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2.1. ESSENCE OF HUMAN RESOURCE TRAINING:

The concept of Human Resource Development through managerial training in India is of recent origin. Its beginning can be traced to early fifties, particularly after getting independence in 1947. The economic development achieved through five year plans is now providing necessary infrastructure for industrial growth and development. As a result of this there is an increasing awareness on the need for Human Resource Development. Along with this several other factors can also be attributed to this situation. These factors include such as rapid industrialisation, introduction of new technologies, new social awakening, trade union movement etc. All these factors have shown a need to look upon Management and Labour Training as a separate essential function.

In essence of management development involves training in various aspects and functions of Human Resource. It is basically concerned with developing people on a systematic and continuous basis, enabling them to carry out their functions effectively to achieve the desired goals. In this context, the management function not only implies but also involves a philosophy of available human resource development through various training techniques.

However, in India, unlike in other countries, management
training and development has not been keeping pace with the overall industrial development. No doubt that the organized development in the industrial and other sectors of the economy has been taken place since independence, the management development has been lagging behind.

The five year plans have greatly accelerate the tempo of development and have brought to focus not only the need to consolidate the gains made so far, but also to expand and develop the managerial personnel. The new set of circumstances created through rapid economic development has thus forced to evaluate, rethink, and modify the policies, practices and procedures in every sphere of activities including management training.

2.2. THE THEME OF STUDY:— Impact of Training on Managerial Productivity:

In recent years management training has been gaining momentum and many firms have been coming forward to accept the concept of management training for managerial productivity and job effectiveness. In this direction many firms have realized that the managerial productivity is determined not only by his personal attributes, but also by the special characteristics of his job and his situation and by his organizations policies and practices. These paving a way for total development of individual from the point of view of organizational requirements. As a result of this the cost incurred on management training has been increasing at a
rapid rate. Most of the available on the amount money and organizations invest in management training do not distinguish between money spent for programmes that are applicable to management and those applicable to non-management employees. Thus it is difficult to estimate exactly how much is spent on management training and development relative to the other kinds of training. It is evident from the general observation that in many organizations the major training commitment is to training and development of management level.

These programmes vary in scope and material. However, many companies are determined to improve managerial productivity through training at any cost. At this outset the key question that arises is why are organizations investing so much of money in training and development of managerial staff and what is the outcome of this investment. Through some previous research it is evident that from the point of view of organizations the most important reason for sponsoring management training programmes is to improve the performance of managers on their present jobs and secondly, the programmes are designed to prepare manager's future promotions.

Thus, organizations appears to be looking for a rather immediate return on the money they invest in management training. Whether this is a reasonable and indeed a desirable expectation is of course a good question and need to identified through systematic research efforts. Another important issue is that in recent years there has been a
marked change in the management development programmes.

The highly formalised training programmes concentrating only on skills development has been slowly disappearing. Such programmes are now being replaced by programmes that are organized, designed to fit the needs of each individual manager and thus they often appears to be flexible and need oriented.

This situation can be described as a condition when there is heavy emphasis placed on self development, where in the trainers confront the training programme with respect to objective content and time. Because of this individualization of training programmes, it is more and more difficult to generalized about what kind of training managers are given at different companies and its probable effect on managerial productivity. It is also equally difficult to make any statements about whether companies are using a certain kind of training device or technique. Indeed it appears that every company has been trying different devices or techniques.

It is true that, the individualization of training and development programmes for managerial productivity has created a need for many specialized programmes. No longer do companies assume that a single standardize programme is adequate for the developmental needs of all managers. It is currently fashionable to analyze the individual and his work situation and suggest number of potential programmes ranging from simulation to T-groups.

However, only few organization have the internal capacity
to offer the different kinds of programmes. Such programmes are exceedingly difficult to provide within any given organization, often because of low demand for the course or unavailability of skilled and professional trainers. And also since many of these programmes focus on behaviour, there are certain difficulties associated with professional and ethical issues involved in in-home training programmes. The assumptions of many companies is that these programmes are better fitted to the needs of the individual than a large internal programme could be because internal programme focus on the specific area or area in which each individual needs training.

Because of the trend towards sending managers for outside training, it becomes considerably more difficult for the organization to do research on a given programme and evaluate its impact on managerial productivity. For example, if a training programme like T-groups, it may find meaningful research impossible because it has sent out few managers to the programme. Even so many firms do try systematically to gather personal testimonials from every training participant.

A second consequence is that firms often loose direct control over the content and objectives of the course. The most they can do is carefully selected the progerammes to which they sent their managers. However this is often difficult because of wide variations among programmes which may have the same broad label, for example, T-groups may differ greatly depending upon who the trainer is. Thus
although organization may hope a given course will fit the needs of the managers, they sent it, may not be perfectly designed to accomplished this purpose for every one.

Similarly, the current tendency for training programmes to multiply outside and to a lesser extent inside organizations, as well as the inclination of organizations to use multitude of programmes, makes it difficult to find out the validity of frequency of use of individual programmes. In a sense this is the same problem that exist in the testing area where it is impossible to discuss each individual test. The most one can do is to focus upon a few broad classifications of training and development programmes and consider the frequency of their use.

Given these circumstances, it would be undoubtedly impossible to evaluate the impact of management training on managerial productivity. However the lack could be made possible with the help of a comprehensive framework on training evaluation. The central aspects of the present research work lies on the problem associated with the fulfillment of a gape in training evaluation and management and measurement of the impact management training has on managerial productivity. Thus it can be stated, that the possible of present study is associated with a serious consideration of various issues that are associated with training evaluation, and further development of a framework for measuring the impact on managerial training on productivity.
Fulfillment of this gap in the field of management training necessitates a systematic research work. The present research work is an attempt in that direction.

2.3. DIMENSION OF THE PROBLEM: A Need for Systematic Research Study:

This create lack of attempt to training evaluation is particularly interesting in light of the point that most organization train managers in order to improve present job performance. Admittedly managerial productivity is not easy to measure, but with this limited objective in mind for training, it would seen that the a substantial amount of research would be needed on the impact of training. The question of this point concerns, how long organization would follow a policy that is best characterised on spending millions for training but not one penny for training evaluation.

In order to predict, develop or nurture effective managerial productivity through management training, it is essential to define and measure managerial productivity. Managerial productivity can be defined as an outcome of managers effectiveness according to his impact on his organizations continued functioning through optimal acquisition and utilization of internal and external resources such as human financial and material. Viewing the effective manager in this way, as an optimizer of present and potential resource allocation yields important implications.
for measuring the impact of management training on managerial productivity.

Most important aspect is that a manager of managerial productivity should be based on what the manager himself does to affect the conceptual criterion of optimal resource allocation. Such a manager can be rationally derived from experts' designations on the job behaviour based on performance criteria, which is seen as a relevant to optimal resource allocation and utilization. In particular such a measure should avoid both deficiency, including fewer than all behaviour relevant and excessiveness, including behaviour or outcomes which either are not relevant to the conceptual criteria or go beyond what the manager himself may do to affect them.

Ideally then measures of managerial productivity achieved through training should provide a means for observing accurately and recording systematically the full range of training activity, and for evaluating the impact on managerial productivity. Rating scales or feedback data training programmes to describe the effectiveness of training have fallen in to relative disuse in favor of global estimates, Such as man to man ranking and so called success histories. This is unfortunate because most global estimates, through related indirectly to several aspects of management productivity, undoubtedly suffer to unknown degrees from deficiency, excessiveness or both. Moreover such as estimates tends to reflect societies common stereotypes of what many
constitute success rather than affording a diagnosis of job relevant behaviours that could be used to gain better understanding of the diverse parameters making up managers effectiveness as called as productivity.

Therefore it is highly desirable that a better method for observing and recording training impact on managerial productivity be developed.

The one which is designed to overcome or avoid the plethora or potential sources of observational error such as poor sampling of jobs behaviours, responses set tendencies, vantage point differences, in behaviour observations, and changes in job requirements etc. from which nearly all traditional evaluation techniques suffer.

It is likely that most evaluation techniques have been prove to such problems, because they were not understood and accepted by the evaluations. This problem can be overcome by involving the potential evaluation intimately at every stage during the development and implementation of evaluation programme. By given increased attention to developing such systematic procedures for measuring the training impact, and by using such evaluation to learn exactly how managerial productivity relate to other factors, the impact of training and managerial productivity can be well defined and understood more in terms of managerial requirements of the firm of the future rather than in terms of current or status quo measures.

However the important question is still remains, or
regards to what from evaluation should take, what kinds of criteria should be used, what individual should be measured, when should they be measured and what sort of data gathering plan or experimental design should be used. As it was pointed out that if training effects can not be demonstrated in economic terms, then training should be forgotten.

Essentially if it is impossible to set up an experimental and control group with before and after measures, then the whole thing is not worth bothering about, because nobody will know what the training is doing.

In this direction it can be stated that the best measures of a training programmes effectiveness are the opinion of the trainees, subordinates and peers. However this make little mention of the need to link explicitly the training criteria to the goals of the organizations or to account for all the sources of ambiguity in determining causation. It is true to the sense that, this question must be dealt with by any one trying to decide the effectiveness of training and development. Therefore it is almost implicit argument that if a training programmes is evaluated by asking the trainees, in what ways did it heap, then the linkage of training activity to the organizations goals, the comparison of before and after situations, and the examination of interaction between training effects and other organizational forces must go on within the individual before he renders his opinion.

In general evaluation, is the process of determining whether progress is being made toward stated training
objectives of reasonable speed and expense. The essential flower of this argument is that in a real life situation, there is no one best criterion measure and what is probably impossible to arrange an optimal experimental design. As a result of organization must defines its training goals as well as it can brings much expert judgment to bear as possible on an analysis of whether the content and process of the training can be expected to do what they are supposed to do systematically solicit opinion from participants and their associates and obtain data on as many criteria as possible with as many controls as possible.

After making possible efforts in this directions, the organization must decide whether the criteria of reasonable speed and expense have met. If they have the training is judged as effective and useful. If they are not satisfied or if there are not enough data to enable a judgment to be made, the training is judged as successful and should be discontinued. However it is further essential to arrange that the above suggestions have their strongs and weak points and they all suffer in varying degrees from too narrow a view of the problem. For example the use of the economic indexes obtained from the performance obtaining unit is subject to a great deal of bias, measures such as unitcost are not always under the controls of the managers, and the biasing influences that may be present are not always obvious enough to be compensated for his role. Usually managers are responsible implicitly or explicitly for many things. Besides
certain narrow range economic indicators, contributing to the growth of the organization, relative to both the human and economic resources is just one example.

There are really two considerations implicit in any attempt to explore the importance of a significant training effect on managerial productivity. One is the motion of practical significance or utility for the organization.

The other consideration might be labeled as theoretical or scientific significance. This is a concept with which a particular organization may not be directly concerned. Once the effects of such a programmes are mapped out for different kinds of trainees and for different types of criteria problems under various organizational situations, the general body of knowledge concerning management training has been enriched. Other organizations and investigators may then use this new knowledge to advantage in the planning of their own programmes.

This is to say in another way, practical significance is concerned with what the training is worth to the organization, and theoretical significance is directed at the contributions of the development programme to a general theory of management learning.

The dynamics of interactions between the training functions and the entire organization gained paramount importance, if one accepts the argument that one of the prime objectives of management training and development is more adequately to prepare managers for an uncertain future. That
is management training is somehow enable an individual to cope with job demands have not been yet created.

In summation on the scope of the problem of the present research work, it can be stated that the question of how training and development programmes should be evaluated to find out its impact on managerial productivity, is not answerable in any absolute sense. It is essential to elaborate certain questions and issues on the utility of training efforts towards managerial productivity.

A systematic frameworks needs to developed on criterion problems and evaluation procedure. The final decision concerning the word of training or development programme should not be reduced to subjective judgments of evaluators or researchers. To make a proper judgment as intelligently and scientifically possible, it is essential to undertake an indepth research work on impact of training on managerial productivity. therefore the present research work is efforted towards such an essential direction.

2.4. THE AIMS AND OBJECTIVE OF STUDY:

The present research work on the Impact Of Training on Managerial and Labour Productivity was undertaken with the following aims and objectives, which were also acted as guiding principles in developing several variable for measurement and findings. the following are the objectives:
1. To evaluate the Impact Of Management and Labour Training on Managerial as well as Labour Productivity, through a
systematically, designed research programme.

2. To make a critical assessment of the determinant factors of Managerial as well as Labour Productivity by way of developing a conceptual framework of Managerial and Labour Productivity and its implications for Human Resource training and development.

3. To evaluate the effectiveness of individualized training programmes, and its impact on individual, organizational, effectiveness and managerial performance.

4. To make a critical assessment on the type of training programmes conducted by different organization and the benefits gained in relations of cost benefit analysis on Management and Labour Training.

5. To study the impact of changing environment on Human Resource Productivity and importance of training programmes, as perceived by top management and managers and measure through value orientations on management training and development.

6. To make a critical appraisal of the importance of new technologies for management training and development, aimed to develop the managerial productivity.

7. Finally, to produce an integrated summary of present literature to cast it within an interpretative framework that would constitute and contribution to basic knowledge, for surveying and evaluating existing training policies to develop strategies for individualizing the approaches used in management and productivity efforts.
2.5. THE HYPOTHESIS:

In order to guide the present research efforts towards a proper direction, the following set of hypotheses were formulated and tested.

1. Among all types of management training programmes, job related programmes have impact on managerial productivity;

2. Though there exist diversity in objectives of various training programmes, the most important objective of management training has been that of improving technical skills rather than developing appropriate behavioural skills;

3. In spite of greater awareness on the importance of management training, many organization are unable to adopt the concept of total training and development, due to lack of orientation and required facilities;

4. The effectiveness of management training is usually affected by lack of planning, direction, and control on the part of top management;

5. Most of the training programmes conducted for managers lack in futuristic orientation as they aim at short term oriented individualised goal;

6. The fallacy of management training is unbalanced more by external environmental factors rather than by internal job demands;

7. On the Job Training for labour is the most effective method of training for improving labour skills.
2.6. RESEARCH APPROACH:

As part of developing appropriate research strategy and method, certain assumption were developed and conceptualized. These are:

1. Effectiveness of Human Resource training depends on the synergic relationship and collaborative working amongst the four major components of training, via participant training organization, trainer and client. Hence evaluation should provide necessary feedback to all of them for continuing to training effectiveness.

2. Training effectiveness depending not only on what happens during training, but also on what happens before the actual training (pre-training factors) and what happens after the training has formally ended (post training factors). Evaluation can not neglect these important contextual factors.

3. The focus on the main task of evaluation should only be in the nature of auditing that is, measuring training outcomes in terms of what has been achieved, how much, but should also be diagnostic as why has the effectiveness been lower high and remedial, how can effectiveness be raised.

4. It is important to discard the nation that objective yardsticks are the best primary criteria, for evaluating the effects of management training. Instead the behaviourally based measures should be carried out.

5. A most appropriate and fruitful approach would be to
develop a wide range of realistic and complex problems or
decision situations to be used to evaluate trainer
behaviour experimental and control groups.
6. To be effective research, the subjects participating in
the research should come from many different forms and
administrative settings roles, and they should represent a
variety of functions and levels of responsibility.
7. It is necessary to study, Management and Labour training
as a human development process, that is men’s careers
should be observed, described and evaluate as they unfold
overtime.
8. In particular the essence of variety of organizational
practices such as: pay, promotion, job assignments,
participative decision making, etc. should be abstracted
and their effects on Human Resource Productivity.

These assumptions which were formulated in the forms of
generalizations have been instrumental in conducting the
present empirical research work on assessing the impact of
Management and Labour training on Managerial and Labour
productivity or performance.

2.7. RESEARCH TOOLS AND VARIABLE:
Within the set of parameters as explained above and in
consistent with the requirement for fulfilling the research
objectives, three different types of questionnaires were
constructed and the required information was collected
through both primary and secondary data sources. These
questionnaires were developed on the basis of the following variables. The content scope of each variable are as follow:

2.7.1. INDEPENDENT VARIABLES:

A. Pre-training factors:
   1. Preparation.
   2. Learning motivation.
   3. Expectations.

B. Training events:
   1. Curriculum including strategy.
   2. Specific events.
   3. Specific session and process.

C. Training management:
   1. Areas of satisfaction/dissatisfaction.
   2. Training facilities.
   3. Other facilities.

D. Training process:
   1. Learning climate.
   2. Training methods.
   3. Training team effectiveness.

E. Post training factors:
   1. Cost.
   2. Management support.

2.7.2. DEPENDENT VARIABLES:

1. Technical competence:

To what extent management training has led to improvement in technicals competence of participants, job related tasks
requiring some degree of technical knowledge and skill.

2. Learning capacity:

To what extent the ability to learn various aspects of a position while on the job has been improved due to the management training.

3. Imagination:

To what extent management training has contributed towards the development of imaginative skills among participants. The skills relating to the ability to discover new methods of performing tasks, the ability to solve novel problems.

4. Persuasiveness:

To what extent the ability to present effectively and convincingly a point of view has been developed or improved among participants by management training.

5. Group membership skills:

To what extent management training had impact on the group membership skills of the participants. The skills associated with the ability to work productively with a group of people.

6. Communication skills:

To what extent management training has led to improvement in the ability of managers to make well organized, and clear presentations orally and in writing.

7. Supervisory skills:

To what extent supervisory skills were enhanced by management training in relation to ability to supervise and direct effectively the work of others.
8. Organising skills:
   To what extent the management training has contributed towards the development of organising skills among the participants. This skills relating to their ability to plan and organise over-work efforts or those of others.

9. Decision making skills:
   To what extent the ability to make responsible decisions well without any assistance from others has been improved by management training.

10. Initiative:
   To what extent initiative derive and self development has been improved among participants as a results of management training.

2.8. RESEARCH DESIGN:
   Being its an empirical investigation, it has been decided to adopt an evaluation approach in identifying the impact of Training on the Performance of the Managers and Labour. An assessment approach was not considered appropriate due to the reason that such an approach would not be helpful to identify the factors which are responsible for low effectiveness in the Training. Further more evaluation approach was need due to the reason that through such approach it would be possible to make a clear demarcation between the factors which are leading to Training effectiveness and the factors which are impeding Training effectiveness.
2.9. THE METHOD OF STUDY:

As part of adopting evaluation approach, it was felt appropriate to adopt a survey method to collect the information from various sources. The sources of information were confined to the Managers and Labour, Trainers, and the Organizations, who constitutes as the sample in the present study. The required data was collected through a well designed questionnaires, each one separate for the managers, labour, trainers, and the organizations. The data collection was done through direct interview method. In all 5 organizations were selected for data collection, and at each organization 30 managers and 100 labours representing various departments as well as level were drawn on the basis of quota sampling method. As the objective was to give proper representation to all types of employees, a random sampling method was felt inappropriate and hence a quota sampling method was adopted. Initially 15 organizations were contacted for data collection. However among them only 10 organization were granted permission to conduct the evaluation study. As it was decided strategically to study only 5 organizations, then efforts were made exclude the other 5 organizations. In selecting the final sample efforts were made to have various types of divergent organizations, so that the bias in the sample could be positively eliminated. The finally selected organizations from who the data were collected includes the following organizations:
A. Alfa Laval.

B. Bharat Forge.

C. TELCO.

D. Kirloskar Oil Engines.

E. K.S.B. Pumps.

While in case of managers, as well as labour the data was presented in the matrix tables and analyzed in descriptive manner, whereas in case of the organizations, the data was analyzed through content analysis method. The descriptive findings of the study were presented in the form of a Thesis.

***