?

    • How would you use the evaluation results?

4. Tell me about your overall feelings and concerns about the training program.

APPENDIX F

인터뷰 가이드 (Korean)
(학습자, 강사, 학습자 동료)

1. 귀하께서 최근 혹은 현재 참여하고 있는 교육훈련 프로그램에 대해서 말씀해주십시오.

    ● 교육훈련 프로그램에 대해서 귀하께서 가졌던 처음에 가졌던 기대나 혹은 생각은 어떠했습니까?

    ● 본 프로그램에 있어서 귀하는 어떤 역할을 하셨습니까?

    ● 본 프로그램에 관여하게 된 동기나 이유는 무엇이었습니까?

2. 본 교육훈련 프로그램 평가와 관련하여 HRD 담당자와 귀하의 관계에 대해서 말씀해주십시오.

    ● 주로 어떤 경로로 HRD 담당자들과 접촉하고 의사소통을 하였습니까?

    ● 교육훈련 담당자에게 본 프로그램과 관련한 귀하의 생각이나 의견을 이야기하였습니까?

    ● (이야기하였다면) 어떤 것들을 어떤 식으로 전달했습니까? (하지 않았다면) 왜 그랬습니까?

3. 본 교육훈련 프로그램 평가를 통해서 나온 결과들에 대해서 말씀해주십시오.

    ● 교육훈련 프로그램 평가결과에 대해서 귀하께서 가졌던 생각이나 느낌은 어떠했습니까?

    ● 평가결과가 귀하께 어떻게 활용될 수 있을 것이라고 생각하십니까?

4. 본 교육훈련 평가와 관련하여 귀하께서 아쉬웠던 사항, 힘들었던 점, 혹은 앞으로 개선해야 할 사항으로 생각되는 것들에 대해서 말씀해주십시오.