CHAPTER III
TRAINING & DEVELOPMENT
Chapter 3

Training and Development:

Helping employees to become effective in their jobs is one of the most fundamentally important tasks in people management that any work organization has to undertake. Employers depend on the quality of their employees' performance to achieve organizational aims and objectives; employees have motivational needs for development, recognition, status and achievement that can and should be met through job satisfaction.

Training aims to achieve short-term specific organization objectives, 'education is directed towards the long-term development of individuals'.

Training in a work organization is essentially a learning process, in which learning opportunities are purposefully structured by the managerial, HR and training staffs, working in collaboration, or by external agents acting on their behalf. The aim of the process is to develop in the organization's employees the knowledge, skills and attitudes that have been defined as necessary for the effective performance of their work and hence for the achievement of the organizational aims and objectives by the most cost-effective means available.

The importance of using a comprehensive definition as a basis for practice is that it focuses attention on the main aim of training, that is, effective performance, and leads logically to certain important conclusions and questions arising from the definition that determine the degree of effectiveness in practice.
Some salient feature of training are:

1. Training is always a means to an end and not an end in itself. Unless it leads to the effective performance of work it inevitably incurs a waste of valuable resources.

2. Precise definition of the requirements for effective performance in terms of knowledge, skills and attitudes by means of job analysis is of fundamental importance.

3. Because it is directed towards effective performance of work, it must be seen as an integral and vital part of the whole work system. Training is not, for example, an extraneous activity for which training staffs are largely responsible.

4. Since managers are responsible for the effective performance of work to achieve the organizational aims and objectives, they logically must have the responsibility for ensuring that employees are effectively trained for this purpose. Management must take the initiative in setting up, resourcing and monitoring the effectiveness of the training system and its provision in practice.

5. Whilst management bears the main responsibility, all staff in the organization are involved in the training task. Effective practice requires the collaboration of managerial, HR and training staffs.

6. The purpose of training may be achieved by a variety of means, e.g. by planned work experience in a series of different jobs, by planned experience within one job, by formal training at the workplace or at
training centres. The sole criterion for choice of method is whatever is most likely to achieve the training aim.

7. The development of an organization's human resources applies to all its employees from the most senior to the most junior. When training is defined in traditional narrow terms, it tends to be directed towards junior and middle grades of employees. But all employees are likely to need training of some kind throughout their working lives. It surely could not be assumed that senior staff, on whom so much depends, have no need for further learning - especially in view of the demands of economic, social and technological changes in the present times.

8. Because of the vital contribution that training makes to the development of human resources and the achievement of organizations' aims and objectives, all those responsible for training in any shape or form must themselves be trained for the task, e.g. full and part-time trainers, managers and instructors, as well as first-line supervisors.

Over the last three decades or so, training has acquired a significant position in the world of business and in the field of social development across the developed and the developing world. The scope of training is no longer limited to developing knowledge and competencies in individuals but considerable emphasis is placed on human relations in an organisation, leadership styles of senior management, and on promoting interpersonal effectiveness, training has acquired new dimensions in organisational functioning. In fact, it has now become a crucial element in providing a
sound basis for modern-day management. Having recognised the role of training in enhancing productivity and improving organisational functioning, many public sector undertakings and business houses have established their own in-house training infrastructure and built the necessary expertise and facilities to carry out their programme of training and deployment. At the macro level, training has become a part of the overall national strategy for human resource development and person power planning, thus serving as an important agency to contribute to the economic and social progress of the country. In many developing countries, government agencies offer a wide range of training programmes to young people making them more employable or helping them to become self-employed. This emphasises the need for large-scale, organised efforts to develop technical and entrepreneurial skills in unemployed youth, aiming to make them active and productive units of society. And with rapid strides in the fields of technology, the need for continually updating the skills of those engaged in technical vocations, through training, has been further underscored.

Generally, there is better recognition of training among the business organisations as it addresses their prime concerns of optimising the performance of the staff and enhancing productivity. Training also offers them a possibility to keep abreast with the latest developments in the fields of technology and management. This helps them to respond effectively to competition. A number of business organisations invest considerable amount of money in training their staff and have, therefore, developed appropriate policies and procedures to get full value of their investment. Some of them
even have a policy of sending their staff for regular updates of their competencies.

**The Present Scenario**

Amidst growing acknowledgement of the value of training to individuals and organisations, there are sceptics who are yet to be convinced of its worth. The critics offer a number of arguments to substantiate their contention that the financial resources consumed by a large number of training programmes in any country could be used for more productive and useful activities. They assert that training is often removed from ground realities and practice. And it does not adequately prepare individuals for coping with the problems that they encounter at work or in personal life and deals with certain crucial issues in a superficial and impractical manner.

There is also a view that the persons who need training do not get an opportunity, and where there is no financial commitment, some organisations are inclined to nominate those who are either available or can be spared for the duration of the training programme. On certain occasions, training agencies are keen to get the 'required' number of participants for a programme and are, therefore, willing to make compromises on the criteria for entry. It is also argued that for many participants, a training programme only provides a break from the humdrum of their work or everyday life, an activity that helps get away from their stresses. In all these cases, expectedly, training suffers. The detractors of training also emphasise that for
some business organisations, it has now become more an image-building exercise, with less concern for getting real value for training.

In the present scenario, there are some other disquieting facets of training as well. Increased recognition for training has led to the emergence of a large number of training agencies. Enterprising individuals have entered the field as private training consultants. While many are doing a thoroughly professional job, there are others who consider this a fast-track opportunity for making a mega buck. New training areas are being developed and aggressively marketed, some of them with little regard for their relevance or use to local requirements and conditions. In certain cases, ideas and ready-made curricula are imported from the developed world and planted directly in developing countries. Those who are susceptible to this kind of persuasive marketing, sometimes, return from the programme somewhat disillusioned by the experience. To attract big commercial organisations, training is often organised in five-star facilities. The maxim seems to be: higher the fee and more sophisticated the training facilities, more prestigious and sought after the programme.

There is another disconcerting element in the existing situation. Funding for training, especially in the area of social development, is available through international agencies and donors. As a result, training has become a commercial or profit-making activity for many training agencies or individuals. These agencies organise training programmes to satisfy policy and programme requirements of the donor agencies, with little consideration for training needs of participating organisations. They are driven by a desire to
garner maximum funds from these funding agencies. And it is not surprising that for some, it has become a lucrative business. In this moneymaking pursuit, professionalism becomes a casualty and the quality of training does not figure in the reckoning of these training agencies.

Concept, Meaning and Scope

With the recognition of training as an important avenue for development, during the last few years, the scope and application of training has been considerably widened. While, largely, it still remains a key tool for enhancing job-related performance and organizational effectiveness its value is being increasingly acknowledged in engendering behavioral changes and in developing skills, leading to personal growth. It equips an individual with the competencies that help him cope with day to day problems of living and manage interpersonal relations, improving his interpersonal effectiveness. A number of enterprising individuals and institutions are now offering short term training programs, helping individuals live a qualitatively better life. Thus, training has influenced every facet of an individual's life. As a result of these developments, human relation and personal development training now occupy significant places in the realm of training. It is, therefore, important that while training focuses on developing knowledge and competencies, appropriate to work and life situations, it should, directly or by implication, aim to foster such values in the participants that are consistent, with those prevalent in the larger society outside the precincts of the training venue.
Training and Education – as Approaches to Learning

Essentially, training and education are both growth-oriented and directed at the individual. Both aim to develop in an individual the ability to face the complexities of life and its challenges, although the approach followed in achieving this objective differs. As life becomes more competitive and knotty, there is greater emphasis on the respective roles of education and training. To some extent these roles are becoming increasingly complementary. Education provides the basic foundation on which training thrives. In some cases, training builds and fleshes out some of the areas covered under education. However, there are some dissimilarities between the two approaches to learning.

In training, the emphasis is on developing the repertoire of a participant that assists in improving his work-related performance or enhancing his interpersonal effectiveness. Thus, the scope of training is limited defined by the program objectives. It is specific and structured. It emphasizes application and the practical aspect of knowledge and competencies and not just their acquisition. Training has a shorter term - perspective of an individual life.

On the other hand, education barring perhaps professional courses, is usually not targeted to specific behaviour or function. It has a long-term perspective of an individual’s life. On the other hand, education barring perhaps professional courses is usually not targeted to specific behaviour or functions. It has a long term perspective of an individual life and its scope is wider. It is more inclusive than training and lacks the specificity of a training
programme. Transfer of training to field situations and its impact on the performance or behaviour of an individual can be monitored and assessed.

There is no dearth of definitions of training, each other giving it a different emphasis and focus. Without getting involved in the complexities of an all-inclusive, comprehensive definition, we will attempt to bring out the key elements that constitute training. This will help you understand the meaning and scope of training. The aim of training is to develop potential knowledge and skills of the trainees to carry out defined tasks and responsibilities. Training enhances efficiency and develop a systematic way of performing your duties and assigned tasks.

Cost-effective training: a systems approach

In a nutshell, cost-effective training means training that actually achieves the purpose of helping people to perform their work to the required standards and is at the same time affordable, that is, not unnecessarily lavish, when simpler, less expensive forms would equally well achieve the aim.

How is cost-effective training to be achieved? It is achieved by applying basic principles for cost-effective management to the specific situation of training, assuming that effective systems of job analysis and performance appraisal have been established so that performance criteria are defined and assessable. The steps are as follows:

1. Identify training needs - who needs training and what do they need to learn?
2. Taking account of learning theory (how people learn); design and provide training to meet identified needs.

3. Assess whether training has achieved its aim in terms of subsequent work performance.

4. Make any necessary amendments to any of the previous stages in order to remedy or improve future practice.

This process is commonly known as the systems approach to training (SAT). It has been successfully applied for many years by many organizations in the public and private sectors as one main way of achieving cost-effective training.

The SAT is so called because it is a series of interdependent systems, functionally linked together and integrated into the whole work system. The interdependence of the stages is crucial, since the malfunction or neglect of any one of them inevitably affects the others and the total system. Thus, if job analysis has not defined the criteria for effective performance, training needs cannot be identified by performance appraisal. If needs have not been properly identified, it is not possible to design and provide needs-related training, or to assess ultimate effectiveness in terms of subsequent work performance.

A more educational approach to long-term development is another model, which stresses the development of basic skills, techniques and self-development as a basis for developing adaptability in employees. An 'action
learning' approach is also possible. But all these have some notion of systematically determining what development is needed.

**Identifying training needs**

An analysis of training needs is an essential prerequisite to the design and provision of effective training. This is the first main stage in the problem-solving process that characterizes the SAT, that is, the diagnosis that systematically precedes prescription. In simple terms, the purpose of this diagnosis is to determine whether there is a gap between what is required for effective performance and present levels of performance. If any deficiencies are revealed, the causes and remedies may be various, and training is only one of a number of possible solutions.

Training needs arise at three levels - organizational, group and individual levels. They are interdependent because the corporate performance of an organization ultimately depends on the performance of its individual employees and its subgroups.

The corporate needs of the organization and its groups may be identified in the following ways:

1. The evidence of human resource planning: this provides information about the demand and supply of human resources and the possible implications for training needs. Thus, a forecast of a possible difficulty in recruiting people with required entry levels in knowledge and skills could affect recruitment and training policy, compelling the
organization to recruit at lower levels and then to provide compensatory training to fill the performance gap.

2 The introduction of new methods: whenever new methods of work, e.g. computers, are introduced, this changes the requirements for effective performance, creates a performance gap in knowledge and skills (and with new technology, in attitudes also, perhaps), and hence a training need.

3 Collective evidence from performance appraisal and formal methods for needs assessment: information emerging from the performance appraisal of individual employees or from formal methods such as meetings, interviews or questionnaires, in which line managers, HR and training staffs and individual employees are involved, may reveal needs for training that are common throughout the organization or to groups of employees.

This systematically acquired information is an essential basis for seeing what centrally provided training is really needed. Without this information it is very easy for central trainers to provide training on the basis of unsubstantiated views and personal preferences.

Accurately diagnosing the specific training needs for individuals requires the following system:

1 Job analysis to determine:
   (a) the objectives and component tasks of the job
the knowledge, skills and attitudes required for the effective performance of these tasks.

2 Assessment of the performance gap by line managers and individuals, based on a comparison of the required levels with present levels.

3 Specification of training needs indicated by this comparison.

4 Specification of the forms of training needed to satisfy the identified needs.

The joint participation of line managers and their individual members of staff to assess training needs is very important. It is more likely to produce a comprehensive and systematic analysis, and commitment on the part of the individual. It is also an opportunity to encourage individuals to assess their own needs and possible solutions as a part of their development.

It requires time and conscientious effort to make a thorough analysis of jobs and their specific requirements and then to set up formal arrangements for assessing needs, but there is no other basis for designing and providing the training that is really needed. Specific training needs for individuals may arise at any time during their working careers. However, there are particular occasions when a formal assessment is needed, based on the system described above, that is:

1 Starting employment: new employees will invariably need some kind of training to fill the gap between their present levels of knowledge and skills and those needed for effective performance of work.
Appraising performance: in performance appraisal recent performance is compared with required levels. The comparison regularly reveals deficiencies and needs, which have to be remedied by training.

Changing jobs: people changing jobs are in a similar situation to those starting employment. The requirements for the new job may well create a performance gap that needs to be filled by training.

Apart from the specific needs described above, individuals have continuing general needs for training in the broad developmental sense. They need to develop their experience within particular appointments. This is the responsibility of line managers, who must determine these needs by careful observation of performance and regular discussions with their staff, and provide the necessary opportunities by informal methods such as delegation, job rotation, etc. People also need the wider experience that comes with a variety of jobs. It is the responsibility of these HR managers, in their career development role, to ascertain these developmental needs and to meet them by career planning as far as operational demands will permit.

The learning organization

In recent years the degree of change in organizations has encouraged the view that organizational change through continuous learning is necessary for organizations to survive. This is well expressed in Peter Senge's (1990) book, The Fifth Discipline, in which he suggests that learning organizations are
those that know how to make use of five 'component technologies', these being:

1. Systems thinking: the notion developed of a systemic approach to learning, seeing the whole as well as the relationships between the parts of the system.

2. Personal mastery: 'continuously clarifying and deepening our personal vision' using our energy to develop ourselves.

3. Mental models: challenging the stereotypes and mental maps that managers carry around with them.

4. Building shared vision: leadership through communicating vision and values.

5. Team learning: encouraging team members to think together, through dialogue, using teams as the main learning unit.

Management development is frequently one plank in the change platform, and the notion of continuous development, aimed especially at improving employees through personal development, has gained ground. The two classic management development strategies for dealing with discontinuous, unpredictable change are personal development and action learning. Management development strategies are therefore now integral to change strategies, the argument being that the pace of change is so rapid that employees need to be highly adaptive, intelligent and educated so that they will know how to learn and will be prepared to go through retraining or re-educational programmes many times in their working lives. This is also
consistent, when applied as a principle throughout the organization, with the notion of empowerment - devolving responsibility to work teams and to individuals.

Learning theory

There is an argument that instead of emphasizing training, in HR, we should emphasize learning. The move towards action learning approaches is one sign of this.

Since training is essentially a learning process, all those who are in any way involved in training need to have an understanding of learning. Because learning is a continuous human activity, it has always occupied an important position in psychological studies. The main questions to be discussed are what learning is and how people learn. There is a general consensus about the first question, but much more debate about the second.

Learning may be defined as a more or less permanent change in behaviour, which occurs as a result of the influence of external, environmental stimuli on the inherent, genetic disposition of the individual. In the context of training it is useful to consider learning and behavioural change in terms of knowledge, skills and attitudes needed for effective performance. In formal learning situations this change is demonstrated and assessed by examinations or tests. In everyday life it is ascertained by observable changes in behaviour patterns, for example, an employee without commitment demonstrating through behaviour that he or she is now hard-working and conscientious. Since
training is directed towards the effective performance of work, ultimately this
is the point where learning or behavioural change really matters and needs to
be demonstrated. There is no point in such changes being shown at the end
of a training course if they are not transferred into observable changes in
practice in real work.

How people learn has been the subject of continuing discussion and some
controversy for many decades. Much of the evidence leads to the conclusion
that mostly we learn from experience. Kolb's (1974) learning cycle (Figure
below) suggests a cyclical process of continuous learning.

Chart 4

Concrete experience → Testing new behaviours → Observation and reflection → Formation of concepts and generalization

Above Figure demonstrates the role of experience in learning where we
generalize from our experience, and experiment with new ideas, as a
consequence of what we have learned, taking into account the feedback we have received from significant others. The challenge for development processes is to find ways of creating learning environments where new behaviours can be tested, and where there is assistance with observation and reflection, to facilitate the learning process.

From the theories, it is possible to distil some basic, simple, general truths about learning which are fundamentally important to those responsible for the design and provision of training, which we can summarize as follows:

1. People must be motivated to learn. They must see a beneficial outcome for themselves. They must see how training could help them to perform their work effectively. They must see a personal need for this to happen and to accept the methods chosen to achieve the training objectives.

2. Feedback is important to motivational and learning progress. People need to have feedback on their learning achievement.

3. Because learning depends on motivation, it is essentially an individual process. People will learn, if they want to, in their own preferred ways and at their own pace, depending on a variety of genetic and environmental factors and on age.

4. People learn from experience, therefore from example and by imitation. As a consequence, they may demonstrate behaviour that could be regarded as socially unacceptable or not conducive to the
effective performance of work. In other words, people may easily acquire bad habits and practices and regard these as good.

Learning can only take place through the human senses. All senses may contribute to the learning process, but the visual is the most powerful and, to a lesser degree, the auditory.

What implications does the individual orientation of the learning process have for trainers?

1. Training is a learner- and not a trainer-orientated process.

2. The trainer is essentially a catalyst in the learning process. As Galileo is reputed to have said, 'You cannot teach people anything. You can only help them to learn'.

4. In the practice of training, trainers need, therefore, to:
   
   (a) Show why people need to learn certain things, how it will help them, how their learning fits into a total picture and the relationship of parts to a whole (e.g. the rationale of a whole training programme and of a single subject in a course).

   (b) Make training as experiential and active as possible, i.e. using real work as the learning medium, or methods that relate to real work as closely as possible,

   (c) See that people learn from good examples and practice as far as possible.
(d) Use an imaginative approach, involving interesting, varied and stimulating methods for learning, supported by helpful audio-visual and similar aids.

(e) Be interesting and stimulating themselves through their own presentational skills.

(t) Structure learning so that people have regular assessments of their performance and achievement. Although tests are an obvious means of providing feedback, it can be given informally by the skilful choice of participative, active methods, video recordings, of the exercise, with feedback for the participants, for example.

The design and provision of needs-related training

This question is the second stage of the problem-solving process. The first stage was diagnostic, that is, to determine what the needs are. The second stage is prescriptive, that is, to decide what action is most likely to meet the identified needs. This requires generating and analysing a range of options in the light of objectives to be achieved and the economic use of available resources. As we have already seen, options available to meet the requirements of work, that is, to fill the performance gap, could well cover a wide range, and training is only one of these possibilities. When training is, in fact, the selected option, the same problem-solving principle applies - the next step is to determine in detail what form of training is most likely to meet
identified requirements cost-effectively. In the light of a broad interpretation of training, the range of possible options is wide. Making these choices raises questions such as who should provide training, of what kind, where and by what methods. The answers to all of these questions will be determined by training objectives.

**Training objectives**

Producing clear objectives is crucially important to the design and provision of cost-effective training. In general, sound objectives should specify what learning trainees should be able to demonstrate by the end of training. If objectives do not provide this criterion, how can trainers and the trainees themselves assess whether the required learning has been achieved or not?

Training objectives should meet the following criteria. Objectives should be:

1. Expressed in learner-oriented terms, e.g. 'By the end of the programme trainees should be able to demonstrate specified knowledge and skills'.

2. As specific as possible about terminal performance, standards required and attendant conditions, e.g. 'By the end of training, the manager will be able to use the computer to prepare spread sheets to create a project plan showing all the main stages in the plan accurately.'

3. As measurable as possible and capable of achievement in the time allowed for training.
Expressed in language that clearly states what the trainees have to do.

Training objectives that fail to meet these criteria are still regularly seen in published training programmes, for example, an objective for a management training course might be expressed in something like these terms: 'To familiarize managers with the principles of effective management.' In no way could any objective such as this be used as a criterion for measuring learning achievement. If the objective had said 'By the end of the programme students should be able to define the principles of effective management and support their answers with real examples drawn from practice and personal experience', the refined assessment of learning is then possible.

In fairness, it has to be said that it is much easier to produce objectives that enable learning achievement to be confidently assessed for some training subjects than it is for others. It is a relatively straightforward task to define objectives in measurable terms for specific activities such as computing skills, driving, flying, playing instruments, carpentry, plumbing, cooking, etc. It is much more difficult with a subject such as management. The task is simpler for specific managerial activities such as chairing meetings, interviewing, etc. Here the criteria for effective performance can be reflected in the training.

Once training objectives have been defined, it is possible to address the next stage in the process and to consider questions such as: who will provide the training? What form will it take? What will be the contents? Where will it be held? What methods will be used?
Purposes of Training and Development

Training and development refers to a planned effort by an organization to facilitate the learning of job-related behavior on the part of its employees. The term behavior is used in the broad sense to include any knowledge and skill acquired by an employee through practice. As you can see, the general purpose of training and development involves knowledge and skill acquisition. Any training and development effort can have one or more of the following three goals: (1) to improve an individual's level of self-awareness; (2) to increase an individual's skill in one or more areas of expertise; and/or (3) to increase an individual's motivation to perform his or her job well.

Self-awareness involves learning about oneself. It includes understanding one's roles and responsibilities in the organization, recognizing differences between one's actual and espoused managerial philosophy, understanding how one is viewed by others, and learning how one's actions affect other people's actions. Certain training and development techniques have as their objective giving trainees increased self-awareness.

Most of what is traditionally considered development to be training and development deals with increasing an individual's skill. This skill may involve electrical wiring, painting, blueprint reading, using a computerized cash register, following safety procedures, setting priorities, delegating or handling employee grievances, or increasing one's effectiveness as a leader. Obviously, these are just a few of the many different kinds of skills that can
be learned during training and development programs. Regardless of the type of knowledge and skill involved, the training program is based on the assumption that it will increase an employee’s ability to perform effectively on the job. You will see that many training and development methods have as their goal improving an employee’s knowledge and skill in the areas of decision making and problem solving. Often, people possess the skill and knowledge to perform the job, but they lack motivation to exhibit their abilities. For this reason, the goal of some training and development programs is to maximize the employee’s desire to perform the job well. These programs, admittedly, are relatively few in number. Also, most of these programs do not have employee motivation as their sole objective. For example, job rotation involves giving trainees an opportunity to work on a series of jobs in various parts of the organization in order to sharpen their career aspirations and commitment to the organization and, in addition, help them to develop their managerial skills in the process. On the other hand, there are training and development methods wherein the sole objective is to increase a person’s managerial motivation. These programs are discussed where the focus is on the developing and training of leaders who will be able to cope effectively with the demands of the twenty-first century. These three broad goals – increasing employee self-awareness, skill (including decision making/problem solving), and motivation – are attained by using one or more training strategies. At least three basic strategies are available to a training specialist: The specialist can try to improve an employee’s performance by directing his or her efforts toward (1) cognition (i.e.,
thoughts and ideas), (2) behavior, or (3) the environment in which the person is working. A few examples might help us to distinguish between these three strategies.

Behavioral modeling has its roots in cognitive psychology, but focuses primarily on the trainee's overt behavior. With this training approach, trainees view videotapes showing models who behave appropriately in a particular situation. Supervisors, for instance, might be taught how to take effective discipline action, delegate responsibility to employees, motivate the average performer, and handle customer complaints.

The Relationship of Training and Development to Other Human Resource Functions

Training and development is only one of several functions usually performed by an organization's human resource department. In order to better understand the nature of training and development in organizations, it is worthwhile to examine how the training function relates to other human resource activities carried out by the personnel department. Specifically, we look at how training and development relates to task analysis, staffing, performance appraisal, and organization development.

The purpose of task analysis is to provide information about the duties involved in performing a job and the skills and knowledge required to do the job well. Task analysis information serves as the foundation for most training
and development programs because it answers the important question, "What must a trainee be taught in order to perform a job effectively?"

**Evaluation**

According to most experts, evaluation is a systematic process to determine the worth, value, or meaning of something. In regard to HRD, evaluation usually provides information for a decision about the fate of the HRD program. The question of what to evaluate is crucial to the evaluation strategy. This depends on the type of HRD program, the organization, and the purposes of evaluation. The information collected and used for evaluation can usually be grouped into different categories. Some methods of evaluation are more appropriate for the different categories. The types of groupings vary slightly with the different experts in the HRD field. The following pages presents four popular models.

**The Kirkpatrick Approach**

Probably the most well-known and widely used framework for classifying areas of evaluation comes from Donald Kirkpatrick. In his model he developed a conceptual framework to assist in determining what data are to be collected. His concept calls for four levels of evaluation, and answers four very important questions:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Reaction Were the participants pleased with the program?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Learning What did the participants learn in the program?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Behavior Did the participants change their behavior based on what was learned?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Results Did the change in behavior positively affect the organization?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Reaction.** Reaction is defined as what the participants thought of the particular program, including materials, instructors, facilities, methodology, content, etc. It does not include a measure of the learning that takes place. The reaction of the participants is often a critical factor in the continuance of HRD programs. Responses on reaction questionnaires help to ensure against decisions based on the comments of a few very satisfied or disgruntled participants. Most trainers believe that initial receptivity provides a good atmosphere for learning the material in the program but does not necessarily lead to high levels of learning.

**Learning.** This level of evaluation is concerned with measuring the learning of principles, facts, techniques, and skills presented in a program. It is more difficult than measuring reaction. The measures must be objective and quantifiable indicators of how the participants understood and absorbed the material. They are not necessarily measures of performance on the job. There are many different measures of learning performance, including
paper-and-pencil tests, learning curves, skill practices, and job simulations. The program objectives determine the choice of the most appropriate measure.

**Behavior.** The term "behavior" is used in reference to the measurement of job performance. Just as favorable reaction does not necessarily mean that learning will occur, superior achievement in a program does not always result in improved behavior on the job. There are many factors, other than the training program, that can affect on-the-job performance. Evaluations in this category may include:

- Before-and-after comparisons
- Observations from the participant's superiors, subordinates, and peers
- Statistical comparisons
- Long-range follow-ups

**Results.** Evaluations at this level are used to relate the results of the program to organizational improvement. Some of the results that can be examined include costs savings, work output improvement, and quality changes. This involves collecting data before and after the program and analyzing the improvement. In this evaluation every effort should be made to isolate other variables which could have caused the improvement.

**The Parker Approach**
Another way of classifying types of evaluation according to the information collected comes from Treadway Parker. As with Kirkpatrick's model, Parker has divided the information evaluation studies into four groups:

- Job performance
- Group performance
- Participant satisfaction
- Participant knowledge gained

Although similar to Kirkpatrick, there are some differences in these groupings. Here is Parker's explanation.

**Job performance.** This evaluates the extent to which an individual improved on the job. More specifically, it determines to what extent a program has contributed to this improved job performance. Evaluation can come from objective measurements of job performance, including work output, quality, timekeeping, and cost savings. In addition, observable changes in on-the-job behavior could be an indication of improved job performance.

**Group performance.** This type of evaluation determines the impact of the program on a group within which the participants function, or possibly the effect of the program on the entire organization as a whole. This is a difficult area to evaluate because so many factors other than training can affect the performance of the work group. Types of evaluation data include group performance measures of overall productivity, such as output, error rates,
costs, absenteeism, etc. For this evaluation, it is best to collect before-and-after data to compare the improvements and to try to isolate the effect of other variables as much as possible.

**Participant satisfaction.** This type of evaluation determines how pleased the participants are with the program. The satisfaction covers the content of the program, methods of training, and their attitude toward what has been learned. End-of-the-course questionnaires and interviews are frequent ways to solicit information about participant satisfaction.

**Participant knowledge gained.** This type of evaluation determines what facts, techniques or skills, were absorbed by the participant. In this evaluation a pre- and post-knowledge test is sometimes appropriate to measure the knowledge gained. If a particular skill is to be learned, skill practices or simulations are useful for the participants to show what has been acquired.

According to Parker, most evaluation studies concentrate on the last two categories: participant satisfaction and participant knowledge gained. Much less frequently do they fall into the categories of job or group performance. As a result, a program is evaluated in terms of how many people have been trained, how they personally reacted to the program, and how much new information was absorbed rather than the application of the program material.
The Bell System Approach

A slightly different approach was developed as a result of a study at AT &T and the Bell System units. Stephanie Jackson and Mary Jo Kulp presented their classification of results in an ASTD conference on “Determining the Payoff of Management Training.” The following levels of programme results, or outcomes, were presented:

- Reaction outcomes
- Capability outcomes
- Application outcomes
- Worth outcomes

Reaction outcomes. This presents the participants' opinions of the program as a whole or as specific components such as content, materials, methods, or activities. In a word, did they accept the program?

Capability outcomes. This covers what participants are expected to know, think, do, or produce by the end of the program.

Application outcomes. This involves what participants know, think, do, or produce in the real-world setting(s) for which the HRD program has prepared them.

Worth outcomes. This is a most significant result because it shows the value of training in relation to its cost. This outcome represents the extent to which an organization benefits from training in terms of the money, time, effort, or resources invested.
The first two levels represent the immediate goals of training; the second two levels represent the long-term results.

**The CIRO Approach**

A fourth general approach to classifying types of evaluation comes from Peter Warr, Michael Bird, and Neil Rackham. This rather unique approach to classifying evaluation has been used in their work in Europe, and it has a much broader scope than the traditional use of the term "evaluation" in the United States.

As with the three previous approaches, there are four general categories of evaluation studies. They form the letters C I R O:

- Context evaluation
- Input evaluation
- Reaction evaluation
- Outcome evaluation

Here are the authors' explanations of this approach.

**Context evaluation.** This involves obtaining and using information about the current operational situation (or context) to determine training needs and objectives. This evaluation determines if training is needed. During this process, three types of objectives may be evaluated:

- Ultimate objectives (the particular deficiency in the organization that the program will eliminate or overcome).
Intermediate objectives (the changes in employees' work behavior that will be necessary for the ultimate objectives to be attained).

Immediate objectives (the new knowledge, skills, or attitudes that the employees must acquire to change their behavior as required to reach the intermediate objective).

These three levels of objectives are not always of equal importance. In short, context evaluation consists of collecting information about a performance deficiency, assessing that information to establish HRD needs and, on the basis of those findings, setting objectives at three levels.

Input evaluation. Input evaluation consists of obtaining and using information about possible training resources to choose between alternative inputs to HRD. This type of evaluation involves analyzing the resources available and determining how they can be deployed so that there is a maximum chance of achieving the desired objectives. Factors such as budget and management requirements may limit the options available. Questions which become relevant during this evaluation are:

- What are the relative merits of the different HRD methods?
- Is it feasible for an outside organization to be more efficient at conducting the program?
- Should it be developed with internal resources?
- Should the line organization be involved?
- How much time is available for HRD?
What results were achieved when a similar program was conducted in the past?

Thus, input evaluation refers to the process of collecting evidence and using it to decide on the HRD methods.

Reaction evaluation. This involves obtaining and using information about participant's reactions to improve the HRD process. Most trainers make some attempt to discover the participant's opinions of the program at the end of the course and in follow-up evaluations. The distinguishing feature of this type of evaluation is that it relies on the subjective reports of the participants. There is no doubt that the participants' views can prove extremely helpful if they are collected in a systematic manner.

Outcome evaluation. This involves obtaining and using information about the results (or outcomes) of HRD to improve future programs. This is the most important part of evaluation. If outcome evaluation is to be successful, it requires careful preparation before the training program begins. There are four stages which form outcome evaluation:

- Defining trend objectives.
- Selecting or constructing some measures of those objectives.
- Making the measurements at the appropriate time.
- Assessing the results and using them to improve later programs.

In determining the results of training it is helpful to think in terms of the hierarchy of HRD outcomes. These correspond to the three levels of
objectives discussed earlier and are the immediate outcomes, intermediate outcomes, and ultimate outcomes.

Successful HRD will produce some change in a participant. This is an immediate outcome. Initially, this training is reflected in the alterations or changes of knowledge, skills, or attitude. Although these three characteristics are interrelated, it is often useful for the purposes of analysis to consider them separately. Changes in knowledge, skill, or attitude can be measured as soon as the course has been completed and before the participant leaves the situation.

HRD is not conducted primarily for the sake of learning something. Its main concern is to bring about positive change in the participant, or intermediate outcomes. This involves on-the-job behavior change without which there will be no change in job performance. The change in knowledge, skills, or attitude does not necessarily guarantee a change in job performance. There are many examples where HRD fails to carry over to the work situation. To be successful, changes must take place in the work setting to ensure on-the-job behavior change. Ultimately, changes in the work setting are the responsibility of line management.

If changes occur in the performance of the participants on the job, then the organization will be affected in some way. The impact on the organization is the ultimate outcome of any HRD program. For example, there may be improvements in the department's output, cost, scrap rates, accident frequencies, etc. This type of change is measured in terms of a department
or section as a whole, and not necessarily on the part of individuals. This measurement represents one of the most difficult areas of evaluation.

As you can see, Warr, Bird, and Rackham present a rather unique framework for evaluation, although there are some similarities to the other three approaches. Overall, the common thread among the evaluation experts, and the most important in any framework, is the ultimate outcome which results from improved group performance. It is the most difficult to obtain, document, and measure the other types of evaluation—whether reaction, learning, behavior change, or other classifications—will not suffice as an ultimate evaluation. As mentioned earlier these approaches can be useful to go to the ultimate level of evaluation, i.e., the results. The approach proposed by Kirkpatrick will be referred to more often than the other three because of its popularity and acceptance.
There have been several assumptions made about Kirkpatrick’s approach to evaluating reaction, learning, behavior, and results. First, as shown in Chart-5, the value of the information is greater as you go from measuring reaction to measuring results. In other words, the evaluation of results has the highest value to the organization.

Second, the measurement of reaction is the most frequently used evaluation method, while the measurement of results is the least frequently used method. Many studies support this assumption.
Finally, another assumption is that measuring reactions is easier than measuring results. This is easily verified when you examine the methods of evaluation presented later. It is a relatively simple process to gather the reaction on a training program. It can be extremely difficult to determine an effective way to measure accurately the economic impact of a program on the organization, i.e., the results.

The term "evaluation" will be used as an all-inclusive term and, occasionally, measuring results will be used to be more specific for that important part of the evaluation.

Measures to enhance the status of training

It cannot be denied that there is some validity in the above arguments. It is, therefore, the responsibility of the training agencies, trainers and participating organisations to take cognisance of these views and take necessary corrective measures. They need to make concerted efforts to secure for training the recognition and position it merits. While some measures will suggest themselves during the discussions in this Handbook, it is worthwhile to take an overview at this stage.

Training agencies should facilitate sustained and extensive interaction of its training staff with the field conditions. The problems and situations that prospective groups of participants are likely to encounter in their jobs and everyday life should be thoroughly researched and documented for appropriate use during training. This should be an ongoing job for the
trainers. Such data and information could be helpful in developing suitable training materials such as, case studies, role-plays, assignments, and training instruments and exercises. The objective should be to bring training as close to the field and life-realities as possible. However, it is important to remember that the so-called gap between the training and the field situations can be bridged only through active and continual collaboration between the training agencies and the organisations sponsoring nominees for training.

As training is an evolving field, especially in the developing countries, there is a dearth of professional trainers. In the present scenario, it is not unusual to see training programmes being handled by those who are neither appropriately qualified nor competent. As a result, the quality of training suffers. Under the circumstances, it should be the endeavour of the training agencies to build a cadre of professional trainers, competent to handle a variety of training groups. Training of trainers, therefore, assumes considerable importance. The agency should also have a policy of providing opportunities to its training staff to update their training skills and expertise in areas of their interest. This will be highly fulfilling for the training staff and go a long way in enhancing the credibility of the agency.

The present situation also suggests a need for establishing an associate or any other body, functioning at the national or state level, with a responsibility to oversee training in the corporate and the development sectors. It should perform the task of sifting good training from bad. This will introduce some degree of quality control, make the training agencies more accountable for their work, and check the unrestricted proliferation of training outfits,
including individual consultants. This, inevitably will enhance people's faith in training. This body could also help in establishing a network of training agencies and through these a network of the training staff, facilitating collaboration and co-operation in training-related areas various levels. Even joint ventures could be planned. It will be possible to share training materials and exchange training staff. Thus, an agency will be able to mobilise a wide range of expertise and skills, available with other agencies, for its programmes. These opportunities offering more varied exposure can be very enriching for the trainers and help in cross fertilisation of ideas, leading to professional growth of the trainers. These efforts will greatly assist in promoting training as a major tool for development.

As identification of training needs is crucial to developing a sound programme design, is necessary that considerable attention should be given to this aspect of training. And for carrying out a productive exercise, there is a need for active co-operation between the training agency and the organisations nominating participants for a particular programme. The organisations should take their responsibility more seriously and the training agency must ensure that the actual needs of the participants are fully reflected in the programme. The effort will go a long way in giving the training programme a professional base and direction.

The issue of selection of the participants for a training programme demands a good, ha scrutiny. It should be the endeavour of all those associated with a particular programme, ensure that only those who are likely to benefit the most from it find a place as participants. A training agency should be in a
position to withstand pressure to accept those who do not fulfil the requirements for attending the programme. And an organisation should not be allowed to get away by 'dumping' some unwilling or unwanted participants on the agency. There should be some degree of accountability on the part of the nominating organisations and the agency, as training an individual involves investment of money and time. If an unsuitable candidate gained entry into the programme, it is possible that a deserving participant lost a chance to get into the same programme.

Post-training evaluation has not received the attention it deserves either from the participating organisations or the training agency. Once the training is over, most training agencies demonstrate little interest in assessing its validity and relevance to the organisations. There is a laidback attitude. And to make matters worse, very few organisations make an effort monitor the performance of those who have returned from training or to evaluate the usefulness of the training programme in the context of its requirements. The situation, therefore, calls for collaborative action by the participating organisations and the training agency. The data, collected through such an exercise, should also be made available to the team that responsible for planning similar training programmes in the future. This effort could contribute in bringing training a step closer to the field.

In view of the present status of the training and organisations becoming more cost conscious it was decided to take this topic and try to find out the impact of training on Human Resource Development.