Chapter II

Literature Review
2.1 Concept of Training

It is a well known fact that in order to survive in the tough competition, organizations have to create more intelligent and flexible firms than their competitors, by recruiting and developing more talented human resources, and by updating their skill base.

Increases in competition, globalization, and the speed of change have helped to highlight the importance of the capacity for learning in businesses as a key to both survival and success (Dumphy et al. 1997); (Easterby-Smith et al. 1998); (Fulmer et al. 1998). Developing the human resources of a company would seem to be key to increasing production and closing the gap between the level of worker skill and present and future needs.

Training is a costly yet vital part of operating a successful business. It is the process through which employees learn their job during their induction on the job. It also means continuous upgradation of knowledge, skill & attitude to enhance the productivity. According to Allerton, (1997) businesses in the United States spend $55.3 billion annually on training and expenses associated with this procedure. However, figures for the customer service industry shows that it spends much higher –approximately spends $162 million on training (Allerton 1997).

A systematic approach to learning and development is to improve individual, team or organisational effectiveness. A systematic approach refers to the idea that the training is intentional. It is being conducted to meet a perceived need. Learning and development concerns the building of expertise as a function of these systematic training efforts. Learning outcomes can include changes in knowledge, skills or attitudes (KSAs). Improvement is measured by the extent to which the learning that results from training leads to meaningful changes in the work environment. Therefore, a critical issue is the extent to which the KSAs are
transferred to the job and improve individual effectiveness. Finally, employee training can also be viewed from a broader, more macro perspective, as a mechanism for enhancing work team and organisational effectiveness. In this way, training is seen as integral to facilitating larger scale organisational change and development issues (Goldstein and Ford 2002).

Training for the sake of training, an approach that focuses on developmental ideals and supportive organizational environments, is not aligned with today’s business realities, including compressed career progression pathways, budgetary cuts and constraints, highly competitive environments, and market-driven economic philosophies (McGuire et al. 2005). Training should be need based to cater the performance problem and enhance certain set of knowledge and skills.

Learning and training interventions do not exist in a vacuum and as such we should consider their support of organizational goals and strategies. Montesino (2002) found a group of trainees who self-reported highest usage of training perceived a significantly higher alignment of the training program with the strategic direction of the organization. And Lim and Johnson (2002) found that Korean trainees perceived higher transfer when their learning outcomes matched trainees’ departmental goals. In their case study, Watad and Ospina (1999) reported on a management development program that enabled participants to strategically link their local decisions and daily work operations to the broader organizational mission. They consequently discovered an improvement for organizational effectiveness and learning. More empirical studies could bolster claims that strategically linking training to organizational goals improves transfer to the job.

2.2 Significance of Training and Development

Every organization should train all its employees irrespective of their qualifications for developing skills suitable for the jobs. Training is something that is given not once to new employees but is to be given on a regular basis. Further, technological changes and automation require updating the skills and knowledge of employees (Chaudhari 2004).
The past decade has witnessed a veritable explosion in training research literature, highlighting significant developments in training methodology, evaluation and theory (Salas & Cannon 2001), and in defining what training actually means and is designed to achieve. It was once considered quite acceptable to perceive training as one off, independent event. In more recent years, training practice has increasingly acknowledged training as having a strategic focus, as an event that occurs within existing organizational frameworks, and is custom designed to achieve specific organizational goals (Salas 2001); (Goldstein 2002).

Training is a need that all organisations have in order to employ competent and efficient workers. However, there are large differences between a training programme and an effective training programme. Tall and Hall (1998) suggest that the training programme can provide information and learning as well as other benefits to employees. People can divulge what they feel they need and communicate with the entire team in a more effective manner. Training can help to foster a sense of family or community among the people who work together. It can produce a positive self image and confidence. If people feel more competent it brings about a sense of self worth that spills over into ones work performance.

Training programme are effective only if the training is actually needed. According to Brown (2002) this is an ever evolving process by which a company evaluates if its employees are in need of training. There are four main reasons as to why a company would need a training programme. First, the organisation wants to discover and correct a problem area. Second, management support is needed or the training programme will not have a chance of being implemented. Third, in order for an evaluation to be conducted there will need to be preliminary data collected even before the training program is implemented. Fourth, it is important to be able to distinguish the costs as well as the benefits of the training. Organisational Heads would want to know if the training is worth their money. (Brown 2002).

Training and development also enable employees to perform their jobs with limited supervision and control. It provides flexibility to the organization for placing employees in different positions due to their ability of multi skillning.
Terry (2009) quoted in journal that when Motorola Inc introduced Quality Assurance, it found that plants delivered a return of $33 for every $1 invested where senior management reinforced training. In contrast, plants that provided the same training but without the management-led follow-up generated a negative return. A similar study of Xerox demonstrated that trainees’ retention of new skills fell to a disappointing 13 per cent if managers failed to provide coaching, support and recognition as these skills were being applied.

Indian Companies are not also lagging behind. A study by Kodwani, Abhinya & Swapnika (2005) reveals that public sector banks do give a lot of importance to training in their organizations. They invest a huge amount of money like 0.05% of their entire payroll. Keeping in the pace of the best HR practices, National Training Policy (1996) of Government of India envisages training for all in every level. The policy calls for improving efficiency of the manpower by inculcating knowledge, skill and appropriate attitude.

The cost of not training employees is something that all organisations should consider (Hubbard 1995). These can have long lasting and highly negative impacts on the employees and the profitability of the company. Not training the employees can result into reduction in employee morale, low productivity, more turn-over and decrease in organizational effectiveness.

Pareek & Lynton (2000) have done extensive research on training & development. They are of the view that even in the briefest and simplest training, then, the more effective behaviour of people on tasks in their real life settings—the primary objective of the training process as a whole is a dependent variable and participants and their home system(s) the independent variables. They gave a simple model of training as presented in Fig 2 (i).
They further stressed that training is actually a more complex process than Fig 2 (i) suggests. In the first place, the training system itself needs to be included. It may be a temporary system, for example, an occasional program in a permanent institution, such as a training department. In addition, the trainers also learn in the course of this program, with the various opportunities it offers to check the effectiveness of what they do and also through feedback from participants and colleagues. At these times the independent and intervening variables also become dependent variables. This truer reality was better illustrated by another model given in Fig 2 (ii)
Review of Literature on training effectiveness reiterates that organisation should include training as a strategic tool for enhancing their effectiveness. The human resources needs to be updated in their knowledge and skill so that they can face the changes happening in business and technology.

2.3 Transfer of Training

Transfer of training refers to the degree to which trainees regularly apply to their jobs the knowledge, skills, behaviours, and attitudes learned in training. This requires a generalisation of the training to the work context and its maintenance over time, with the intention of improving the trainee’s job performance.

Transfer of learning from training is the effective and continuing application, by trainees to their jobs, of the knowledge and skills gained in training (both on and off the job). Transfer may encompass both maintenance of behaviour, and its generalisation to new applications (Broad and Newstrom 1992). Training
literature and previous studies on transfer of training provide evidence to support
the claim that training works when it is theoretically driven, focused on required
competencies, designed to provide trainees with realistic opportunities to practice
and to receive feedback (Salas, and Cannon-Bowers 2001).

The transfer of learned knowledge and skills from instructional programs remains
a paramount concern for training researchers and practitioners (Burke 1997). Since the desired outcome of training is performance improvement, no matter
how good the training programme is, it is inadequate if it does not produce
significant new behaviours in the workplace. It is recognised that the period after
training seems to be the most crucial for facilitating transfer; several authors
suggest that post-training interventions need to be explored (Baldwin & Ford
1988). However, rigorous empirical investigation in this area remains scant
(Burke 1997)

Changed work-behaviours as a result of training interventions indicate transfer.
Transfer of training refers to the extent to which trainees apply the knowledge,
skills, and attitudes gained from the training back to the workplace (Mandl et al.

Transfer of training is an important concern for training researchers and
practitioners because it is estimated that only a small percentage of the training
actually results in transfer to the job (Baldwin and Ford 1988). Wexley and
Latham (2002) suggest that about 40 percent of content is transferred
immediately following training. However, the transference falls to 25 percent after
six months and 15 percent after one year. This suggests that as time passes,
trainees are unable to retain and use the information gained in the training
programme. Furthermore, this indicates that much of the time and money
invested in training is never fully realised.

Although transfer of training is one of the key criteria for evaluating the
effectiveness of any formal training programme, research has revealed that by far
the most commonly collected training criteria are trainee reactions and learning
(Al-Athari and Zairi 2002); (Alliger et al. 1997). These factors are relevant to
evaluate training but they are not the crucial ones to determine whether, or not, a training course has succeeded. In fact, trainees can react positively to the training and can learn something, but it does not mean they will apply the training once they are back on the job (Caetano and Velada 2004).

As training transfer is an important criterion of a training programme's success, a number of researchers have called for studies that analyse factors affecting training transfer. Until now, the available literature has revealed three main influences on training transfer viz. the training design, such as instructional techniques and learning principles (Alvarez et al. 2004), self-management and relapse prevention strategies (Tziner et al., 1991); (Wexley and Nemeroff 1975), goal setting (Gist et al. 1990); (Brown 2005), and the four ability dimension factors of the learning transfer system inventory (LTSI), such as the training content validity, transfer design, personal capacity for transfer, and the opportunity that trainees have to use learning in the work context (Bates et al. 1998); (Chen et al. 2005); (Ford et al. 1992); (Holton et al. 2000).

Regarding organizational-level factors, Kontogiorghes (2004) emphasized the importance of both transfer climate and the work environment in facilitating transfer. Transfer climate includes a number of factors including supervisory and peer support, but also task cues, training accountability, opportunities to practice, opportunities to use new knowledge and skills, and intrinsic and extrinsic rewards for using new knowledge. Work environment factors include sociotechnical system design variables (e.g., fostering job involvement, employee involvement, information sharing), job design variables (e.g., fostering task autonomy, job match), quality management variables (e.g., employee commitment to quality work, customer focus), and continuous learning variables (e.g., continuous learning as a priority, rewards for learning). With a sample of 300 employees in the information technology division of a large U.S. automaker, Kontogiorghes (2004) found support for both climate and work environment factors as predictors of transfer motivation and performance.
A number of studies have investigated in-training strategies for improving transfer, with little or mixed success. Brown (2005) examined goal setting at the end of training by comparing three conditions: setting distal goals, setting proximal plus distal goals, and telling participants to do their best. Contrary to expectations, participants instructed to do their best out-performed trainees told to set distal goals, and did as well as participants told to set proximal plus distal goals. In contrast, Richman-Hirsch (2001) reported positive effects for a post training goal-setting intervention, particularly in supportive work environments.

The importance of holistic and more systemic models of transfer takes into account various factors outside of the learning intervention (Ruona et al., 2002; Kontoghiorghes, 2002; Russ-Eft, 2002). Those situations and consequences in organizations that either inhibit or facilitate the use of what has been learned in training back on the job—referred in the literature as transfer climate (Rouiller & Goldstein, 1993)—have been shown to influence transfer outcomes directly (Kontoghiorghes, 2001; Lim & Morris, 2006; Mathieu et al., 1992; Tracey et al., 1995), indirectly as a moderator between individual or organizational factors and transfer (Burke & Baldwin, 1999), and as a correlate to transfer implementation intentions (Machin & Fogarty, 2004). Features of a positive transfer climate have been identified as cues that prompt trainees to use new skills, consequences for correct use of skills and remediation for not using skills, and social support from peers and supervisors in the form of incentives and feedback (Rouiller & Goldstein, 1993).

Since 1980’s transfer of training theories emerged to highlight the interaction among the trainee characteristics and the work environment as the primary source of influence on transfer of training (Baldwin & Ford 1988); (Broad & Newstrom 1992). Some trainee characteristics thought to affect transfer have been suggested in the literature: motivation, self-efficacy, and self-expectancy. Motivation to transfer can be described as “the trainees’ desire to use the knowledge and skills mastered in the training programme on the job” (Noe 1986). Self-efficacy refers to an individual’s judgment on “how well one can execute course of action required to deal with prospective situations” (Bandura 1982). Expectancy theory proposes that people interact proactively with their
environments based on their expectancies about the likelihood of the desired outcomes (Howard 1989).

The traditional transfer strategies are not sufficient for achieving substantial positive transfer because they focus only on the period of acquisition of skills within a training process. The literature has focused primarily on the period after training as the crucial time to facilitate positive transfer (Michalak 1981). Many post-training strategies have been suggested in the literature. The main purpose of these strategies is to build a facilitating transfer climate through forming a support group or buddy system to support transfer. Specifically, these strategies attempt to help trainees clarify the expectations and goals for transfer, provide feedback, provide social, emotional, and task support, and thus increase trainees' motivation and self-efficacy to transfer (Broad and Newstrom 1992).

Goldstein and Ford (2002) also proposed a model of learning and transfer outcomes, which further demonstrates links between critical areas necessary for transfer outcomes. As shown in the model, learning outcomes (trainee and retaining material) are influenced by the quality of instruction and trainee's readiness and motivation to learn. These factors indirectly affect transfer outcomes because they impact on learning outcomes occurring during the training session. The extent of transfer of learning outcomes to the workplace (transfer outcomes) also depends on factors within the workplace (work characteristics) Fig 2(iii).
Success of training depends hugely on objectives of training, content, methods, and the need of the training.

Goldstein and Ford (2002) identify four main barriers to the transfer of training into work practice:

(a) Failure to consider trainees’ personal characteristics when designing training
(b) Conducting training in isolation from the job trainees perform
(c) Failure to consider strategies that may potentially enhance or detract from the trainee’s ability to translate new skills into practice
(d) Failure to consider the role or aims of the organisation.

Transfer of training refers to transfer of learned behaviour or skill on the job. The transfer depends on trainee’s inherent qualities and the support of the organisation. Individual traits like Self efficacy, job involvement, job satisfaction, locus of control etc. have an impact on learning and transfer pattern of training. The appropriate inbuilt system and processes prevalent in the organisational culture promotes, support transfer of training for enhancing organisational effectiveness.
Effectiveness of training depends on how efficiently training has been transferred on the job. There are various organisational and individual factors responsible for outcome of the transfer of training. Individual factors includes trainability of an individual, it varies as per the character and behaviour of individual. Locus of Control, Job involvement, job satisfaction, self efficacy and motivation to learn are some of the individual factors which determine the trainability of the individual. Organisational culture, Organisational learning, training philosophy and support of superiors/organisation also affect the effectiveness of training.

2.4 Training evaluation

Organisations are investing lot of resources in training activities. Therefore, there is a need to evaluate the training programme and its effectiveness. Otherwise, the whole process of training will become a ritual only. All training programs should be evaluated (Hubbard 1995). There are many reasons as to why it is essential that training is evaluated. Effectiveness is an important aspect of a training programme otherwise the training is obsolete. It is important not only that the benefits of training be maximized, but also that these benefits are documented. Recently proposed conceptualizations and measures of training effectiveness can enhance the perceived benefits of training from the perspective of the various stakeholders in the process, including those who participate in training, those who deliver it, and those who fund it (e.g., organizations Bruke & Hutchins 2007). It is important that training evaluation include a consideration of the intended purpose of the evaluation, the needs and sophistication of the intended audience, and the variables related to various types of utility reactions (i.e., affective versus utility).

There are several ways to ensure effective training in the workplace. Companies need to be evaluating their programmes which research has shown that only 25% of them are taking this very necessary step (Kraiger 2002). Most companies use reactions data where employees state their satisfaction with the information and the trainer. The participants in the training programmes must be willing and ready to learn the material. They need to have motivation or a compelling reason
to absorb the information. The information in the training programme must be learned and transferred to the job. The participants must know why the training is occurring. The information presented needs to be significant to the trainees. They must be able to practice their knowledge and receive feedback from the trainers as to their progress (Kraiger 2002). Furthermore, Alliger and Janak, (1989); Tannenbaum, Benneett, Traver, & Shotland, (1997) showed that reactions data is correlated weakly at best with learning, behaviour and results data. In fact, Tan, Hall and Boyce (2003) found that those who reported disliking the training programme actually learned the most.

An effective evaluation is much more than that. In 1994, a survey of training in the United States found that for companies with 100 more employees, 66 percent said they assessed learning, 62 percent assessed behavioral change, and 47 percent assessed the impact of training on organizational outcomes (Geber 1995). In 1996 another study indicated 70 percent assessed learning, 63 percent assessed behavior, and 25 percent organizational results (Olsen 1998). Both studies show an increase in evaluation efforts since the late 1980s. A major reason given for this change is an increase in accountability for everyone.

The most important reason is to discover if learning has taken place in the training session. Learning can take place mentally, emotionally or by a change in the level of skill a person acquires. Companies and especially decision makers want to understand how and why the training programme is effective, and are they getting return from the investment in training? (Kraiger, Ford and Salas 1993).

While determining training needs and generating new training programs for employees is important, yet it is not enough. There is also a need to evaluate the effectiveness of the training efforts in order to rationalize them. Prior studies indicated that companies use different levels of analysis to evaluate training effectiveness. Some companies follow a traditional approach that focuses on trainees' attitudes or reactions to a training program e.g., trainees opinions about training materials, delivery methods, effectiveness of the trainers, usefulness of the training program, etc). Others extend the training evaluation to incorporate
some measured outcomes of the training programs (e.g., skills learned or knowledge gained, measured changes in trainees’ behaviour on the job after the training, etc). Still other companies seek to measure the net financial effects of the training programs (or their returns) to the company, as whole, or to its individual departments. Measuring the effectiveness of a training program at the reaction level and/or the levels of skills learned or knowledge gained are the most common approaches that companies use Bramley and Kitson (1994).

Bramley and Newby (1984) identify five main purposes of evaluation: feedback (linking learning outcomes to objectives, and providing a form of quality control), control (using evaluation to make links from training to organisational activities, and to consider cost effectiveness), research (determining relationships between learning, training, transfer to the job), intervention (in which the results of the evaluation influence the context in which it is occurring), and power games (manipulating evaluative data for organisational politics).

In most organisations, training is typically evaluated using reaction data (Saari, Johnson, McLaughlin & Zimmerle 1988). The participants are asked about their satisfaction level of the training programme, content and trainer. Companies should be evaluating their programmes using data that show the amount of learning and transfer that takes place once the person returns to their job.

The importance of evaluation for training effectiveness requires its inclusion as part of the training programme and not something to be thought of at the end of training. Hence, a plan of evaluation should precede training and not follow it. Randall (1960) suggested following objectives of training evaluation:-

(1) To create a self-correcting training system in order to increase effectiveness of current and subsequent training;

(2) To have a well-controlled training programme in which strengths and weaknesses are identified and corrected by means of a positive feedback;
(3) To provide information which facilitates the introduction of new ideas and changes for increasing training effectiveness;

(4) To aid the learning process of the trainee. While evaluating the training, the trainee indirectly assesses his own learning and it is the primary principle of the psychology of learning that knowledge of results facilities learning.

Effectiveness of training programme usually is determined by assessing combination of the criteria presented in Kirkpatrick’s (1967) hierarchical model of training outcomes. This hierarchy is composed of four levels of training outcomes: (a) trainee’s reactions to the program content and training process (reaction); (b) knowledge or skill acquisition (learning); (c) behaviour change (behaviour); and (d) improvements in tangible individual or organizational outcomes such as turnover, accidents, or productivity (results).

Philip (1997) has developed return on investment on model (ROI) which consists of five stages. The first four stages reaction, learning, behaviour and results are similar to Kirkpatrick model, but the fifth one is return on investment, which focuses on benefits – cost comparison. (Bushnell, 1990) introduced Input, Process, Output, Outcome (IPO) system of evaluation, thereafter, Training Validation System (Fitz-End 1994), Goal-based (Worthen & Sanders 1997) contributed in the area of evaluation of training. The problem with evaluation is that only reaction is being evaluated rather than the results.
Goldstein (1974) puts forward simple model of an instructional system, in which he identifies the three main phases as the assessment, training and development and evaluation phases.

**Figure 2 (iv): Goldstein Evaluation Model**
There are three validity issues related to evaluation of training-namely, internal validity (did the training make a difference), training activity (did they reap), performance validity (are they transferring the learning?). Evaluation of training is an attempt to obtain information (Feedback) on the effect of training programmes and to assess the value of the training. It is an ongoing process and performed during the analysis, design, development and implementation phases after the participants return to their job (Goldstein 1978). Evaluation may be internal focusing on the instructional process and measuring the learning outcomes, and external which includes transfer of learning on to the job situation, and getting feedback from participants. The purpose of evaluation includes feedback, control, research, intervention and power games (Bramley & Newby 1984). Various factors which influence the outcome of evaluation are the nature and type of organisation; trainer’s understanding of evaluation; conduct of evaluation; methodology for evaluation and availability of resources such as, time; money and personnel. Burgoyne and Cooper (1975) revealed that very few practitioners were assessing other than trainee’s reactions. Easterby, Smith, and Tanton (1985) observed that much current practice is only a ritual. In many cases the evaluation that counts is done before the course is ever given. Post-course data merely confirm judgements that the training is satisfactory. Foxon (1989) in his review of training and development programmes evaluation found that trainers had a firm belief in principle of evaluation, but it was limited to measure only the reaction of trainees.

Philips (1997) has divided training results emanating from evaluation into two types of data- hard data, which includes output, quality, time and cost, and Soft data which comprises work habits, work, climate, attitudes, new skills, development, advancement, and initiative. Evaluation uses certain assessment and validation tools for ensuring the practical results of the training and to determine whether the objectives of training are met or not. Pareek & Lynton (2000) has observed that there are seven major aspects of training to evaluate. They are listed below, with three parts of each. The sets are also matched with their "dimensions"—KIPO. And the diagram orders these aspects into a conceptual scheme of training.
### Converge of Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.No</th>
<th>Areas of Evaluation</th>
<th>Dimension</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1    | Pre-training Factors Context    | • Preparation  
      |                                 | • Learning motivation  
      |                                 | • Expectations                     |
| 2    | Training Inputs                 | • Curriculum including strategy (sequencing)  
      |                                 | • Specific events  
      |                                 | • Expectations                     |
| 3    | Training Management Context     | • Preparation  
      |                                 | • Learning motivation  
      |                                 | • Expectations                     |
| 4    | Training Process                | • Areas of satisfaction/dissatisfaction  
      |                                 | • Training facilities  
      |                                 | • Other facilities                  |
| 5    | Participant Development Outcome | • Conceptual development  
      |                                 | • Learning of skills  
      |                                 | • Change in values/attitudes  
      |                                 | • Change in behaviour  
      |                                 | • Application                      |
| 6    | Organisational Development Outcome | • Job effectiveness  
      |                                 | • Team effectiveness  
      |                                 | • Organisational effectiveness     |
| 7    | Post-training Factors Context   | • Cost  
      |                                 | • Organisational support  
      |                                 | • Organisational factors hindering or facilitating use of training |

Sikka (1985) suggests two models to evaluate training effectiveness. First is the expectation-achievement model consisting of matching post-training achievements with pre-training expectations of the Supervisor, peers, the subordinates and trainee himself. The second is the experimental control group model, wherein a group of employees who have gone through training is compared in terms of their performance with those who have not. The models are useful in generating comparative data to judge if training has really made a dent.
Bramley and Kitson (1994) discussed four levels of training evaluation. The first is the trainees' reaction to the program. It focuses on assessing what the trainees thought of the training program, usually in the form of a questionnaire. The second level is trainees' learning. It focuses on measuring their gained skills that were specified as training objectives. The third level is the behavioural outcome. It focuses on measuring aspects of job performance, which are related to the training objectives. The fourth level is the organisational results. It focuses on the results of the training program to organisational objectives and other criteria of effectiveness.

Phillips et al (2000) has developed return on investment model, which consists of five stages. The first four stages reaction, learning behaviour and results are similar to Kirkpatrick model, but the fifth one is return on investment which focuses on benefits-cost comparison-

Fig 2 (v): Phillips ROI Model
Burgoyne and Cooper (1975) and Snyder et al. (1980) discussed evaluation in terms of feedback and the resultant issue of control. A decision must be made about how and to whom evaluation feedback will be given. Evaluators are usually conversant with the purpose of the evaluation once they commence it, but this may be because they have a generalised view that the purpose of evaluation is to produce a certain set of data, or because they have determined what purpose the client wishes the evaluation to have. It is possible however that an evaluator may have no specific purpose. The identification of unanticipated side effects of the program may be an important evaluative purpose. Lange (1974) suggests it is often difficult to determine the purpose - there may be several; furthermore, the evaluator may not discover the real purpose until the end of the exercise.

The objectives-driven model focuses on the extent to which training objectives have been met, and the common method of evaluating transfer of learning is by control groups. The desirability of setting measurable objectives, following a cost-effective plan to meet them, and evaluating to determine the degree to which they are met is a recurring theme in the HRD literature (Elkins 1977); (Freeman 1978); (Keenan 1983); (Del Gaizo 1984); (Larson 1985).

The literature is cluttered with suggested evaluation techniques ranging from simple questionnaires to complex statistical procedures. Often the one technique is presented under several different names, such as pre & post testing which is variously referred to as pre-then-post testing (Mezoff 1981), the 3-Test Approach (Rae 1983), and Time Series Analysis (Bakken and Bernstein 1982). Similarly, Protocol Analysis Mmobuosi, (1985) and the journal method of Caliguri (1984) are basically one and the same technique.

Recent years have witnessed a burgeoning of evaluation methods developed by scholars and practitioners (e.g., Wang & Spitzer, 2005), which offer training and HRD professionals more alternative approaches and opportunities to conduct outcome evaluation. Brown (2002) indicates that tests are a means through which to gather data from employees. They can be constructed in order to assess the level of understanding a employee possess about their position. Tests are easily administered in a specific setting or the employee can fill them out from
their home. This type of data collection is a great way to assess deficiencies in the skills of various employees or a specific target group.

A number of reasons have been noted for organizations failing to conduct systematic evaluations. First, many training professionals either do not believe in evaluation or do not possess the mind-set necessary to conduct evaluation (Swanson, 2005). Others do not wish to evaluate their training programs because of the lack of confidence in whether their programs add value to, or have impact on, organizations (Spitzer, 1999). Lack of evaluation in training was also attributed to the lack of resources and expertise, as well as lack of an organization culture that supports such efforts (Desimone, Werner, & Harris, 2002; Moller, Benscoter, & Rohrer-Murphy, 2000).

In a broad sense, training program evaluation can be divided into two categories, formative evaluation and summative evaluation (Noe, 2002; Scriven, 1996). An evaluation intended to provide information on improving program design and development is called formative evaluation (Scriven, 1991). Specifically, the purpose of formative evaluation is to identify weakness in instructional material, methods, or learning objectives with the intention to develop prescriptive solutions during training program design and development (Brown & Gerhardt, 2002).

In contrast, an evaluation conducted to determine whether intended training goals and outcomes are achieved is called a summative evaluation (Scriven, 1991). Summative evaluation is conducted after a training program has been delivered. There may be few resistances to evaluation of training. The HR officials may feel that evaluation is a threat to their job. Blanchard, Thacker (2006) opines that Training managers can come up with a surprising number of reasons for not evaluating training such as nothing to evaluate and No one really cares about it. Such resistance have to be tactfully managed and the focus should be on fulfilment of organisational objectives.

With the increase of spending on training activities by the organisation there is a need to evaluate training programmes and its effectiveness. Evaluation of
training should be an integral part of the planning of training programmes and its execution. It should be a self correcting training system to identify strengths and weaknesses of the training inputs. It should provide feedback to introduce new ideas and methodologies to improve training effectiveness. There are number of tools for evaluating the training programme. Evaluation should be more than just assessing the reaction of the training.

2.5 Training Evaluation and Training Effectiveness

There is a difference between Training evaluation and Training Effectiveness. Training evaluation is a methodological approach for measuring learning outcomes. Training effectiveness is a theoretical approach for understanding those outcomes. Because training evaluation focuses solely on learning outcomes, it provides a micro-view of training results. Conversely, training effectiveness focuses on the learning system as a whole, thus providing a macro-view of training outcomes. Evaluation seeks to find the benefits of training to individuals in the form of learning and enhanced on-the-job performance. Effectiveness seeks to benefit the organization by determining why individuals learned or did not learn. Finally, evaluation results describe what happened as a result of the training intervention. Effectiveness findings tell us why those results happened and so assist experts with developing prescriptions for improving training.

The literature suggests that there are organisational and individual factors affecting the training effectiveness. Organisational culture, organisational learning, need based training, training design, training methodology, infrastructure, work environment plays a major role in effectiveness of training. Individual factors too have a bearing on results of training i.e. motivation of trainees, locus of control of trainees, job involvement, job satisfaction etc. Additionally, there are specific characteristics that contribute to the facilitation of the learning. First, is the trainability of the people considered for the training program. Their cognitive ability impacts the amount of information they learn (Ree & Earles 1992). Employees also need to possess the basic skills and minimum cognitive ability needed to perform the job. Second, their personality
and specifically the trait of conscientiousness impacts the amount of learning that takes place (Kraiger 2002). People who possess this trait tend to be dependable, responsible, organised and strive toward achievement. Those who believe that they can learn are highly motivated to learn and value goals.

Noe (1986) proposed a model of the motivational influences on the effectiveness of training programs. The dependent variables for the model include the multiple measures of training effectiveness described by Kirkpatrick (1967). The model describes the possible influences of trainees' attitudes toward their behaviour, job, career, and work environment on learning, behaviour change, and attainment of desirable organizational outcomes. The variables included in the model were chosen on the basis of a review of the organizational behaviour and training and development literature.

Fig 2 (vi): Noe's Model of Motivational influences on the effectiveness of training

Work environment factors that affect transfer can be classified into three categories: organisational climate, social support and task support. Organisational climate is generally defined as the perceived structures, values, systems, and qualities of a particular organisation (Jones & James, 1979). The
primary source of social support are management/supervisors, work groups, and trainers.

As per the model devised by Noe (1986), environment favourability has an impact on learning behaviour of the trainees. The work environment is an important factor for learning and transfer of learning on the job. It includes variables in the organisational culture and climate dimensions, such as the continuous learning culture (Tracey et al. 1995) and supervisor support, supervisor sanctions, peer support, and performance feedback (e.g. Baldwin and Ford, 1988); (Colquitt et al. 2000); (Holton et al. 2000); (Holton et al. 1997); (Noe 1986); (Tracey et al. 1995); (Tracey and Tews 2005).

Almost always, the application of learned knowledge and expertise are intertwined with other organizational factors, such as organization support and the application environment (Holton, 2005; Wang et al., 2002). Organization culture has a major bearing on effectiveness of trainee in an organization. Organization which promotes learning will encourage its employees for training to enhance their knowledge, skill and attitude, will provide support, encourage experimentation/ innovation and strive for synergy. Therefore, organizational learning is considered to have an impact on the learning from training programme as well as transfer of learning on the job.

2.6 Organisational Learning

The organisation emphasizing on the learning and sharing will have a conducive environment for training effectiveness. The concept of organisational learning has been widely espoused. Huber (1991) believes that organisational learning consists of four major constructs: knowledge acquisition, information, distribution, information interpretation, and organisational memory. His views have been basically synthesized towards interactive systems within the organisational learning construct.

Argyris and Schön (1978) has described Organisational Learning as 'a process in which members of an organization detect error or anomaly and correct it by
restructuring organizational theory of action, imbedding the results of their
inquiry in organizational maps and images' whereas DiBella et al. (1996) feels
that it is 'the capacity (or processes) within an organization to maintain or
improve performance based on experience'. There has been wide ranging
definitions of Organisational learning, according to Edmondson and Moingeon
(1999), 'Organisational learning is a process in which an organization’s members
actively use data to guide behaviour in such a way as to promote the ongoing
adaptation of the organization.

Senge (1990) popularized the term 'learning organisation', states that such
organizations have the following five characteristics. These are:

1. Develop personal mastery.
2. Use mental models.
3. Build shared vision.
4. Understand the power of Team learning.
5. Use systems thinking.

The concept of learning has traditionally been used in the context of individuals.
This concept was extended to organizations, with a distinction being made
between organizational learning (OL) and individual learning. Pareek (2000)
proposes mechanisms that are helpful in diagnosing OL systems and intervening
to make them more effective. Furthermore, He defined OL as "the process by
which an organisation acquires, retains, and uses inputs for its development, and
the process results in an enhanced capacity for continued self-learning and self-
renewal."

Scholars have been debating over the difference between organisational learning
and learning organisations. Chan, Ladd (2004) pointed out that, in spite of the
theoretical complexity, the various definitions indicate organisational learning is
a change process where organisations acquire knowledge and skills to deal with
issues or problems in order to enhance processes or productivity.

Even though measures of transfer climate are in a state of transition, the influence
of other situational influences on trainee skill maintenance continues to serve as a
reliable factor in explaining training transfer. Research in the area of organizational learning culture (Awoniyi et al., 2002; Bates & Khasawneh, 2005; Egan, Yang, & Bartlett, 2004), provides a broader understanding of how an organization's value of learning can impact performance resulting from training. Ultimately, transfer be considered from a multidimensional perspective to elucidate the relationships among situational and individual factors (Ford & Weissbein, 1997; Lim & Morris, 2006; Machin & Fogarty, 2004). Ford and Weissbein (1997) suggested to be mindful to explore transfer not just from an individual program perspective but also from a departmental, subunit, or organizational perspective.

The research literature suggests seven key factors responsible for facilitating organisational learning. These include individual learning (Argyris and Schon 1978); (Kin 1993), team learning (Senge 1990), knowledge sharing (Huber 1991); (McDougall and Beattie 1998), shared vision (Senge 1990), positive learning environment (McDougall and Beattie 1998), change-friendly culture (Argyris and Schon 1978), and system thinking (Senge 1990). Companies intending to be learning organisations must invest their resources towards developing as well as sustaining these factors of organisational learning.

Continuous-learning culture is defined as "a pattern of shared meanings of perceptions and expectations by all organisational members that constitute an organisational value or belief" (Tracey et al 1995). Such shared meanings involve individual, task and organisational characteristics. In consequence, employees working in a continuous-learning environment share the perceptions and expectations that learning is essential to them and associated with their work. According to their empirical study, continuous-learning culture was directly related to post training behaviours.

The supports-in-organisation variables come from the concept of social support that is said to be influential when employees believe that other client systems in the organisation (e.g. their supervisors and peers) provide them with opportunities for practising new skills and knowledge in the job settings(Noe 1986). Opportunity to practise ensures that when trainees have plenty of chances to
apply what they have learned to their jobs, a larger amount of training content can be transferred (Ford et al 1992). Some researchers have used the term "transfer climate" to represent the social supports from the organisation e.g. (Tracey 1992). Basically, there are four major sources of social support - subordinate, peer, supervisor and top management (Facteau et al 1995).

Organisational learning has emerged as one of the tool for effectiveness of the organisation. It is a process by which organisations acquire knowledge and shares amongst the employees, encourages experimentation, believes in learning in teams. This inbuilt capacity of the organisation helps to maintain or improve productivity.

### 2.7 Organisational Learning and Transfer of Training

An organizational culture that fosters employee development and growth, favours constant improvement and progress, and encourages employee initiative will have a positive impact on transfer of training. For example, Baumgartel, H., Reynolds M. and Pathan, R. (1984) found that an organizational climate characterized by high appreciation for performance and innovation had a positive impact on the application of trained skills. Such a culture increases trainee motivation to transfer newly acquired knowledge and skills to the job setting. In addition, as more employees engage in effective transfer of skills, such behaviours come to be taken for granted. Over time this norm of actively seeking to apply new knowledge and skills could become institutionalized (Zucker 1987), which has positive effects on the effectiveness of training programs in organization. On the other hand, an organizational culture that is more "passive" and unenthusiastic about change and challenge will not encourage the effective transfer of trained skills.

Tziner et al (1991) found that supportive environment alone could not influence trainees' use of trained skills. Rouiller and Goldstein (1993), using a sample of managers of fast-food restaurants to study the effect of transfer climate on posttraining behaviour, further found that transfer climate was not significantly related to learning. Yet, some authors' findings indicated that a positive transfer
climate encouraged transfer of behaviour in the job setting (Olsen 1998); (Rouiller and Goldstein 1993); (Tracey et al 1995). Other studies showed that support from supervisors and peers moderately affected pre-training motivation (Facteau et al 1995) but significantly affected the perceived transfer of training (Xiao 1996). Seyler et al (1998) revealed that opportunity to transfer and peer support were related to motivation to transfer, while Axtell et al (1997) found that trainees' motivation to transfer was a key predictor of both immediate (one month) and longer-term (a year) skill transfer. Moreover, subordinates' support (Facteau et al 1995) and management support (Brinkerhoff and Montesino 1995) could facilitate transfer of training. (Brinkerhoff and Montesino 1995) also found that strong relationships built by involved parties (i.e. trainers, trainees and managers) before, during, and after training could ensure a positive transfer.

Although practitioners stress the importance of the work environment in creating positive transfer of training, empirical research focusing on this dimension was limited (Baldwin and Ford 1988). Recently, more studies have been based on note such work-environment variables as supports-in-organisation, continuous-learning culture and task constraints e.g. (Facteau et a 1995); (Tracey et al 1995).

Another major component of work environment is task constraints. Mathieu et al (1992) found that task constraints were shown to be negatively, but only marginally, related to training motivation. Furthermore, the study of Facteau et al (1995) revealed that manager's perceptions of task constraints in the environment were not significantly related to their pre-training motivation and perceived training transfer.

Perhaps the most consistent factor explaining the relationship between the work environment and transfer is the support trainees receive to use their new skills and knowledge (Clarke, 2002).

Support from peers and colleagues have also proven to wield more consistent influence on trainee transfer than supervisory support (Facteau et al., 1995). When testing a model of individual and organizational support for transfer, peer support emerged as having the only significant relationship ($B = .65, p < 0.05)$
with skill transfer in the modeled relationship; the other variables (supervisory support, self-efficacy, and goal orientation) affected skill transfer through pretraining motivation (Chiaburu & Marinova, 2005). In a qualitative study exploring which peer support behaviors were most influential on transfer, Hawley and Barnard (2005) found networking with peers and sharing ideas about course content helped promote skill transfer 6 months after training. However, despite the findings for peer support and trainee transfer, the lack of manager support participants perceived back on the job limited the positive influence of peer support on continued skill maintenance. Follow-up focus groups conducted 6 months after the training revealed that manager support of transfer could be improved with a better alignment of organizational and training goals.

Training failure can be a manifestation of the values, beliefs, and assumptions shared by members of various levels of organizational culture. Bunch (2007) has pointed out that disregard for sound practices are an immediate cause of failure but also a reflection of cultural barriers that can circumvent the best-designed program. Beliefs that training is simple, unimportant, or pointless generate behaviours such as employing incompetent trainers, rejecting the recommendations of competent trainers, discouraging transfer of learning to the job, and failing to recognize positive transfer.

In the review of literature, Ford and Weissbein (1997) have emphasized that, for deriving practical applications, more efforts have to be devoted to examining the relationships between work-environment factors with learning and transfer so as to develop intervening strategies by adjusting these factors to a favourable level. The supports-in-organization variables come from the concept of social support that is said to be influential when employees believe that other client systems in the organization (e.g. their supervisors and peers) provide them with opportunities for practicing new skills and knowledge in the job settings (Noe, 1986). Opportunity to practice ensures that when trainees have plenty of chances to apply what they have learned to their jobs, a larger amount of training content can be transferred (Ford, J.K., Quinones, M.A., Sego, D.J. and Sorra, J.S. 1992)
Recent increases in the study of work-environment variables have resulted in a more mature understanding of the impact of work environment on training transfer. Relevant publications include the operationalisation of the meanings of work environment (e.g. dimensions as transfer climate and continuous-learning culture) by Tracey (1992) and the study of construct validation of work-environment measures (e.g. the development of a transfer climate instrument by Holton, E.F., Bates, R.A., Ruona, W.A. (2000). On the other hand, Tracey, J.B., Tannenbaum, S.I., Kavanaugh, M.J. (1995) examined the impacts of transfer climate variable on transfer outcomes using a sample of supermarket managers, while Rouillier and Goldstein (1993) used a sample of managers of fast-food restaurants. The relationships of these constructs deserve more tests to ascertain their generic validity in other training programmes for managers in order to identify the key characteristics of climate and culture to support the positive transfer of supervisory or managerial skills.

Saks and Belcourt (2006) studied the effect of activities before training (e.g. supervisor involvement, training attendance policy), during training (e.g. training rewards, training feedback) and after training (supervisor support, organization support) on transfer of training. One of their important findings showed that pre-training and post training activities were more strongly related to transfer than were activities during training. A group of researchers also attempted to establish a generic instrument, namely the learning transfer system inventory (LTSI), to measure transfer and its antecedents in real work settings (Holton, Bates, and Ruona 2000). The LTSI classified 16 constructs (identified based on extant literature) into four categories: trainee characteristics, motivation, work environment and ability.

Very few empirical studies have been found which assesses the impact of organisational learning on transfer of training. Roberson, Kulik and Pepper (2009) conducted evaluation study of diversity training of associates of different departments. They found that trained knowledge and skill were positively related to the use of transfer strategies by their respective organisations.
Valeda, Caetano, Michel, Lyons, and Kavanagh (2007), recently investigated whether aspects of the work environment (performance feedback and supervisor support) predicted the transfer of training. Specifically, performance feedback from the supervisor that was received after training had a significant correlation with skill transfer. In their study, performance feedback was defined as an indication from management about how well an employee is performing on the job. Feedback concerning the newly acquired knowledge and skills, and how these relate to job performance, increases the probability of its transfer to the workplace (Valeda, Caetano, Michel, Lyons, and Kavanagh 2007). Although positively related to training transfer, the other component of the work context – supervisor support – did not predict skill transfer. This is a finding that is consistent with several other studies examining support coming from a vertical source (e.g. Chiaburu & Marinova, 2005; van der Klink et al., 2001).

In learning organisations, emphasis is laid on shared learning and team work. Leaders play an important role in subordinate development. Kang and Stewart (2007) states that leaders who from high-quality social exchanges with their subordinates create an environment where subordinates have increased levels of trust, empowerment and performance. These dimensions are beneficial for training transfer.

Effectiveness of training programs and interventions extends beyond the individual participating in the training, the particular type of training and the intervention design features. The individual who has a good relationship with his or her supervisor stands a much better chance of benefiting from the training, which will lead to positive outcomes, both for the individual and the organisation. Anne Scaduto, Douglas Lindsay and Dan S Chiaburu (2008) conducted a study on transfer of training and found that Leader Member Exchange is positively related to training transfer, training maintenance and training generalization.

2.8 Training Design and Training Effectiveness

For achieving the objectives of training programme, the training course should be designed effectively. Design should include proper objectives, relevant
contents, methodology which is helpful for the process of learning. Improper
design will make the training programme a mere ritual of assembly of employees
of the organization in an official function.

In terms of training delivery, recent research indicates that the benefits of using
technology can be enhanced by providing trainees with adaptive guidance.
(Herman Aguinis and Kurt Kraiger 2009).

Circumspect procedure is required for starting the design process (Lynton &
Pareek 2000). It is similar to that required for developing the overall strategy:
within its narrower confines, it must include all the key components and provide
for successively finer approximation. Developing good training objectives takes
time, effort and careful thought. Good training objectives affect the learning of
trainees, Training design, trainer and training evaluation. Trainees benefit from
training objectives in a number of ways. Objectives at the beginning of training
tells the trainee exactly what will be required at the end of training. Knowing
what is expected up front can serve to reduce the stress of the training. It also
provides a context for focusing trainee’s attention, and attention is the first step in
the learning process (Blanchard, Jame, Thacher 1999)

Designing the training programme with clearly defined objective is a vital step in
the entire gamut of training activities. Training is a means to achieve an end. It
is not an end in itself. Unless the objectives are clearly defined and programme
designed in such a way that it leads to the achievement of the objective set out, it
will be only a wasted effort (Singh 2004). The linkage between the design and
the objectives must be carefully thought through by the trainer before announcing
a programme.

Emphasizing on the importance of Training, Blanchard, Jame, Thacher (1999)
observed that desirous about training , design of training integrate what we know
about “how people learn” (Learning theory) with “what they need to learn” to
develop the appropriate training, that is, how the training needs will be addressed.
People learn best when they feel they have control over the pace and depth of the learning process (Scherer 1984). Therefore, training design should allow trainees to have input into the pace and time spent on topics. Trainees will attend to things in the environment that are most important to them.

Retention of what is learned in training programme is an important aspect. Linou & Kontogiannis (2004) compared immediate recall and follow-up retention levels (after six weeks) in four groups. Trainees were production engineering undergraduates. The primary objective of training was to help participants develop diagnostic strategies to identify symptoms and problems given a set of fault scenarios. One group received systemic training (focusing on structural, functional, and physical relationships among subsystems), two groups received either low-level or high-level diagnostic information, and one group received general training on theories related to manufacturing plants. The theory group and both diagnostic groups performed better on the immediate recall measures, whereas the systemic group performed better on the retention measure, presumably because group members built a more stable organization (mental model) of the training content. Similarly, Holladay & Quinones (2003) showed that adding variability to practice trials resulted in better long-term retention, presumably because trainees had to exert greater effort during skill acquisition.

Training methodology will have a direct impact on training outcomes. The trainer has to show creativity in designing the course. Type of method will improve the effectiveness of learning. Error training is one such creative method. Researchers continued to explore error training as a strategy for increasing performance and maintaining performance under changing environmental demands. In contrast to traditional training design approaches that focus on teaching correct methods (and avoiding errors), error management training encourages trainees to make errors and engage in reflection to understand the causes of errors and strategies to avoid making them in the future.

Heimbeck et al. (2003) implemented error training using a sample of undergraduate students. The task consisted of learning how to use spreadsheet software (i.e., Excel). Performance was assessed by raters who reviewed
videotaped sessions and rated whether discrete tasks such as entering data correctly or formatting a table were performed correctly. Trainees who were provided the opportunity to make errors (together with explicit instructions encouraging them to learn from these errors) performed significantly higher than those in error-avoidant conditions. In a follow-up experiment, participants learning how to use presentations software (i.e., PowerPoint) performed better in the error training with meta-cognition prompting (i.e., instructions encouraging trainees to think explicitly about what the problem is, what they are trying to achieve, and so forth) compared to the error-avoidant condition (Keith & Frese 2005). A meta-analysis by Keith & Frese (2008) reported that overall, error management training was superior to either proceduralized error-avoidant training or exploratory training without error encouragement ($d = 0.44$). Effect sizes were moderated by two important factors: Effect sizes were greater for post-transfer measures compared to within-training performance, and for adaptive transfer tasks (as opposed to tasks structurally similar to training). Thus, error training may be appropriate for developing a deeper task understanding that facilitates transfer to novel tasks.

Research on error training highlights the importance of understanding and affecting learner states and answers long-standing calls to engage in research on how individuals learn, not in just the latest training fads (e.g., Campbell 1971, Kraiger et al. 1993). For example, Schmidt & Ford (2003) reported that levels of meta-cognitive activity mediated the effects of a computer-based training program on declarative knowledge, task performance, and participants' self-efficacy.

An increasing amount of evidence suggests that trainees’ self-regulatory processes mediate the training–learning relationship. Self-regulation refers to the extent to which executive-level cognitive systems in the learner monitor and exert control on the learner's attention and active engagement of training content (Vancouver & Day 2005). Chen et al. (2005) trained 156 individuals in 78 teams on a flight simulator task and examined adaptive performance on subsequent performance trials. Training participants' self-regulation processes mediated the effects of training on task self-efficacy and their adaptive performance across
trials. Two studies reported by Sitzmann et al. (2008) used repeated trials to demonstrate that while engaging in self-regulatory processes facilitates learning, the effects improve over time.

Proper usage of technology helps in the process of training effectiveness. Technology-delivered instruction (TDI) continues to become increasingly popular in industry (Paradise 2007), although researchers have been slow to study factors that facilitate or limit its effectiveness (Brown 2001, Welsh et al. 2003). TDI includes Web-based training and instruction on single workstations, PDAs and MP3 players, as well as embedded just-in-training in work-related software (Aguinis et al. 2009). One potential drawback of TDI is that it transfers more control to learners to make decisions about what and how to learn (Noe 2008). A recent meta-analysis by Kraiger & Jerden (2007) indicated that high learner control has only marginally beneficial effects on learning, and in many studies, high control has a negative effect. Low-ability or inexperienced learners under high learner-control conditions may make poor decisions about what and how to learn (DeRouin et al. 2004). Sequencing of contents is also very important. If topics of discussion do not seem to follow some logic and just come in random succession the learning may be piecemeal and participants may not be able to relate one session to the other Saiyadain (2004).

It is important to know which instructional method is well accepted by A meta-analysis by Sitzmann et al. (2006) examined the relative effectiveness of Web-based instruction over classroom instruction. In an analysis of 96 published and unpublished studies involving 19,331 trainees, the researchers found that Web-based instruction was 6% more effective than classroom instruction for teaching declarative knowledge but was equally effective for teaching procedural knowledge. However, when the same instructional methods were used in both forms of instruction, there were no differences in the relative effectiveness of either media. Thus, the small advantage of web-based instruction over classroom training may be due more to the use of novel (and effective) training strategies than to the medium per se.
Although a vast amount of conceptual support exists for using needs assessment to ensure the appropriate training needs are identified (Rossett, 1999; Swanson, 2003), there is a shortage of empirical support linking use of needs assessment to transfer outcomes.

Indeed, using goals (both assigned and participative goal setting) to increase training transfer has received much support in the extant literature (Locke, Shaw, Saari, & Latham, 1981; Richman-Hirsch, 2001; Taylor et al., 2005; Wexley & Baldwin, 1986; Wexley & Nemeroff, 1975). Goal-setting has been found to help individuals regulate their behavior by directing attention and action, mobilizing energy expenditure or effort, prolonging effort over time (i.e., persistence), and motivating the individual to develop relevant strategies for goal attainment (Brown, 2005; Locke & Latham, 2002)—all behaviors necessary for transfer.

While designing a training programme, utmost importance should be given to determine the objectives of the training. In a study comparing trainee and manager perceptions of the importance of training objectives, Lee and Pucil (1998) found a significant relationship between the importance of training goals and perceived transfer of training.

Presuming a learning intervention is needed, explicitly communicated objectives can inform learners of the desired performance, the conditions under which the performance will be expected to occur on the job, and the criterion of acceptable performance (Mager, 1962, 1997) to maximize transfer. Researchers have investigated how to design and teach for transfer (Machin & Fogarty, 2004); thus, as the instructional design literature continues to burgeon, numerous instructional strategies and methods have emerged to facilitate transfer (Russ-Eft, 2002).

Kontoghiorghes (2001) found that the development of learning goals and objectives was significantly correlated with transfer ($r = .37, p < .05$), indicating that participants are likely to transfer when they have a clear understanding of what knowledge and behaviors are required after training. From a practical perspective, Brown (2005) found that participants who set proximal (short-term)
goals plus distal outcome goals reported increased transfer than those who set only distal outcome goals.

Van Merrienboer, Kester, and Paas (2006) suggested a design strategy that reduces extraneous cognitive load by presenting learners with a whole–part approach to learning. The whole–part sequence involves first presenting learners with varying task elements through worked examples (i.e., examples work out to show learners correct solution steps) and completion problems (i.e., where a learner must complete a portion of the solution) and then increasing task complexity by using conventional problems such as case studies. Gradually presenting learners with different examples of a task and reducing the amount of performance feedback—called scaffolding—supports germane load by supporting learners’ internal monitoring and feedback mechanisms.

A related instructional strategy that has been studied to promote transfer is the use of error-based examples, or sharing with trainees what can go wrong if they do not use the trained skills back on the job. Smith-Jentsch, Jentsch, Payne, and Salas (1996) presented trainees with videotaped re-creations of airliner mishaps to create a perceived need for training. These authors had proposed that negative pretraining events enhanced trainee performance by increasing the perceived instrumentality of training to avoid negative outcomes (i.e., aviation mishaps). They found that the number of negative event types the trained pilots had previously experienced predicted their ability to apply the trained skill 1 week after training. Similarly, in Ivancic and Hesketh’s study (2000) firefighters were exposed to error-based training (i.e., where trainees learn from others’ mistakes), and they found that firefighters using detailed case studies reported higher transfer performance than those who were trained using error-free examples.

Intervention design and delivery includes numerous established variables influencing transfer, mostly via their impact on learning, including learning goals, content relevant, practice and feedback, and behavioural modelling (Burke, Hutchins 2007). A glaring gap is the paucity of empirical data to support widely touted active learning methods; although continuously advocated, they remain unsubstantiated in their effect on transfer.
In a review of the training design factor, Ford and Weissbein's (1997) indicated that the cognitive and instructional psychology perspectives held promise for future research, specifically in the areas of error-based training, metacognitive skills, and goal orientation. Design of training plays an important role in the learning process of a trainee. The design should be in order so that individual is motivated to learn and transfer the learning on the job. It should include proper framing of objectives, content, methodology, duration, as per the requirement of trainees. It should also be ascertained that design of training is done after proper training need analysis.

2.9 Trainer’s Role on Outcome of Training

The major objective of any training programme is to improve the performance and behaviour of trainees. The role of trainer is to assist the trainee to learn appropriate skills and translate the knowledge into action. The credibility and success of any trainer depends upon what he teaches and how he teaches. This will have a greater impact on learner's ability to learn and act. The existing literature does not place sufficient emphasis on trainer's roles in transfer following the training. Broad and Newstrom (1992) recognised the transfer responsibility of trainers has not always been recognised or fully accepted.

Trainers are no longer mere providers of activities; their role is increasingly to add value to organizational learning as the foundation for future competitiveness. A trainer is a crafts person at work. Intent on the utility and elegance of the result, he or she also varies the pace to go with the learners' best pace (Lynton & Pareek 2000). There is lot of literature reflecting the role of trainer in training Effectiveness. Gilleard (1998) conducted a study on how the attitudes, feelings, and experiences of three trainers affected their role of change-maker, within one particular training program. The results suggest more account of trainers' belief systems may be necessary if change management objectives are to be credibly and consistently achieved. Employers, managers, and peers, as well as the individual all have a part to play in enabling trainer empowerment as bedrock for organizational change-making.
Trainer not only shares knowledge with the trainees he has other roles also. Masih (2007) proposed the idea of treating the role of trainer as leading in the classroom and emphasized on rich overlaps and similarities between the role of a leader and trainer. Both require knowledge, passion, and motivation. He gave a framework of roles of a trainer and elaborated on the leadership component of each. Trainer plays a decisive role in making training a successful event.

James (2001) argues that people should not be treated at par with machines and practical trainers turn to psychological theories for support. There is sufficient advice available to trainers regarding the tricks that work in successful training for academicians and consultants (Robertson 1978); (Jones 1979).

For effective training, trainer should take steps so that he leads to the crux of the performance problem. Hays (1984) states that trainer should research to the clients needs in depth. Then they should work side by side with management to procure a solution. This allows for the management team to feel a sense of ownership for the training programme.

Trainer’s job is to create an environment where learning takes place. Tall and Hall (1998) state that no matter what type of style of learning one uses there are some important elements that must be in place for the training to be effective. Communication is a major key to the learning environment. People will be able to rid themselves of their fear or disregard any misunderstandings about the purpose of the learning. Open discussion is also important for the participants to voice their opinions and ask any questions. The trainer should indicate what the training goals and objectives are at the beginning of the session. This will help to maintain focus during the learning process. It should also be explained how the training will benefit the employee as well as the company in the long run.

The classroom behavior of any trainer can be explained by using the dimensional model given by Lefton & Buzzatta (1990).
As per the model developed by Lefton and Buzzotta, (1990) the classroom behaviour of any trainer may show one of the four patterns depicted in the model. Since they interact with the learners, they follow certain pattern of behaviour. Q1 is mainly concerned with self-aggrandizement. The training session is seen as an opportunity for show off and to make an impression. It results in confrontation and little learning. Q2 is concerned with self-protection and training session is seen as a threat, which requires change in behaviour. It creates a vacuum – a complete absence of motivation and enthusiasm for learning. Q3 is concerned with acceptance and the session is seen as an opportunity to develop congenial and good relationship with trainees. It results in mutual admiration and trainers and trainees accept each other’s ideas leading to harmony. Q4 is concerned with learning and training session and is seen as an opportunity to develop potential and satisfy the curiosity of trainees. Trainer is open to any new idea and helps the group to synergize the learning. It is desirable for a trainer that he should be in Q4 for better learning by trainers. It is important to develop good interpersonal skills to be successful as trainers. Similarly, the dimensional model of learning.
behaviour is also presented to explain the behaviour of learners, which explains the expected behaviour patterns of learners if trainers are reflecting behaviour as depicted in the earlier mode.

Understanding the learner's behaviour is equally important to trainer. It provides them an idea to handle the learner in an effective manner. Some learners are difficult and they always try to overpower the trainer and trainers find it hard to train them. Similarly, some learners keep quite and do not open up. At the same time, some of them are easy going and always reflect a positive attitude. But true learners are open, involved and actively participate in the discussion and try to learn as much as possible. Thus, it is important for trainers to understand trainee behaviour and accommodate them accordingly for learning to take place.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dominance</th>
<th>Warmth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q1</strong> Stubborn, opinionated openly resist to learning. Challenges or tries to throw trainer off balance. Tries to dominate group discussions. Dogmatically defiant. Makes knowledge of show and skepticism.</td>
<td><strong>Q4</strong> Involved, attentive, open-minded, asks questions, voices disagreement without rancor; explores issues in depth. Enjoys candid give and take. Eager to learn and to contribute. Learns by active involvement and keeps an open minded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q2</strong> Uninvolved, remote, silent. Reactions are hard to read. Seldom asks questions, Response is tense and guarded. Doesn't participate in group discussion or makes noncommittal contributions.</td>
<td><strong>Q3</strong> Outgoing, agreeable, talky. Lavishly praises training programme and trainer. Make positive comments only; rarely disagree or raises controversial questions. Acts as a conciliator in group discussions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Lefton and Buzzotta, (1990).

Figure 2 (ix) : The Dimensional Model of Learner Behaviour
As per the model, the task of the trainer is to adapt to the need of each learner and thereby surmount the obstacles raised by those needs. He needs to tone down the exhibitionist characteristics of Q1 learning so that class is not disrupted. He has to overcome the reluctance shown by Q2 learner so that he participates in the learning process. Trainer also tries to make Q3 learner more candid and open. Thus it can be said that adaptability based on the understanding that no two learners are identical and no two learners should be treated equally helps the trainer to excel. Trainer's job is to motivate learners to shift towards Q4 behaviour, as it will deliver better results. Trainer must be able to understand each learner's behaviour. He should clearly communicate and convince them that there is something in store for them. He should be able to manage disagreement and stimulate and maintain interest.

Studies relating personality and trainer behavior indicate that his personality can influence his training philosophy and behaviour. Deutsch, Pepitone, and Zander (1948) looked at the trainer of a basic skill-training programme. The results showed that trainers have superior intellectual ability, and turned creative imagination to immediate and practical aspects of work. They were sensitive to others, affiliative and non-aggressive. They were skilled in communication, tactful, and responsible.

In another such study, Reisel (1959) made an in-depth analysis of two trainers and found that the first trainer had self-efficacy attitude toward him and work, and tried to play the role of a father figure for the group. Second trainer, on the other hand, was highly ambivalent in his behaviour due to his insatiable need to be successful. Thus Riesel's study attempted to show the relationship between trainer's personality and his behaviour. Effectiveness of the trainers not only depends upon his personality, but the type of group being trained, and some social-cultural factors.

Learner's perception about the trainer is also important. Lohman, Zenger, and Weschler (1959) studied student's self-perception and perception of the trainer. They found that trainer was seen as significantly more adequate in the beginning than at the end of the group. Thus, it can be said that trainer's intervention in the
group results in participant changing to some degree in one form or other. The trainer may force compliance, serve as model or offer help and information. It has also been found that location of the trainer in terms of various emotional and work sub-groups, the nature of the consensus among these sub-groups and compatibility is important for group development (Stock & Hill 1958). A study by Stermerding (1961) showed indirect influence of the trainer on group development. Another study to examine the effects of the training interventions on the pattern of the group behavior specifically on its normative behaviour by Psathas and Hardert (1966) showed that trainer's interventions influenced what members should or ought to do and his view constitutes what is appropriate group behaviour. Trainer's interventions were consistently fit into four normative categories: analyzing group interaction or process, feelings, feeding, and acceptance concerns.

The relationship between trainee and trainer is very important for the development of the group such as whether the trainee group is maintaining a work-oriented, non-personal relationship or the group is withdrawn and shows confusion and anxiety. It depends upon the members of the group. Mann (1966) examined the trainee-trainer relationship in the group development and developed a schema. He suggested five stages of development.

| Appraisal | Confrontation | Reevaluation | Internalization | Separation |

In another study, Peters (1966) examined the relationship between trainer identification and personal change and found that participants who identified with the trainer became more like the trainers. Specifically, participant's self-concept converged with their perception of the trainer and the trainer's self-concept. This shows that identification is a relevant learning mechanism. Bolaman's (1968) study reveals that trainer congruence empathy was positively related to participant learning. Cooper (1968) in his study found that when the trainer was seen to be attractive, the participants became more like the trainer in their attitude.
and behaviour. Similarly, when the trainer was seen to be congruent, changes occurred in the participant's self-concept.

The review of literature reveals that trainer plays a major role in the process of training. Trainer assists the trainees to learn appropriate skill and translate the knowledge into action. The role of trainer is not only teaching but he is responsible for creating an environment where learning takes place. He should be able to impart knowledge and skill to the trainees and extract their experience so that everybody including him learns from their inputs. He should show strong interpersonal skills like patience, interest, sociability, willingness to learn and positive attitude. Trainers should be open to continuous and thoughtful analysis. His supportive instinct will help the trainees to learn effectively and transfer the training on the job.

2.10 Individual Factors and its impact on Training outcomes

Although the "bottom line" for most training programs is effectiveness, little attention has been devoted to studying why training programs are effective for some individuals and ineffective for others.

There has been a long history of research examining the linkage of individual characteristics with learning. For example, training motivation has been proposed to be a function of personality dimensions, both narrow traits (e.g. simple skills and hobbies) and wider traits (e.g. mental and physical abilities, personality) (Digman 1990). Their effect on training outcomes nevertheless remains 'a relative void in the literature' (Mount and Barrick 1998), except for a couple of studies. For example, locus of control (i.e. a person feels in control of events in their lives), conscientiousness and anxiety are significantly related to transfer behavior (e.g. Ackerman et al. 1995; Barrick and Mount 1993; Silver et al. 1995).

Moreover, Silver et al. (1995) found a significant relationship between locus of control and skill acquisition. Ford et al. (1998) revealed that both mastery and
performance orientations predict post-training self-efficacy positively and negatively, respectively.

Burke & Hutchins (2007) in their integrative literature review pointed out that certain learner variables have been fairly well established as having important influences on transfer of training, including cognitive ability, self-efficacy, pretraining motivation, negative affectivity, perceived utility, and organization commitment variables. Other individual-level variables exhibit mixed findings particularly conscientiousness, extrinsic versus intrinsic motivators, and external versus internal locus of control, and thus demand primary attention moving forward.

Hogan, Hogan, and Roberts(1996) advocate considering personality dimensions in combination when analyzing performance, because the way each trait operates depends on other traits. As such, relevant research questions in this category include: What is the ultimate profile or combination of traits for trainees who struggle with transfer? How can trainers most efficiently develop such profiles for employees and utilize them? What transfer interventions will help this type of trainee transfer learned knowledge and skills on the job?

Ford and Weissbein’s (1997) extensive review of trainee characteristics acknowledged improvements in using theoretical perspectives to guide the selection of learner characteristics to examine but indicated little had been studied on personality. This is an area that has improved since their review; the development of personality models has no doubt fueled the improvements in this realm. A gap that remains is their call for research on trainees’ prior experience, for which we found negligible coverage.

Having trainees set specific, but challenging goals (Brown, 2005; Richman-Hirsch, 2001; Wexley & Baldwin, 1986), use action plans (Broad & Sullivan, 2002; Foxon, 1997), and engage in self-regulatory/management behaviors (Frayne & Latham, 1987; Gist, Bavetta, & Stevens, 1990; Latham & Frayne, 1989) have found conceptual and empirical support for direct and indirect effects on trainee transfer.
In one of the first models of managerial performance was developed by Porter and Lawler (1968). They proposed that performance was a function of abilities, traits, effort, and role perceptions. This model is useful for understanding why learning, behavior change, and performance improvement differ among training program participants. Trainability is hypothesized to be a function of three factors: ability, motivation, and perceptions of the work environment. The cognitive and psychomotor skills that trainees possess directly influence whether or not they will be able to understand and master the content of the training program.

The ability component of trainability has received the most attention; that is, most studies addressing the trainability issue have focused on the relationship between the trainees’ ability levels and mastery of the program content (Siegal & Ruh 1973). If the results of trainability testing studies summarized by Robertson and Downs (1979) are considered an indicator of the relationship between ability and training effectiveness, then approximately 16 percent of the variance in trainee performance can be attributed to Trainability. Perhaps trainees’ motivation and perceptions of the favourability of the work environment can account for an additional 15-20 percent of training effectiveness variance.

In a study conducted by Dnyanesh & Meenakshi (2005) on factors that influence the training participation of employees. Valence and instrumentality of the individuals are more important predictors of training participation than expectancy. Motivation to learn and motivation through expectations are the mediating variables for participation in training. Therefore one shouldn’t overlook individual factors when training is considered.

2.11 Locus of control and Training Effectiveness

Among various personality variables, locus of control was hypothesised in many earlier studies to affect the transfer process e.g. (Baumgartel et al 1984); (Noe and Schmitt 1986). Locus of Control refers to individual’s belief that events, which happen to him, are contingent upon his behaviour or circumstances. Locus
of control is a stable personality trait that is likely to affect individual motivation and ability to learn. Based on Rotter's (1966) definition, individuals who are Internals believe that job performance and events that occur in the work setting are contingent on their own behaviour and are, therefore, under personal control. Because Internals feel they can control their environment, opportunities at work which may increase the probability of receiving rewards such as promotion, pay increases, or recognition are particularly salient to these individuals. An internal person feels in control of things, which happen to him whereas an external person thinks that events are beyond his control. Internal/external tendencies have implications for employee's attitude, perception and behaviour in the organization. Externals believe that work outcomes are beyond personal control and, therefore, attribute the cause for work outcome to luck, fate, or the actions of others.

In a review of the effects of locus of control on organizational behaviour, Spector (1982) suggested that because locus of control is a personality characteristic that influences beliefs about the ability to improve skills, it should be an important determinant of individual trainability. Internals may exert greater effort towards collecting relevant information in a training situation than Externals. A study by Broedling (1975) supports the link between locus of control and effort-performance expectancies. Here, Internals were more likely to believe that performance was contingent on their personal effort than externals. Applied to a training situation, the results of this study suggest that Internals may exert greater effort toward collecting relevant knowledge and skills in a training situation than Externals because they believe mastering the program content is under their personal control.

Trainees with an internal locus of control are more likely to act upon feedback regarding their skill strengths and weakness than externals; that is, Internals are more likely to exhibit high levels of motivation to learn in a training program. Internals may doubt the accuracy of negative feedback (Stone, Gueutal, & McIntosh 1984).
The study of Tziner et al (1991) indicated that those with an internal locus of control who benefited from a relapse prevention module exhibited higher levels of mastering the training contents. They were more likely to use trained skills and transfer strategies and were shown to transfer those trained skills to the workplace.

2.12 Job satisfaction and its impact on Training Outcomes

Job Satisfaction is another individual factor which affects the trainability of a person. An individual's satisfaction with his or her job has been defined and operationalized in a number of different ways. For example, some have satisfaction as a derivative of need (Hackman & Lawler 1971); (McGregor 1960). Others, operating within an equity work, have viewed satisfaction consequence of a comparison between inputs and outputs (Pritchard, Dunnette, & Jensen 1972). Similarly, expectancy- valence models have conceptualized satisfaction as a function of the individual's expectant rewards owing to his behaviors on the job (Vroom 1964). The approaches described emphasize cognitive approach to job satisfaction. The individual is assumed to be a rational, highly output oriented, who engages in logics, comparisons, rankings, and orderings.

Job satisfaction can be influenced by a variety of factors, e.g. the quality of one's relationship with their supervisor, the quality of the physical environment in which they work, degree of fulfillment in their work (Tesluk et. al 1995). Numerous research results show that there are many factors affecting the job satisfaction. There are particular demographic traits (age, education level, tenure, position, marital status, years in service, and hours worked per week) of employees that significantly affect their job satisfaction. Satisfying factors motivate workers while dissatisfying ones prevent. Motivating factors are achievement, recognition, the job conducted, responsibility, promotion and the factors related to the job itself for personal development.

It is reasonable to assume that perceived job satisfaction is comprised of multiple dimensions. These dimensions constitute one's affect responses to various facets of the work environment. For example, these may include one's perceptions of his or her supervision, pay, promotion, co-workers, and the work itself. Considerable
support exists for the viability of these as the primary dimensions of job satisfaction (Smith, Kendall, & Hulin 1969).

Maslow (1954) connects the creation of the existence of people's sense of satisfaction with the maintenance of the classified needs. These are: physiological needs (eating, drinking, resting, etc.), security needs (pension, health insurance, etc.), the need to love (good relations with the environment, friendship, fellowship, to love and to be loved), need to self-esteem (self-confidence, recognition, adoration, to be given importance, status, etc.) need of self-actualization (maximization of the latent [potential] power and capacity, development of abilities, etc.). Insufficient education, inability to select qualified workers for the job, lack of communications, lack of job definitions, all affect job satisfaction negatively.

Maslow (1954) asserts that participating in the management, having the decision making power, independence on the job and the unit where the individual works, have positive impact upon the job satisfaction. The job itself (the work conducted), and achievement and recognition at work result in satisfaction while the management policy, relations with the managers and colleagues result in dissatisfaction. Factors related to the job itself such as using talents, creativity, responsibility, recognition have influence on the job satisfaction.

While the dimensions of job satisfaction appear fairly clear, the causal agents of satisfaction are far less so. Certainly, variables such as opportunity to participate in decision making (Vroom 1964), job enlargement, job enrichment (Herzberg 1966), working conditions (Barnowe et al. 1972), and the individual's perceptions of his or her success and the internal-external feedback one receives from his or her performance (Hackman & Lawler 1971); (Herzberg 1966), all have some effect. In addition, individual's self-esteem, his perceptions about the job and environment play crucial roles in job satisfaction.

Job attitudes generally refer to the cognitive state of psychological identification with one's job (Cheng and Ho 2001). In general, we can argue that trainees who had a high level of job identification were more likely to transfer the learning acquired in training to the work context, perhaps because they can be more optimistic to the importance and utility of an organisational improvement. Based
on the expectancy theory, Noe (1986) developed a model in which he posits that motivational factors such as trainee’s attitudes concerning their jobs and careers can influence training outcomes. Nevertheless the applicability and usefulness of this model, the empirical analysis between job attitudes and training outcomes is still quite limited (Holton 2005); (Santos and Stuart 2003)

There is some empirical evidence e.g. Tesluk et al., (1995) suggesting that job attitudes are important predictors of training-to-work transfer, such as job satisfaction, organisational commitment and organisational cynicism. Tesluk et al. (1995) examined the influence of variables at the individual, unit and sub-organisation levels on the generalisation of employee involvement training to the work setting. The authors found that, regarding work-related attitudes, the trainees that are more committed to the organisation are more likely to report that they transfer the material from training to their core job, as do individuals with fewer cynical attitudes toward the organisation.

The theory of the organisational learning culture also suggests that there is evidence of a positive relationship between similar measures of occupational satisfaction and learning constructs. Organisations that promote and encourage continuous learning and development have employees who are more satisfied with their work (Egan, T.M., Yang, B. and Bartlett, K.R. 2004). According to this theory, they assumed that when individuals are more satisfied with their occupation they are more likely to learn the training material and to subsequently transfer it to their job.

Raquel Velada and Anto’nio Caetano (2007) found support for the direct effects of occupational satisfaction on perception of learning and perceived training transfer. This suggests that individuals who are highly satisfied with their occupation are more likely to learn and to transfer the training to the work context.
2.13 Past Studies on Evaluation of Training

The study conducted by Hill, Haynes & Baumgartal (1973) is dated and deals with the initial stages of management development movement in the country. It covers a sample of 240 participants trained in 17 different courses offered by Administrative Staff College in India and the Indian Institute of Management, Calcutta and Ahmedabad. Participant's reaction to the course revealed that more than 50% of them had been sent for training as a result of their company's policy without any clear perceptions and objectives about the course.

Though the study tried to link a number of variables like the organisational climate, participants' profile, content appropriateness, etc the findings are not free from methodological limitations. One primary limitation is the use of only tool of evaluation, i.e. perception of participants who had attended the training course. This method of self reporting is liable to personal bias.

A useful research study had been conducted by Virmani and Seth (1985) in Administrative Staff College of India, Hyderabad. It focuses on the methods of determining both the efficiency and effectiveness of such programmes. The researcher emphasised on the fact that any learning from training must also contribute to the transfer of learning on the job.

The approach to evaluation of management training and development has to be based on action research where the researcher themselves can play a leading role improving the training and development process and contribute to implementation of learning to the job. In their book "Evaluating Management Training and Development" the authors offer a great deal of guidance about the various factors which determine the effectiveness of training, the procedure for selecting trainer, clear goal setting in relation to results sought, post-training follow-up, etc and developed and evaluation model which in general with necessary changes could be adopted in all levels of institutional training.

Kailash, Srivastava, Deb & Prasad (1999) conducted a study to assess the effectiveness of training programmes offered by SNTI of TATA Steel through
internal customer satisfaction measurement and rating of employees about training effectiveness.

It was found that satisfaction level of participants, their superiors, and divisional heads were above average for all types of programmes. Participants had benefited from programmes, but transfer of learning was not as expected from their supervisors, there were changes in the post-training performance ranging from 10-37 percent. Training programmes could meet the objectives only to a limited extend, and it was not linked with the career advancement of the participants. Certain corrective measures were recommended. Such as- updating its programmes through redesigning the content and delivery; getting feedback from the various constituents; providing them support and opportunities to transfer their learning on the job. This would make training system relevant and help participants to improve their performance in a changing social, economic and technical environment.

Arago’n-Sa’nchez et al. (2003) investigated the relationship between training and organizational performance by distributing a survey to 457 small and medium-size businesses in the United Kingdom, the Netherlands, Portugal, Finland, and Spain. Organizational performance was operationalised as (a) effectiveness (i.e., employee involvement, human resource indicators, and quality), and (b) profitability (i.e., sales volume, benefits before interest and taxes, and a ratio of benefit before taxes/sales). Results indicated that some types of training activities, including on-the-job training and training inside the organization using in-house trainers, were positively related to most dimensions of effectiveness and profitability. Ubeda Garc’ia (2005) conducted a study including 78 Spanish firms with more than 100 employees. This study related organizations’ training policies (e.g., functions assumed by the training unit, goals of the training unit, nature of training, and how training is evaluated) with four types of organizational-level benefits: employee satisfaction, customer satisfaction, owner/shareholder satisfaction, and workforce productivity (i.e., sales per employee). Results suggested that training programs oriented toward human capital development were directly related to employee, customer, and
owner/shareholder satisfaction as well as an objective measure of business performance (i.e., sales per employee).

Benson et al. (2004) collected data from each of the 9439 permanent, salaried employees of a large high-technology manufacturing firm to assess the effects on employee turnover of the organization's investment in employee development via a tuition reimbursement program. Investment in training via tuition reimbursement decreased turnover while employees were still taking classes. There is a need for offering developmental opportunities to the employees and align training efforts within an organization's performance management system for reducing the turnover (Aguinis 2009).

Chakravarty (2000) conducted a study on training effectiveness in IST&M. He evaluated various Training Programmes in three phases i.e. Pre-Training, Input Evaluation, Post-Training Evaluation. Following are the findings:

**Training needs and training objectives:** As regards matching of training objectives and training need it is observed that in view of 70 percent of participants it was "complete", while in respect of remaining 27 percent it was "partial". About 64 percent of participants stated that the training objectives met the organizational needs "fully" and remaining 36 percent only "partially".

**Motivation in participant:** Almost 51 percent of participants had taken the initiative to get nominated for the course, in the case of another 20 percent initiative was taken by their supervisors. In spite of the course being a compulsory one for all directly recruited Assistants, only 29 percent have stated that the decision to nominate them was exclusively an administrative decision of their respective offices. However, most of them have also admitted that, had the training course been optional they would have opted for it for fulfilling their personal training needs.

**Need and timeliness of the training:** About 85 percent of the participants have agreed fully and remaining 'to some extent' that there was a need of this programme to enable them to have a basic knowledge of their work and to learn necessary skill. 52 percent of the participants have found that the training is at
the right time while 48 percent of those and who have already put in some service feel that they are too late. None felt this training was too early.

The course input and Pre-training knowledge of trainees: The responses reveal that while subjects included in the syllabus adequately covered the nature and functions of the job, good number of participants have some knowledge of one or more subjects.

Tracey et al. (2001) collected data from 420 hotel managers who attended a two-and-a-half-day managerial knowledge and skills training program. Results showed that managers' job involvement, organizational commitment, and perceptions of the work environment (i.e., perceived support and recognition) were predictive of pre-training self-efficacy, which in turn was related to pre-training motivation. Pre-training motivation was related to post-training measures of utility reactions, affective reactions, declarative knowledge scores, and procedural knowledge scores.

Ibrahim (2004) examined the effectiveness of training programme offered to 94 trainees at two locations of training institutes in U.A.E. The researcher extracted the needed data from the record of institute for the year 2003. He examined empirically two levels of measuring training effectiveness using a sample of trainees who attended a training program in 2003. The first level focused on trainees' reactions to the training material and the course instructor as documented in the trainees' evaluation forms. The second level focused on knowledge and skills gained from training as measured by scores on entry and exit tests. The paper also attempted to identify some of the variables that help in explaining the achieved level of effectiveness.

The results indicate significant positive reactions to the training course. They also indicate significant increase in trainees' knowledge and skills after training. These results lead to the conclusion that the training course was effective. Additional analyses also indicate that trainees' perceptions of the training usefulness and their efforts to gain knowledge and skills are significant variable in explaining training effectiveness, after controlling for the effects of the demographic variables. These results indicate the need to prepare the trainees...
mentally before holding training sessions. They need to be oriented about the
importance of training and its usefulness. They need to be motivated to work hard
to gain the desired skills and knowledge.

Jain (1985) collected data on 119 managers in the steel industry who had attended
in-company or external training programmes. A questionnaire was administered
and their responses were tallied. A majority of the respondents were found to be
satisfied with the instructors, the size of the training group, the training duration,
the reading material and the training equipment. Except for one respondent, all
felt that training contributed substantially in developing their knowledge, skills
and attitudes. They also felt that the environment did help in implementing some
of the learning that took place during training

Rastogi (2002) conducted a study aimed at studying "Managerial Training and
Development" as existing at middle and junior levels of management in some
selected organizations in Public and Private Sector. It was observed that Training
Programmes Contribution toward Improvement in Performance of the executives
who attended the Training Programme. The organizational environment was
observed to be favourable to training as 35% executives reported to have got
favourable organizational climate "quite often"; 33% "sometimes and 23%
"often".

A comparative study of health care in Indonesia and India, Rao (2001) found the
reaction of participants centered on facilities available at the sight of the training.
He suggested that evaluation based on knowledge should be introduced. Singh
(2004) in his study of 27 supervisors from 10 mills concluded that compared to
controlled group, learning scores of experimental group improved significantly,
demonstrating, training did result in learning.

Sengupta (1999), found significant improvement in teaching skills of
experimental group of 14 trainee teachers, when compared with control group of
14 trainee teachers. Pattanayak (1998), comprising 1200 employees, concluded
that while training programs are successful to help employees understand their
job requirements and responsibilities (72% of people agreed) and effective in
developing interpersonal skills (50% of respondents agreed), training is not fully effective when it comes to practice what one learns in the day-to-day job.

Haque (2007) conducted a study on impact of training on the executives of Airtel. He was observed that there was a significant shift in intermediate result of knowledge and skill evaluation scores for experimental group, there was also a correlation between improvement in knowledge scores and shift in skill evaluation scores. The shift in productivity of experimental group has been found consistent.

Yet, two studies suggest some opposite findings. Bannerji (1981) collected data on supervisors who had undergone training in an Indian engineering company. They were administered a check-list. The responses indicated that the inputs in industrial relations had little or no impact on their effectiveness. However, most of them felt that training did improve their self-confidence, motivation, identification with management goals, and communication ability. In another study, Maheshwari (1981) collected data on 999 respondents from banking institutions. Though these managers found training programmes less effective with respect to their contribution to job performance, they did endorse the usefulness of formal training.

There is a mixed reaction to the usability of training generated capabilities. Kazmi (1990) found that most organisations have a high level of formalisation with regard to the collection of training evaluation data. While the data is used to provide feedback to trainers and course directors, it is of little use to the user departments. In case of sampled organisation (N = 113) the data was not used for placement, promotion or transfer of employees. On the other hand, Kumar and Shankar (1993) found that the alumni who went through training programmes reported training to be very much useful (34 percent), quite useful (63 percent) and of somewhat utility (3 percent). Using a before-after design, Subramanian and Sajjan Rao (1997) studied the effect of tailor-made training on 34 workers labelled as dirt bag or marginal workers. These workers were rated by their supervisors on overall job performance and adaptability, discipline record was provided by personnel department and they rated themselves on morale,
interpersonal effectiveness and self esteem. All ratings were done on a five point scale and the results are presented below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Before</th>
<th>After</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall Job performance</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>3.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adaptability</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>3.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>2.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morale</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>3.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Effectiveness</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>3.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Esteem</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>3.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All differences between the before-after averages were found to be statistically significant. Much of training effectiveness may also depend on the felt need of trainees to make use of training. Omar bin Sayeed (1998) found that learning effect is a function of trainees’ ability to develop meaningful expectancy of career utility of training and a deep sense of job involvement as most important variables contributing to training effectiveness.

The Kirkpatrick four-levels approach to training evaluation continues to be the most widely used training evaluation model among practitioners (e.g., Sugrue & Rivera 2005, Twitchell et al. 2000), although the approach continues to be criticized by researchers (e.g., Holton 2005, Kraiger 2002, Spitzer 2005). There has been little empirical work in the twenty-first century on designing and validating new evaluation measures, although there have been several conceptual contributions to frameworks guiding evaluation decisions (Holton 2005, Kraiger 2002, Spitzer 2005, Wang & Wilcox 2006).

There continues to be calls for establishing the return on investment for training, particularly as training continues to be outsourced and new forms of TDI are marketed as cost effective. Although the tools and strategies for showing return on investment are well known (e.g., Kraiger 2002, Phillips & Phillips 2007, Spitzer 2005), as the above review of organizational-level outcomes indicated, there remain few published studies of return on investment.
2.14 Research Gap

Extensive literature review conducted by the author reveals that although there has been lot of studies on training effectiveness but there is a huge research gap in impact of various organisation and individual factors affecting the outcome of the training in central government department of government of India. No empirical study could be traced on impact of organisational learning, effectiveness of design and trainer, locus of control and job satisfaction on the learning behaviour of trainees and subsequently its transfer on the job. Few studies could be located regarding impact of training on organisational learning but not the vice versa. Moreover most of the literature was related to European and American content. This huge gap in the area of empirical research in the field of training effectiveness especially in the context of Govt. of India needs to be addressed.