

A decorative graphic consisting of several overlapping circles in various shades of blue (dark, medium, and light) and thin blue lines that intersect and curve across the page. The circles are arranged in a way that suggests a path or a sequence, with one large circle at the top right, a smaller one in the middle, and another large one at the bottom right.

# STAP

Why do employees pursue employer sponsored general skills training? What do they hope to gain?

Research Prospectus, PA 705

Nikhila Pai  
12/1/2005

## Introduction

Most of the research conducted on employee sponsored general skills training seems to focus on the employer side of the equation. Researchers define their arguments around Becker's theories on human capital [1962] and prefer to ask questions concerning why employers offer general skills training, what benefits in terms of productivity and retention can they reap, and how pervasive employer sponsored training (both general and specific) is across industries.

No one seems concerned as to what employees think they gain from employer sponsored general skills training or why, if at all, they would pursue it. Part of the problem is there is no such data, "not even any individual-level data on the use of tuition assistance" and what we do have concerns itself solely with employers [Cappelli 2004]. A few studies have noted, as an aside with little evidence, that employees who engage in tuition reimbursement programs obtain increases in their wage, promotions, and easier job shifts once their degrees are complete [Blundel, Dearden, Meghir, Sianesi 1999; Krueger, Rouse 1998; Loewenstein, Spletzer 1999, 1998]. Most assume, implicitly, that workers who engage in general skills training do so for the sole purpose of increasing their marketability for future employment [Bagshaw 1996, 1997; Benson 2003; Loewenstein, Spletzer 1999; Lynch, Black 1998; Meisle 2004].

However, while most research is focused on the employers and costs, no one seems to have noticed the low rate of employee involvement in these programs. The largest number amongst these studies (of which few even give numbers) cited 18% of an observed employee population receiving training<sup>1</sup>—which included both general and specific skills training. Later studies quote high enrollment numbers in continuing degree programs paid for by employers [Meisler 2004], but fail to offer what percentage of total employees these numbers represent.

The number of employees enrolling in tuition reimbursement or general skills training programs seems very low despite the fact that many firms offer expansive programs for their staff [Frazis, Harley 1995]. When "9 in 10 employees work in establishments that provide some kind of formal training," [Frazis, Harley 1995] no one has thought to question why enrollment in these programs is so low, particularly given the types of benefits these studies claim an employee can hope to reap [Krueger, Rouse 1998; Loewenstein, Spletzer 1998, 1999].

Given this gap in research, it is worth exploring the issue of employer sponsored general skills training from the employee side of the equation. As a beginning point, this study will offer a case study that examines an employer-sponsored program available at Stanford University.

Stanford offers two types of employer sponsored general skills training programs: Stanford Tuition Reimbursement Program (STRP) and Stanford Tuition Assistance Program (STAP). STRP offers a classic tuition reimbursement program with a \$5,200 cap per year for accredited higher education degrees (AA, BA, BS, MA, MS, PhD). STAP covers general skills training or materials costs for courses, seminars, conferences, etc. that can be considered work related with a cap of \$800 per year. The parameters for 'work related' are quite broad and can even cover yoga classes. This project will focus on the STAP, general skills training program.

---

<sup>1</sup> Loewenstein and Spletzer [1999] use data from a NLSY survey from 1993 with a sample of 4,814 individuals.

## **Literature Review**

Employer sponsored training programs have become quite common in the private sector. Recent studies show as many as 87% of employers offer some form of formal training to their employees [Lynch 1998]. In addition, the majority of these costs are borne by the employers rather than their workers. In an attempt to understand this trend and the benefits behind the variety of training programs offered by employers, researchers have focused mainly on the employer side of the equation.

### ***Types of Employer Sponsored Training: General V Specific***

Employer sponsored training can take on many forms, but most studies focus on employer sponsored formal training programs, rather than informal on the job training. Formal training is defined as any training that is planned in advance and has a defined curriculum; topics include orientation training, safety and health training, apprenticeships training, basic skills training, workplace practices training, and job skills training [Frazis, Harley 1995]. The main distinction within formal training seems to rest between specific skills training and general skills training.

Specific skills are those taught by an employer so that a worker can perform her current job; these skills cannot be transferred to another position and sometimes make an employee less marketable by pigeonholing her into a specific industry [Garcia, Arkes, Trost 2002; Feuer, Glick, Desai 1987; Frazis, Harley 1995]. Although general skills training may increase a worker's productivity on her current job, for training to be considered general, "alternative employers must in fact recognize that a worker's training at a previous employer raises [her] productivity elsewhere" [Loewenstein, Spletzer 1999].

For ease of discussion in this review, the category general skills training encompasses conferences, seminars, workshops, classes, held on employer premises and off, tuition reimbursement programs and the like that are deemed 'general' rather than 'specific' by the researchers conducting these studies.

### ***Human Capital Theory Applied***

Despite its 1962 publication date, Becker's theories on human capital offer one of the most cited pieces in the literature concerning tuition reimbursement and employee training programs. Becker defines human capital as "activities that influence future real income through the embedding of resources in people" (9). Human capital theory considers workers to be another part of the means of production in an economic equation, like machinery or factory space [Becker 1962]. Any money spent on them to develop their general skills or make them happy (like vacation time, health benefits, training, etc.) is considered an investment in capital used towards production.

By assessing training and employees in terms of economic market forces, Becker determines that workers who receive on the job training in any form pay for the investment through lower wages. Employers only cover costs of the least transferable, most specific types of training as employees are unwilling to bear the lower wage involved in gaining skills that increase productivity and profits only for their employers. Successful firms would never be

willing to cover the costs of general training, as they would not (exclusively) reap the rewards of training their staff.

Therefore, any general skills training costs incurred by an employer should be offset by a decrease in wage for the staff receiving training. He theorizes that employees are willing to pay this cost, in terms of lower wages for their labor, because the training promises higher future earnings. He further surmises that if employers went against their interests by covering the costs of general training they would lose out by attracting too many trainee level people and would lose few employees during the training period—resulting in higher labor costs. Only through sharing the cost of training (with staff) can an employer retain their employees past the training period and cover the cost of said training.

This 1962 claim regarding the parameters for human capital investment sparked a myriad of studies beginning in the late 1980's through today. Every study considered in this review begins with a refutation of Becker's theories concerning the market forces surrounding employer sponsored general and specific training. Contrary to Becker, firms almost always pay for general training while continuing to pay their employees market wages, and in fact reap rewards that Becker never even conceived in his original paper [Acemoglu, Pshke 1998; Barron, Berger, Black 1999; Bartel 1994, 2000; Cappelli 2004; Feuer, Glick, Desai 1987; Lowenstein, Spletzer 1998; Lynch, Black 1998].

All the data collected thus far points in the opposite direction of Becker's theories, including his hypotheses of lower wages, no general training by firms, and attracting trainee level employees. Becker's findings may have been true for the time period he covers, but during the explosion of general training benefits in the late 80's and the subsequent studies in the late 90's, his findings have become outdated.

This literature review will focus mainly on general skills training programs and their accompanying studies as most agree, an employer paying for specific skills training is considered a good investment in human capital [Acemoglu, Pishke 1998; Bartel 1994; Cappelli 2004; Feuer, Glick, Desai 1987]. Despite Becker's analysis, with the change in work environment, it has been shown that general skills training is yet another good investment in human capital.

### *Shift in Thinking: Training=Loyalty*

While employers continue to expect their employees to work hard, the expectation of job security has all but disappeared [Bagshaw 1997]. With the dissolution of the original employment contract where, in exchange for employee loyalty, "firms offered a credible promise of long-term employment," employers needed to find a new way to win employee loyalty and thereby recreate the collaborative environment lost in the days of layoff, downsizing and mergers [Bagshaw 1996, 1997; Benson 2003]. In many respects, this is a welcome change, according to Michael Bagshaw, as a dynamic workforce is one that is unwilling to be tied to one employment situation and instead seeks opportunities to develop fully and spread their influence in many directions [1996].

One way for firms to recreate a commitment to workers is through employer sponsored general skills training; as this type of skills development has a positive effect on how staff feels about their firms [Bagshaw 1996; Feuer, Glick, Desai 1987]. Additionally, in order to attract the new dynamic workers, employers must offer a high standard of training and development; instead of job security, employers offer their workers inner security for employability so they know they can take care of themselves [Bagshaw 1996, 1997; Cappelli 2004]. Employees that

know they are gaining new skills are less alarmed by the thought of losing their current job and give more freely of themselves in their work environment [Bagshaw 1997].

As both employer and employee know this work contract between them is temporary, they can agree to value another sort of investment relationship [Bagshaw 1996; Benson 2003]. If an employer is willing to spend money to train an employee for the next job (or even to improve their performance on this job), an employer is able to create an environment of trust in even the most volatile markets. An employee feels making an investment in this job will pay off in her future career.

In fact, through this mutual commitment, general skills training can help reduce turnover, not increase it as initially suspected by Becker [Acemoglu, Pishke 1998; Feuer, Glick, Desai 1987]. While this Polyanna-like view of the employer-employee relationship may sound far-fetched, many employers do view tuition reimbursement programs as a benefit to assist with staff retention or recruitment [Benson, Finegold, Mohrman 2004; Cappelli 2004; Meisler 2004].

### *Benefits to Employers*

- *Higher Employee-Retention*

General skills training was not considered a retention tool initially. Some studies showed that employees tend to use general skill training programs, like tuition reimbursement, as a way to increase their marketability in order to eventually leave their current employer [Benson, 2003; Bretz, Boudreau, Judge 1994]. The only employees who seem to buck the turnover trend were in highly specialized fields that required periodic skill-updating [Benson, Finegold, Mohrman 2004; Feuer, Glick, Desai 1987].

Given the possibility of turnover, these general skills programs seemed like a losing investment because firms paid market wages for their staff while also covering the additional costs for training. Subsequent studies showing that employees with general skills acquired at the expense of a prior employer tend to have higher productivity levels, require less training, and receive more pay, seemed to reinforce this view [Black, Lynch 1996; Lowenstein, 1998]. However, these studies failed to look at tenure or the duration of employment for workers enrolled in training programs versus workers not utilizing these programs.

Despite the fact that employees tend to leave their employer once they complete their higher education degrees (with the exception of employees who receive promotions soon after achieving their degrees) [Benson 2003; Benson, Finegold, Mohrman 2004], these plans do seem to increase tenure or duration of employment [Acemoglu, Pishke 1998; Cappelli 2004; Garcia, Arkes, Trost 2002]. As often employees take years to complete their training, they end up working for their employers for longer than their counterparts who don't partake in these general skills programs [Cappelli, 2004].

Peter Cappelli establishes in his 2004 study that employer provided tuition assistance is the most common form of financial aid for post-secondary education. Tuition reimbursement programs are the most ubiquitous form of general skills program and they often increase an employee's tenure in a company by as many as 8 years [Cappelli, 2004]. This is because most employers create small obstacles to using tuition reimbursement: workers need to be employed for a year, work full-time, and have managerial approval to obtain tuition reimbursement funds. The funds themselves may only cover 50% of tuition rates. Given that full-time employment can exceed 40 hours a week, a 2 years Masters program can take 4-6 years.

- ***Higher Quality Employees***

In addition to retaining employees for longer, tuition reimbursement and general skills training programs attract stronger candidates during the recruiting process [Cappelli 2004; Feuer, Glick, Desai 1987; Garcia, Arkes, Trost 2002]. Employees who participate in voluntary skills training programs tend to be more highly motivated, innovative, and skilled [Benson 2003; Cappelli 2004; Krueger, Rouse 1998]. These are candidates who are ripe for internal promotions and typically are more productive [Feuer, Glick, Desai 1987; Krueger, Rouse 1998].

Some studies claim that these higher quality candidates are not obvious to competitor firms, allowing hiring firms to pay these new, highly motivated employees the prevailing wage despite their potential for higher productivity [Acemoglu, Pischke 1998; Autor, 2001]. This discrepancy in expense, where higher producing employees are underpaid for their work, can be used to cover costs of general skills training programs.

Counter to this theory, other studies have shown firms that offer various skills training programs also tend to pay their employees higher than the going rate. These studies claim that with the prevalence of studies on employer sponsored general skills training benefits, competitor firms may have bought in to the view of these programs as effective recruitment techniques [Cappelli 2004].

- ***Higher Productivity Rates***

Various studies have shown that training, both general and specific, has a positive impact on productivity [Bartel, 1994; Black, 1996; Blundell, Dearden, Meghir, Sianesi 1999; Garcia, Arkes, Trost 2002]. However, training itself has a mixed effect with current on the job training lowering productivity while completed training or off-the-job training raising it [Black, Lynch 1996]. Average education level of a firm has a positive and significant effect on productivity in both manufacturing and non-manufacturing sectors [Black, Lynch 1996], so it behooves employers to either hire trained staff or supply training to them.

Many studies also found productivity increased far more dramatically than wage after incidences of general skills training [Blundell, Dearden, Meghir, Sianesi 1999; Loewenstein, 1998]. But, none could establish a relationship between increased productivity and increased profit [Bartel 1994; Blundell, Dearden, Meghir, Sianesi 1999; Lynch, Black 1998].

Most employers and employees agree the on the job training they receive is general and transferable to other positions. In fact, not only do other firms recognize this training, they often substitute it for their own training programs and prefer to hire employees with previous training and experience [Barron, Berger, Black 1999; Loewenstein, Spletzer 1998]. One study demonstrated that previous on-the-job training has a more lasting positive impact on productivity over time [Blundell, Dearden, Meghir, Sianesi 1999]. Despite the increased marketability of staff at the expense of their employers, firms continue to offer general training because they too reap the rewards in greater productivity; and, given the costs of finding and hiring staff, one study claims everyone ends up sharing in the costs of training [Bartel 1994; Loewenstein, Spletzer 1999].

## *Benefits to Employees*

Few studies have focused on the employee side of the equation when considering the tradeoff of personal time versus future benefits. Many claim employees involved in firm sponsored general skills programs have increased wages, higher productivity, and achieve more promotions [Acemoglu, Pishke 1999; Blundell, Dearden, Meghir, Sianesi 1999; Krueger, Rouse 1998]. One study further asserts that employer sponsored training has the longest lasting positive effect on wage [Blundell, Dearden, Meghir, Sianesi 1999].

However, there has been little evidence to support the claim of increased wages or promotability. While it is true, education does offer increased job opportunities and wages [Blundell, Dearden, Meghir, Sianesi 1999], it doesn't follow that employer sponsored general skills training has the same affect. One study did find that higher wages seem to be associated with the incidence of these training programs, but was unable to establish a causal relationship [Cappelli 2004].

In addition to a lack of data on future benefits to employees involved in these programs, there is little done on other benefits employees derive from these programs. Only one survey questioned workers further to report that workplace education improved worker's self-esteem, family lives and work confidence, as well as satisfaction with their employers [Garcia, Arkes, Trost 2002].

With their focus squarely on employers, most studies assume employees pursue firm sponsored general skills training programs to increase their wages and promotion opportunities without exploring the issue further.

### *Counter Arguments: What these Studies Miss*

- *How much tracking takes place?*

Despite the results of these various studies on return to employers and employees regarding tuition reimbursement, Eduventures, a private research and consulting firm in Boston, estimates over \$10 billion was paid out in tuition reimbursements in 2003 with only 2% of employers actually tracking the educational progress of their employees [Meisler 2004]. Ambitious or recession spooked employees have driven enrollment in for profit schools making it quadruple from 114,129 in 1992 to 397,675 in 2002 [Meisler 2004]. While these enrollment numbers look high, it is difficult to establish what percentage of total employment they represent.

Despite the fact that employers are spending millions on their employee's continuing education, no one within these firms seems to be tracking how effective these general skills degrees are for their subsidizers or even for their employees; and only 45% reported a 'fair amount' or 'not very good' control over the distribution of tuition-reimbursement funds [Meisler 2004].

In most midsize and large companies, internal training and development is viewed as a strategic imperative while tuition reimbursement is seen as a miscellaneous employee benefit with little return on investment expected [Meisler 200]. Tracking of costs is a problem because most employers are not geared up to measure training costs, general or specific, because there are no clear, agreed upon accounting principals for determining these costs, especially when considering indirect ones such as losses or gains in productivity [Lynch, Black 1998].

This lack of accounting practices for tracking costs and profits associated with firms sponsored general skills training programs puts many aspect of prior research into doubt—is the increase in productivity (which has its own discrepancies in data) really paying off in profits? Additionally, these employer focused studies have had a notoriously low response rate [Lynch, Black 1998]—are only the firms offering these programs responding to requests for data?

- ***Who is getting trained?***

Most of the survey data obtained by researchers indicates that general skills training makes a positive and significant impact on employee wages, but not all workers typically get training [Lynch, Black 1998]. In fact, training is typically offered to already highly educated workers, at the managerial or professional level, in larger firms that pursue high performance work systems [Cappelli 2004; Lynch, Black 1998]. Larger, non durable goods manufacturers that offer more benefits and utilize more progressive workplace practices are more likely to offer general skills training programs than any other type of firm [Frazis, Harley 1995; Lynch, Black 1998].

While most employers and employees agree the majority of employer sponsored training is general and transferable [Loewenstein, Spletzer 1999] and most employers claim to offer formal training [Frazis, Harley, 1995; Lynch, Black 1998], one study showed less than half offered training which had obvious components that are portable to other employment situations—like computer skills training, teamwork training or tuition reimbursement [Lynch, Black 1998]. Only slightly more than a quarter offered basic education training [Lynch, Black 1998]. This indicates that employees without basic education skills cannot expect to get them on the job and will probably end up in a cycle of low human capital positions with no future higher wages.

- ***Do firms select higher producing staff for general skills training?***

While many studies correlated higher productivity or better qualified staff with firms sponsored general skills training, one may argue that firms only select highly qualified and high productivity staff for training [Feuer, Glick, Desai 1987]. If firms consider these programs an investment in human capital, they may be more selective than these studies imply, which undercuts the causal relationship between wages, promotions, productivity and firm sponsored programs.

- ***How effect is training really?***

Not all studies assume or prove the value of employer sponsored general skills training for employees. In contrast to earlier studies that claim job training has a positive impact on productivity and wages, one study conducted by Alan Krueger and Cecilia Rouse [1998] found no such correlation. The results of the study are from one training program geared toward low-skilled, hourly workers, which are traditionally a group that has experienced extremely low or negative real wage growth in the US.

When controlling for age and tenure, upon examining a general skills training program geared at service and manufacturing industry employees, their study found no significant impact on wage (for the service industry employees) at worst to a slight increase in wages (for the manufacturing sector employees) at best, as well as a somewhat higher rate of promotion. However, the study didn't seem to control well for the possibility that more motivated employees

would pursue the training program as well as higher wages/better positions which could well eliminate a causal relationship between training and wages/promotion. While the group is more homogenous and deals with the same labor market conditions, it's not clear that these results can be applied to other industries.

- *More Missing Pieces*

As illustrated by this review, the majority of research on employer sponsored general skills training focuses on the employer. These studies explore issues around productivity, retention, and quality of employees. However, most fail to address the issue of cost versus profit as a result of these programs and few touch on the true value of involvement in these programs for employees in their careers. Of the studies reviewed, only two mention percentage of employees involved in these programs [Lynch, Black 1998; Loewenstein, Spletzer 1999] and only one surveys employees on their impressions and attitudes concerning these programs [Garcia, Arkes, Trost 2002].

Employee attitudes and enrollment are an important missing piece of this research on firm sponsored general skills programs. Whether employers offer these programs as a benefit or an aid to productivity, it is useful and necessary to know of their employees perceptions of these programs match up. For example, if employees don't perceive these programs as loyalty inducing benefits, how much can they aid with retention? If employees aren't enrolling in these programs, how efficient are they in recruiting higher quality candidates?

## **The Project**

### ***Hypothesis***

The focus of this project will be on employee use and attitudes concerning STAP at Stanford University. With its \$800 per year spending cap and broad range of options for its funds, it should be easy for staff to engage in this program. Given the informal interviews conducted so far, it seems that few staff utilize the funds of this program; the ones that do consider it a staff benefit, contrary to established research that claims employees view general skills training as a way to gain skills to increase their earnings potential [Bagshaw 1996, 1997; Becker 1962]. Given the research findings by Black and Lynch [1998], exempt employees with higher education degrees are more likely to use this program than non-exempt staff without degrees.

### ***Methodology***

This study on STAP at Stanford will offer a case study on the employee use of general skills training funds. As it will present a qualitative first step in analyzing the issue from the employee side, the majority of the data will be obtained through an employee survey and in depth interviews. It will follow a cross-sectional design allowing the data to come from a number of employees at differing levels, but all at one point in time. This should allow for data collection on both attitudes and behavior concerning employer sponsored general skills training or at Stanford University, STAP. The nature of the time constraints won't allow a longitudinal study, that would allow for tracking how often employees use this program over time, which would make for a more in-depth study. Given the nature of the cross-sectional design, this study will not attempt to structure causal relations between variables at this time.

Due to time constraints and the long-standing establishment of the program, this study will not follow a classical experimental design as it impossible to perform a pre-test, nor can employees be randomly assigned to use STAP funds or the like. Nor will it fall under a randomized-post-test design, for reasons similar to the above. As most employees are able to partake in STAP, it is hard to create a good testing environment. Instead, this will be a quasi-experimental design as there will be no baseline (pre-test) comparisons, nor will it be fully randomized. As this study isn't randomized it will be hard, if not impossible, to draw general conclusions about the results due to threats to external validity. However, as a first step toward re-assessing this topic from the employee-side, a case study is a good way to start.

### ***Design***

- ***Sample***

The study will use a non-probability sample as it is exploratory research that can be used to generate a hypothesis which will be tested more fully by further studies. It will be a convenience sample based mainly in the School of Humanities and Sciences of at least 200 employees; a sample of 200 employees would yield a confidence range of 7 on a 50/50 split. However, this issue does not seem to be controversial or divisive and more people will tend to agree with each other.

- ***In-Dept Interviews***

These interviews will be purposive and composed of key-informant interviews with exempt and non-exempt staff, as well as managerial exempt staff. The intention is to get a good cross-section of people who work in the humanities, social sciences, and sciences, as well as in finance, faculty support, or student services.

These interviews will be semi-structured, with some open-ended questions. As there isn't much research in the area, it's necessary to hear what people have to say to establish guidelines. Ideally, interviews will be conducted both before and after the survey as a kind of pre-test/post-test to get a better sense of how people think to improve the design of the survey.

### ***Research Bias***

In considering my position as an interviewer, I think I have an advantage by being an 'insider' and fellow-employee here at Stanford University. My age will also help to undercut my senior position as a department manager. The only problems I see with my subjectivity and position is a bias in favor of the use of STAP funds as well as my personal attitudes about the program. I consider STAP to be an employee benefit and while I think it can be an effective tool for skill-building, I'm not sure it can increase an employee's income. As an employee who uses STRP funds to pay for my Master's Degree, I value these programs and want to believe they can be used to improve my skills in the hopes of forwarding my career aspirations. I also value STRP above STAP because the former helps with degree achievement while the latter is used to fund a variety of classes, including healthy back classes.

## Survey Design

After looking at a number of online survey formats, the survey for this study will use [www.surveymonkey.com](http://www.surveymonkey.com) to create an online survey. According to a technology expert in the Dean's office, the School of Humanities and Sciences conducted a survey using this program and got a 100% return rate. Although this survey will not have the authority of the dean's office behind it, as most staff spend their days in front of a computer using email and web search applications, the return rate from an online survey will be much higher than one from a paper survey. It is also a cheaper option. Below is a copy of the study's proposed survey. It attempts to integrate concepts and ideas from *Survey Research Methods* and *Research Methods for Public Administrators*. This draft will be revised again after the first round of in-depth interviews.

## Survey Questions:

*This is an internet survey which is to be sent to Administrative Staff within the School of Humanities and Sciences at Stanford University.*

1. Are you aware of the availability of STAP Funds?
  - Yes
  - No
  
2. The Staff Training Assistance Program (STAP)—Pays up to \$800 per fiscal year for general skills training and development. Are you aware of what types of skills training it covers?
  - Yes
  - No
  
3. At the department level, are you encouraged to use STAP funds?
  - Yes, my manager is very supportive
  - No, my manager is not supportive
  - I was not aware of the program
  - Other \_\_\_\_\_
  
4. Do you use your STAP Funds?
  - Yes (skip next question)
  - No

5. If you don't you use STAP Funds, why?

- No time during work day or after work
- Doesn't cover classes I want to take
- Discouraged by manager
- Wasn't aware of the program
- Other \_\_\_\_\_

Go to question 10

6. If you use STAP funds, how much of it do you use per year (on average)?

- Less than one third (\$250 or below)
- Less than Half (\$500 or below)
- Full amount (\$800)

7. Please rank the following choices (1-4 with 1 as the most relevant and 4 as the least). Why do you use STAP Funds?

- \_\_\_ Personal interest or enrichment
- \_\_\_ Personal choice to increase my general work skills set
- \_\_\_ Encouraged by manager to take specific courses
- \_\_\_ Other \_\_\_\_\_

8. If you use STAP funds for career development purposes, which choice best describes your usage:

- Improve job performance in current position
- Improve skill set for future position

9. Please put a check mark next to all the relevant choices. What do you use your STAP funds to cover?

- \_\_\_ HIP Courses for Relaxation or Stress
- \_\_\_ HIP Classes for Exercise, like Yoga
- \_\_\_ ITSS Classes for Staff Development
- \_\_\_ ITSS Classes for Pleasure
- \_\_\_ Courses Recommended by my Manager
- \_\_\_ Seminar/Conference/Workshop for Career Development
- \_\_\_ Seminar/Conference/Workshop for Personal Development
- \_\_\_ Stanford Continuing Education Courses
- \_\_\_ Courses offered outside of Stanford
- \_\_\_ Textbooks
- \_\_\_ Other \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_ Other \_\_\_\_\_

10. Please rank your agreement with the following statement: STAP Funds are an important part of the benefits package here at Stanford University for staff retention.

- STAP is very important
- STAP is somewhat important
- STAP is important
- STAP is not very important

- STAP is not important at all

11. Please rank your agreement with the following statement: STAP Funds are useful mainly for staff training and increased productivity on the job.

- STAP is very useful
- STAP is somewhat useful
- STAP is useful
- STAP is not very useful
- STAP is not useful at all

12. Please choose one from the following: After taking this survey I am

- more likely to take classes using STAP Funds
- less likely to take classes using STAP funds
- not affected by the survey and will continue to take the same number of classes using STAP funds
- not affected by the survey and will continue not to take classes using STAP funds

13a. Do you think the university does enough to publicize the availability of STAP Funds?

- Yes
- No

13b. Do you think the School of Humanities and Sciences does enough to publicize the availability of STAP Funds?

- Yes
- No

14. Can you think of ways the university can improve STAP?

15. What is your position within the School of Humanities and Sciences at Stanford University?

16a. What category does it fall under?

- Exempt
- Non-exempt

16b. Is it a managerial role?

- Yes
- No

17. Rank the following with 5 being the most relevant, 1 being the least relevant and 0 not being relevant at all. Please choose a job area that best describes the main focus of your position.

\_\_\_ Office Support

- Department/Program Finance
- Faculty Support/Sponsored Research Finance
- Faculty Support General
- Student Services
- Other \_\_\_\_\_

18. How many years have you worked at Stanford?

- under 2 years
- 2-4 years
- 5-8 years
- 9-11 years
- 12-15 years
- more than 15

19. What level of education have you completed:

- High School
- AA/AS
- BA/BS
- MA/MS
- PhD

20. What age range do you fall under?

- under 25
- 25-34
- 35-44
- 45-54
- 55-64
- 65+

Works Cited:

- Acemoglu, Daron and Jörn-Steffen Pischke. 1998. Why do Firms Train? Theory and Evidence. *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 113 (1) 1998: pp79-119.
- Autor, D.H. 2001. Why do Temporary Help Firms Provide Free General Skills Training? *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 116 (4) 2001: pp1409-1448.
- Bagshaw, Michael. 1996. Creating Employability: How Can Training and Development Square the Circle Between Individual and Corporate Interest? *Industrial and Commercial Training* 28 (1) 1996: pp16-18.
- Bagshaw, Michael. 1997. Employability—Creating a Contact of Mutual Investment. *Industrial and Commercial Training* 29 (6) 1997: pp187-189.
- Barron, John M., Mark C. Berger, and Dan A. Black. 1999. Do Workers Pay for On-the-Job-Training? *The Journal of Human Resources* 34 (2) 1999: pp 235-252.
- Bartel, Ann P. 1994. Productivity Gains from the Implementation of Employee Training Programs. *Industrial Relations* 33 (4) October 1994: pp 411-425.
- Bartel, Ann P. 2000. Measuring the Employer's Return on Investments in Training: Evidence from the Literature. *Industrial Relations* 39 (3) July 2003: pp 502-524.
- Becker, Gary S. 1962. Investment in Human Capital: A Theoretical Analysis. *The Journal of Political Economy* 70(5) 1962: pp 9-49.
- Benson, Geroage S. 2003. Examining Employability: Effects of Employee Development on Commitment and Intention to Turnover. *Academy of Management Best Conference Paper* 2003 CAR: C1-C6.
- Benson, Geroage S., David Finegold, and Susan Albers Mohrman. 2004. You Paid for the Skills, Now Keep them: Tuition Reimbursement and Voluntary Turnover. *Academy of Management Journal* 47 (3) June 2004: PP. 315-331.
- Black, Sandra E. and Lisa M. Lynch. 1996. Human-Capital Investments and Productivity. *The American Economic Review* 86 (2) Papers and Proceedings of the Hundredth and Eighth Annual Meeting of the American Economic Association San Francisco, CA January 5-7, 1996 (May, 1996): pp 264-267.
- Blundell, Richard, Lorraine Deardon, Costas Meghis, and Barabara Sianesi. 1999. Human Capital Investment: The Returns from Education and Training to the Individual, the Firm, and the Economy. *Fiscal Studies* 20 (1) 1999: pp1-23.

- Bretz, R.D., J. W. Boudreau, T. A. Judge. 1994. Job Search Behavior of Employed Managers. *Personnel Psychology* 47 1994: pp 275-301.
- Cappelli, Peter. 2004. Why Do Employers Pay for College? *Journal of Econometrics* 121 2004: pp213-241.
- Feuer, M., H. Glick, and A. Desai. 1987. Is Firm Sponsored Education Viable? *Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization* 8 1987: pp121-136.
- Frazis, Harley J. and Diane E. Herz. 1995. Employer Provided Training: Results from a New Survey. *Monthly Labor Review* 118 (5) May 1995: pp 3-15.
- Garcia, Federico, Jeremy Arkes, and Robert Trost. 2002. Does employer-financed general training pay? Evidence from the US Navy. *Economics of Education Review* 21 2002: pp19-27.
- Krueger, Alan and Cecilia Rouse. 1998. The Effect of Workplace Education on Earning, Turnover, and Job Performance. *Journal of Labor Economics* 16 (1) 1998: pp 61- 94.
- Loewenstein, Mark A. and James R. Spletzer. 1998. Dividing the Costs and Returns of General Training. *Journal of Labor Economics* 16 (1) January 1998: pp 142-171.
- Loewenstein, Mark A. and James R. Spletzer. 1999. General and Specific Training: Evidence and Implications. *The Journal of Human Resources* 34 (4) Autumn, 1999: pp 710-733.
- Lynch, Lisa M. and Sandra E. Black. 1998. Beyond the Incidence of Employer-Provided Training. *Industrial and Labor Relations* 52 (1) October 1998: pp64-81.
- Meisle, Andy. 2004 A Matter of Degrees. *Workforce Management* 83 (5) May 2004: pp32-38.