

Copyright is owned by the Author of the thesis. Permission is given for a copy to be downloaded by an individual for the purpose of research and private study only. The thesis may not be reproduced elsewhere without the permission of the Author.

**A descriptive study of training products and practice,  
using a field test of the Evaluation of External  
Training (EET) Tool.**

**A thesis presented in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of  
Master of Business Studies in Human Resource Management at  
Massey University, New Zealand.**

**Lance Ian Gray**

**1996**

658.312404

Qra

DC 20

---

## ABSTRACT

The growth of the National Qualifications Framework since its inception in 1993 has seen a corresponding increase in training products entering the market as competition for the training and education dollar increases. What tools do public and private enterprise managers have, to differentiate between good and poor training products?

The purpose of the present study is to design, implement and formatively evaluate a tool for assessing the quality of external training products. The tool would be piloted as a field test in the context of a prospective training purchaser evaluating a training product for possible purchase.

Using "snowball" sampling, seven informants: five females and two males, provided training products of their choice for evaluation using the Evaluation of External Training (EET) Tool. Informants represented central and local government; small and medium sized private enterprises.

The present study was divided into two distinct stages: a background interview and the evaluation interview. The background interview used the qualitative technique of a semi-structured, in-depth interview that allowed the informant to discuss a variety of topical issues without the constraint of predetermined answers.

From the background interviews a typology of informants was developed; building on existing research by McMorland (1990). Informants in the present study were differentiated by training context: internal or external to the organisation; and employment type: primary or secondary. Using McMorland's typology three internal trainers were further differentiated to training manager, training coordinator and training consultant. Informants came to training indirectly from other careers where their talent for training was recognised; a lack of a first qualification in training has seen many seek qualifications to support their new career.

---

A typology of informant issues was developed showing the competing demands placed on managers and trainers by the issues of resources and accountability. The fundamental resource issue for informants was time to develop employees to a standard; this was balanced against the managers desire for continuous production. The issue of accountability for informants was stark: accountability ended at the delivery of objectives; transfer of training to the workplace was seen as management's responsibility.

The second stage of the present study was a field test of EET (Evaluation of External Training) to the informant's training product. Using a structured interview format all informants were asked to provide evidence of 18 training outputs provided under the four components of needs analysis, design, implementation and evaluation.

Four of seven training products passed the threshold of 75% over the 18 outputs as quality training products. Three products that failed to reach the threshold shared similar deficiencies: poor needs analysis and evaluation outputs. These were outputs informants in the present study were not generally required to provide, or rewarded for providing. For the growth of training as a profession it is suggested trainers build relationships with managers that allow for the maximum leverage from the training dollar.

EET as a tool was used more in a developmental context than in the purchasing context as proposed because ultimately informants realised their product was not up for actual purchase. The strength of EET is in identifying key outputs of training products; a weakness is that users need training knowledge to be able to converse effectively with trainers. A formative evaluation of EET identified confusing output and quality descriptions which were amended as part of the present study. Throughout the present study there existed a gulf between the language of academic training and the informant's or practitioner's experience with the researcher continually re-phrasing and clarifying "terms".

---

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

To acknowledge those who have supported my studies for the year ignores the support I received in years previous. I especially thank my friends at Whenua-it Trust and Nelson Polytechnic for giving me the opportunity to return to Massey University. I would like to thank Mum & Dad for their support in my continued learning; and to Fiona who has shown me life outside study. Special thanks to Barbara Nunn who provided transport from Wanganui and debate along the way; and, Anna Jameson who I have shared an office and much company over the year. I would also like to thank Dr Philip Dewe, Head of Department of Human Resource Management; Dr Lesley Frederikson, my advisor, for her confidence in my research ability; and Philip Ramsey, my supervisor, for his unbounded optimism in the idea this research report is based upon.

---

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

|   |  |        |
|---|--|--------|
| <b>Abstract</b>                               |  | i-ii.  |
| <b>Acknowledgements</b>                       |  | iii.   |
| <b>Table of Contents</b>                      |  | iv-vi. |
| <b>List of Abbreviations</b>                  |  | vii.   |
| <b>List of Tables</b>                         |  | viii.  |
| <b>List of Figures</b>                        |  | ix.    |
| <br>  |  |        |
| <b>1. Literature Review</b>                   |  |        |
| 1.0   | Introduction                             | 1      |
| 1.1   | Definition of Training                   | 1      |
| 1.2   | New Zealand Training Context             | 2      |
| 1.3   | New Zealand Training Research            | 4      |
| 1.4   | Trainer Professionalism                  | 7      |
| 1.5   | Trainer Accountability                   | 10     |
| 1.6   | Management Accountability                | 12     |
| 1.7   | Trainer Effectiveness/ Assessment        | 13     |
| 1.8   | Training Evaluation                      | 16     |
| 1.9   | Benchmarking                             | 18     |
| 1.10  | Evaluation of External Training Products | 20     |
| <br>  |  |        |
| <b>2. Methodology - Background Interviews</b> |  |        |
| 2.0   | Introduction                             | 23     |
| 2.1   | Purposeful Sampling                      | 23     |
| 2.2   | Informants                               | 24     |
| 2.3   | Summary of Informant Training Products   | 25     |
| 2.4   | Informed Consent                         | 26     |
| 2.5   | Background Interview                     | 27     |
| 2.6   | In-depth Interviewing                    | 28     |
| 2.7   | Interview Procedure                      | 29     |
| 2.8   | Processing of Interviews                 | 30     |
| 2.9   | Data Analysis                            | 30     |

---

|           |   |    |
|-----------|---|----|
| <b>3.</b> | <b>Methodology - Evaluation of External Training (EET) Tool</b> |    |
| 3.0       | Introduction  | 32 |
| 3.1       | Models for HRD Practice   | 32 |
| 3.2       | Human Resource Development Outputs                              | 33 |
| 3.3       | Output Quality Requirements                                     | 34 |
| 3.4       | Design and Development of EET                                   | 34 |
| 3.5       | Construction of EET   | 36 |
| 3.6       | Structured Interview  | 40 |
| 3.7       | Administration of EET   | 41 |
| 3.8       | Processing and Analysis of EET                                  | 41 |
| 3.9       | Quality Threshold for EET                                       | 42 |
| <b>4.</b> | <b>Results - Background Interviews</b>                          |    |
| 4.0       | Experience and Education  | 43 |
| 4.1       | Trainer Employment  | 43 |
| 4.2       | Fundamental Training Issues                                     | 45 |
| 4.3       | Accountability  | 46 |
| 4.4       | Primary Role as Trainer   | 48 |
| 4.5       | Training Model  | 48 |
| 4.6       | Training Policies of Organisations                              | 48 |
| 4.7       | Informant Training Practices                                    | 49 |
| <b>5.</b> | <b>Results - Evaluation of External Training (EET) Tool</b>     |    |
| 5.0       | Training Products   | 54 |
| 5.1       | Training Outputs  | 56 |
| 5.2       | Needs Analysis  | 56 |
| 5.3       | Design  | 57 |
| 5.4       | Implementation  | 58 |
| 5.5       | Evaluation  | 59 |
| <b>6.</b> | <b>Formative Evaluation of EET</b>                              |    |
| 6.0       | Introduction  | 60 |
| 6.1       | Revisions to EET  | 60 |
| 6.2       | Review of Outputs   | 62 |
|           | 6.2.0 Needs Analysis  | 62 |
|           | 6.2.1 Design & Development                                      | 63 |
|           | 6.2.2 Implementation  | 63 |
|           | 6.2.3 Evaluation  | 64 |
| 6.3       | Effectiveness of EET  | 64 |

---

|  |  |     |
|--|--|-----|
| <b>7. Discussion</b>   |  |     |
| 7.0  | Introduction - Background Interviews     | 66  |
| 7.1  | Informant Education & Experience         | 67  |
| 7.2  | Trainer Roles                            | 68  |
| 7.3  | Outputs of Internal vs External Trainers | 72  |
| 7.4  | Fundamental Training Issues              | 73  |
| 7.5  | Accountability                           | 74  |
| 7.6  | Public Sector Training Research          | 76  |
| 7.7  | Introduction - EET                       | 78  |
| 7.8  | Needs Analysis                           | 78  |
| 7.9  | Training Design                          | 80  |
| 7.10   | Implementation                           | 81  |
| 7.11   | Evaluation                               | 85  |
| <b>8. Implications for future research</b>                       |  | 87  |
| <b>References</b>  |  | 89  |
| <b>Appendices</b>  |  |     |
| Appendix A. - Information Sheets                                 |  | 97  |
| Appendix B. - Background Interview Questions                     |  | 98  |
| Appendix C. - Evaluation of External Training (EET) Tool         |  | 99  |
| Appendix D. - Informant Training Product Evaluations Using EET   |  | 111 |
| Appendix E. - Revised Evaluation of External Training (EET) Tool |  | 153 |
| Appendix F. - Suggested Questions For EET                        |  | 168 |

---

## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

|       |  |
|-------|--|
| ASTD  | American Society for Training & Development        |
| CRI   | Criterion Referenced Instruction                   |
| EET   | Evaluation of External Training                    |
| ETSA  | Education Training and Support Agency              |
| HRD   | Human Resource Development                         |
| IPMNZ | Institute of Personnel Management New Zealand      |
| ISA   | Instructional Systems Association                  |
| ISD   | Instructional Systems Design                       |
| ITO   | Industry Training Organisation                     |
| NQF   | National Qualifications Framework                  |
| NZATD | New Zealand Association for Training & Development |
| NZEF  | New Zealand Employers' Federation                  |
| NZQA  | New Zealand Qualifications Authority               |
| PTE   | Private Training Establishment                     |
| RITA  | Research in Training in Auckland                   |
| TTI   | Trainer Task Inventory                             |

---

## **LIST OF TABLES**

|             |  |
|-------------|--|
| Table 4.1   | Typology of Trainers in the Present Study                              |
| Table 5.0   | Training Product Scores Using EET                                      |
| Table 5.0.1 | Training Products Ranked by Weighting                                  |
| Table 5.0.2 | Example of Scoring Using EET   |
| Table 7.2   | Typology of Trainers "Within"<br>the Organisation in the Present Study |

## **LIST OF FIGURES**

- Figure 3.2 HRD Units of Analysis
- Figure 3.5.1 Instructional Systems Design (ISD) Model
- Figure 3.5.2 Evaluation of External Training (EET)
- Figure 3.5.3 Outputs for Evaluation of External Training Tool
- Figure 4.3 Typology of Informant Training Issues

---

# 1. LITERATURE REVIEW

## 1.0 Introduction

When training is regarded as the fuel to sustain international competitiveness (Bogan & English, 1994) it is logical to assume that training purchasers will demand quality training products from training consultants and providers. How can purchasers assess the quality of these training products? How will they know their investment in training is likely to provide a real return and so sustain their competitiveness (Kerr, 1994)? The purpose of the present study is to design and develop a tool that allows purchasers of training products to assess the quality of these products and so increase the likelihood of making informed decisions.

## 1.1 Definition of Training

Training, as defined by Goldstein & Buxton (1982), is "... the placement of trainees in an instructional program where the learning that takes place will transfer to the job" (p. 136). As this definition suggests, training is about improving an individual's performance in a particular occupation or job, its focus is very narrow; this is in contrast to education whose role is to provide learning which will improve an individual's general knowledge and overall competence (Rudman, 1994).

There are a multiplicity of terms used interchangeably around "training", such as: training and development, employee development, human resource development and staff development. These suggest there is no readily agreed upon definition of training. This is reflected by the "Hawke Report" 1988 on post compulsory education and training in New Zealand, which draws out the close links between education and training but refuses to distinguish between the activities (cited in McMorland, 1990). More recently with the establishment of the National Qualifications Framework (NQF) the distinction between training and education has become blurred with both vocational and tertiary qualifications on the framework. The broadening of the term "training" mirrors the

---

transition from personnel management to human resource management. Personnel management is regarded primarily as a day to day activity administering staff matters; training then is used to deal with immediate needs. By contrast human resource management's perspective is strategic: looking not only at the training required today but the skills and abilities required to be delivered by training today for the future. This is training that may not immediately manifest itself in an individual's current job. In the business world this strategic training is loosely termed "development" (Rudman, 1994).

McLagan & Suhadolniks' (1989) definition of training and development neatly captures the competing demands of immediate versus future training needs. They define training and development as "identifying, assuring, helping develop, through planned learning, the key competencies that enable individuals to perform current or future jobs" ( p. 7). This definition accepts the day to day realities of getting the job done and also accepts the need for preparation for future business needs.

## **1.2 The New Zealand Training Context**

Training in New Zealand can be grouped loosely into two categories: (a) training that contributes to a nationally recognised qualification on the NQF; and (b) training provided by business for their specific purpose that is not recognised by the NQF (Deeks, Parker & Ryan, 1994).

The National Qualifications Framework introduced in 1993 is integrating school, vocational and academic qualifications into one comprehensive framework. With the enactment of the Industry Training Act 1992 and the abolition of the Apprenticeship Act 1983, and a number of other Acts, the Government is creating a completely new industry training system (Deeks, Parker & Ryan, 1994). The Education and Training and Support Agency (ETSA), established by the Education Amendment Act 1990, is an independent organisation under a charter to the Ministry of Education to develop policy for education and training. In the transitional period ETSA is responsible for assisting the creation of industry training organisations (ITOs) so that the ITOs can ultimately be

---

responsible for industry training; including apprenticeships. Skill New Zealand as a training initiative of ETSA, aims to promote industry managed training responsive to the needs of employers, employees and trainees. This includes extending systematic training to industries that currently do not have formal training systems; ensuring future needs are met by existing training arrangements, and providing for training to national industry standards which will be recognised by the NQF (Statistics New Zealand, 1995).

ITOs are being established by particular industries or groups of industries and are responsible for: setting national skill standards for their industry; developing training packages for employers in their industry; arranging for delivery of training on and off-job, and for deciding how to monitor training standards and the assessment of trainees. ITOs will not attempt to become training providers but rather act as supervising agencies. At the end of 1993/94 there were 40 officially recognised ITOs (Statistics New Zealand, 1995).

The New Zealand Employers' Federation [NZEF] Training Survey (1994), of 673 employers' organisation members, excluding central government and publicly funded education institutions, showed 27% of respondents provided structured training in trades leading to a national qualification. Structured training as defined by NZEF is "...all training activities which have a structured plan and format designed to develop and assess job related skills and competence" (p.4). The next most popular areas in which training for a national qualification was provided were in the technical (24.5%), professional (20%), and general management functions (18%).

Training provided by individual enterprises that will not be recognised by the NQF represents a significant portion of the total training in New Zealand industry. The NZEF Training Survey (1994) showed there was a significant amount of structured training not leading to any qualification on the NQF, especially in computing (44%), general management (38%), supervisory (38%), technical (37%), health and safety (37%), clerical (33%), and marketing (32%).

- ✓ A first attempt by the NZEF to estimate levels of unstructured training showed that unstructured training "...was clearly the main way in which people learn on the job" (NZEF, 1994a, p. 6). Unstructured training was defined as "... training other than structured programmes. It includes all informal training on the job such as being shown how to do things as the need arises, or learning by doing a job" (NZEF, 1994a, p. 5). Sixty-eight percent of respondents provided unstructured training in the field of computers with 50-58% providing this sort of less formal training in clerical, supervisory, health and safety, technical, and sales and marketing areas.

These results they suggest are not surprising considering the formative stage of the NQF. Till recently the only national qualifications which required on-job formalised training were the trade certificates in 36 apprenticeable occupations, and to a lesser extent New Zealand certificates, mainly in engineering and science. Changes to the way qualifications are structured and delivered will probably see a gradual favouring of more nationally recognised structured on-job training in enterprises in certain industries, as is starting to happen in , for example, the dairy, forestry, seafood, horticulture, motor, journalism and electronic media industries (NZEF, 1994a).

Clearly as the NQF takes shape more structured training will lead to recognised qualifications, but conversely it appears there will always be a significant amount of training, be it structured or unstructured, that will be provided through necessity that is not covered by the quality processes inherent in the NQF.

### **1.3 New Zealand Training Research**

Roger Kerr (1994a), the Executive Director of the New Zealand Business Roundtable, in a speech to the Institute for International Research Conference on Skill Development and Industry Training said:

There is no agreed or obvious definition of training, no definition of trainers, and no one knows how many trainers there are. No one has any

---

idea of the magnitude of on-the-job training or other forms of informal training. (p.161)

Kerr was responding to an assertion that New Zealand was under-investing in training. Kerr pointed out, correctly, that little knowledge of training activity in New Zealand existed to be able to make reasonable comparisons with other countries. While some of Kerr's assertions are questionable they do not hide the fact that research with regard to training in New Zealand is minimal.

Training research in New Zealand is limited to two main examples: (a) the NZEF training surveys of June 1989, February 1992, and June 1994; and (b) the Research in Training in Auckland (RITA) group's survey of 1987 (McMorland, 1990).

The NZEF surveys only attempt to describe training at a gross level of activity because they are designed in terms of current or proposed government policy on industry training (NZEF, 1994a). The most obvious example of this is the funding of ITOs. The NZEF suggests that ITOs should operate without a training levy; a figure of 1.5% is often proposed as an appropriate levy on payroll for ITO funding. The NZEFs' evidence to the contrary is the 3.48% of total payroll spent on training across all respondents in all industries. This the NZEF suggests supports their argument that there is a lot of money spent on training (over one billion dollars by NZEF estimates), and so ITOs should be governed by commercial and practical realities and survive on their level of customer accountability and service. A particular limitation to the NZEFs' figure of 3.48% of payroll spent on training is that only 25% of respondents recorded their spending in any way. The survey question reads "What is your total annual expenditure on all training as a % of your gross annual payroll? (An approximation or estimate if necessary) " (NZEFb, 1994, p.3). Considering the low level of recording of training expenditure it can be assumed there were many approximations or estimates; though there is no denying far more training is carried out that is recorded (NZEF, 1994a).

The NZEF surveys do not set out to collect training data that is representative of training

---

activity in New Zealand but to advance its member's cause on a particular national issue; a fact it does not try to hide. The NZEF findings then must be read in this light because they contain an obvious bias. The data that has resulted from these surveys though does give a good indication of where training from an employer's perspective is heading.

The purpose of the Research in Training in Auckland (RITA) group was different to that of the NZEF. In 1987 this group, led by Judith McMorland of Auckland University, representing different sectors of commerce, industry and university, designed an exploratory study into the state of training amongst Auckland enterprises. All members of RITA were experienced senior practitioners in either training or personnel. A questionnaire was designed to investigate in particular the relationship between strategic planning and training, as well as to develop more up-to-date baseline data in Auckland companies (McMorland, 1990).

From a random sample of 229 enterprises in metropolitan Auckland, employing more than 100 people, RITA had 72 useable returns by the due date, a response rate of 32.4%. Larger organisations were targeted on the rationale they were more likely to have the information required. As Toulson (1990) showed, and RITA found out, the human resource information systems of these large organisations were often unable to provide the information researchers thought they should. Despite care over wording, pilot testing and considered debate over each item the questions RITA provided were clearly interpreted in a number of ways and answered by staff with different levels of access to the information needed. The NZEF voiced this same concern that there appeared a lack of a common understanding of training terminology which left many questions unanswered or wrongly interpreted.

RITA's findings showed that 10 of the 72 enterprises derived training policy from their strategic plans, a figure RITA suggests is un-representatively low given qualitative comments. The content of training plans was shown to be reactive (remedial, problem solving, redressing imbalances), rather than proactive (anticipatory of long-term future

needs). From the training professionals perspective 40% of those surveyed indicated there was follow-up of training by supervisors; 17% indicated some measure of performance improvement was sought; 41% indicated a lack of adequate or formal follow-up procedures; 21.3% had thorough evaluation measures, and 46% indicated that only informal or poor procedures were in place. The survey highlighted the concern felt by a number of respondents about the standards of professional competence of training consultants. Whilst specific individuals or agencies were commended for their work, there was a strong call for registration of consultants and the establishment of practice standards (McMorland, 1990).

The generalizability of RITA's research to the rest of New Zealand is difficult due to a number of factors. Firstly RITA deliberately focused on large Auckland enterprises; small businesses experience of training were not represented and no distinction was made between public and private sector training activities. Since 1987 the profile of human resource management, and industry training in particular, has changed considerably along with the structural changes to the New Zealand economy. While providing a starting point, RITA's research needs to be updated, possibly a national form like the NZEF surveys. The immediate concern for researchers contemplating such a national survey is the disturbing lack of consensus over training terminology. There have been other exploratory surveys such as Stablein & Geare (1993); Gilbertson, Fogelberg and Boswell (1987) but they have dealt with human resource management as a whole, with training receiving minimal attention from the researchers.

#### **1.4 Trainer Professionalism**

As evidenced by RITA's research, there was, and still is, a concern about the standards of professional competence of trainers, and human resource practitioners in general, with the desire for registration of trainers and the establishment of practice standards at the national level (McMorland, 1990; Stablein & Geare, 1993). As London (1989) suggests training professionals, just as other employees, are concerned about maintaining their level of expertise. Reflecting the reality of training in organisations, it is also desirable

---

to have a procedure in place at the enterprise level to ensure that newcomers to training positions have the skills and knowledge needed for the job (London, 1989). Certification is a way to identify employees as professional and is a formal recognition of the individuals accomplishment and abilities. The Institute of Personnel Management New Zealand (IPMNZ) instituted in 1993 the certificate classification of membership: the first attempt at professional human resource management certification in New Zealand (Stablein & Geare, 1993). Subsequently the New Zealand Association for Training and Development have also instituted certification (Dawson, 1995).

A licence is inappropriate because it must be mandated by law and is meant to protect the public from incompetent practice. Analogies can be drawn with the user of a poisons or the handling of explosives. Users in these two examples require a licence to operate; the risk to the public is such that laws mandating their use are appropriate. Certification is appropriate because the perceived risk to the public due to incompetent performance of human resource professionals is slight. In response to calls for accountability Colin Dawson (1995), National President of the New Zealand Association for Training and Development announced in an editorial:

One of the important responsibilities as a professional body such as ours is to promote standards of performance within the training discipline. This year at conference we will be introducing the framework for graded membership. Members will be able to enjoy a grading that reflects their skills and gives them individual credibility throughout the training world. Purchasers of training will be able to use this benchmark as a means of recognising trainers who can work to a required standard. The framework will also recognise students at the beginning of their careers or people who are not full-time trainers. This system is used in most professional organisations and I am sure this is the next logical step in the development of our Association. (p.2)

This graded membership only applies to NZATD members, not everyone engaged in

---

training, the assumption being that those enjoying a high grading will have a marketing edge over trainers who do not seek membership and a grading. The determination of a trainers grade, the criteria used, will be of great interest to practitioners. London (1989) describes a competency model which identifies those behaviours and those associated individual characteristics necessary for acceptable and high levels of performance. Presently it is unclear how the NZATD will determine membership.

Fitzsimmons (1995) alternatively, suggests the demands of the two quality processes for the NQF, accreditation and registration, are a trainer's warrant of fitness. He sees it as being no different to being a tour operator or a bus driver; they give a trainer credibility in the market place. Lesley Edgley, New Zealand Qualifications Authority (NZQA) quality systems analyst, with regard to the accreditation and registration process says:

We're not examining course content or the programme delivery. We are looking to see that the systems are there to ensure the development of effective programmes and that the provider is capable of assessing against unit standards. The key focus is on the systems that manage quality.  
(Fitzsimmons, 1995, p.31)

As Lesley Edgley notes, the registration and accreditation processes relate to management systems of training providers rather than individual training products.

Certifying the trainer is one issue, what about certifying the training product? With the move to distributed learning (Geber, 1994a; Smith, 1994; Albright & Post, 1993) using electronic performance support systems, (Hewlett Packard delivers up to 65% of training outside the classroom) how will trainer performance be observed in the future?

Training products now and in the future will not necessarily come with a specific trainer attached to the product. Portability of training products means businesses will not want to be duplicating effort; at the same time the product must meet minimum quality standards. When individuals think of training products it usually conjures up vague off-the-shelf training that satisfies no one (Tracey, 1993). They then have to be customised

---

to fit the organisation which begs the question of "why not develop your own?"

Many businesses, especially small business, do not employ that expertise (Elkin & Inkson, 1995) but at the same time require the benefits of specific training. How do they determine the quality of the training they are considering purchasing? Do they examine the potential trainer, the training product, or both? When engineers build a hydro-electric dam they expect inspection of their finished product. Could the same logic be applied to training? In the final analysis regardless of the engineer's qualifications (even though they are important initially) a quality dam is the desired output. With training products the qualifications and experience of the trainer are important for selection purposes but if the final training product does not meet agreed standards no amount of personal prestige is of interest to the purchaser.

### **1.5 Trainer Accountability**

The statement by Du Chateau (1994) that "...substantial fees are paid to trainers, but are they earning them?" (p.36), reflects the need for trainers to be accountable for what they deliver; otherwise, it is suggested, they will become subject to increasing scepticism and ultimately lose work. Kerr (1994b) picks up on this theme by suggesting training get back to the fundamentals of helping business measurably improve performance and productivity and that this can only be positive for all parties concerned. He argues that for business, training will become more of a rational business practice; for trainers it means a more central and respected role in business strategy, and for employees their enhanced productivity is likely to result in greater job security and greater rewards. Hannemann (1993) follows in the same vein arguing that it is for trainers to explain the value of the investment in such a way so as to make it abundantly clear that to reduce the level of funding of training is irrational. He suggests trainers have failed "spectacularly" to do this; "...if we've got a lousy product why would we expect people to buy it? (p. 15)

For what, exactly, are trainers accountable? Campbell (1989) argues that making

---

trainers accountable for individual and organisational performance improvements is incredibly naive. Training is only one component of a canonical variate that includes the costs and benefits of selection improvements, incentives, changes in equipment design, improved production processes and the like, all of which affect a productivity index. Further, any major component of performance is multiply determined. Employees may not do well on a particular part of a job because; (a) they have the aptitude for it; (b) they have acquired the necessary knowledge and skills; (c) they understand what specific tasks or goals are to be addressed at particular times; (d) they choose to start working; (e) they choose to expend high effort, and (f) they choose to persist for however long the task takes. Training is appropriate then only for teaching knowledge, skills and task understanding; the other determinants are in the realms of selection and motivation (Campbell, 1989).

From a cursory analysis the questions that follow seem reasonable. Will a specific training programme result in increased job performance? Does training produce cost savings in the form of fewer absences, less turnover, fewer accidents, fewer grievances? While they seem reasonable Campbell (1989) notes they all incorporate one principal source of confusion: increases on many of these variables can be a function of a number things besides training issues. Depending on the nature of a training programme, the changes may not be related with the measures of performance. Campbell (1989) suggests the best question to ask is "...whether the training programme produces the specific changes it was designed to produce" (p.179).

Asking whether a programme achieves the specific objectives it was designed to accomplish is a much more direct and relevant question than whether it produces changes in overall job performance. Sackett & Mullen (1993) emphasise these points when they note that evaluating training is typically equated with measuring change and the use of experimental design to control threats to internal validity so the causal "arrow" can be pointed unequivocally at the training intervention as the cause of the change. A more suitable approach in line with organisational realities they suggest is to assume the training will have an effect and focus on determining whether individuals

---

have reached a target performance (objective) . Trainer accountability from this perspective is simple: did the trainer deliver what they say they would in the objectives? The emphasis then turns to the relationship of the trainer with management and their ability as a team to identify real training needs.

### **1.6 Management Accountability**

Trainers are not the only party culpable for poor training outputs; management ultimately must sanction training as the tool to solve their problems (Campbell, 1989). Bernhard & Ingolis (1988) when studying training and its strategic implementation in North American companies believe that a considerable amount of money is thrown away because fundamental issues such as a training needs analysis in relation to short and long-term strategic business plans had not been addressed. Of equal concern is the fact that many organisations do not know how much money is spent on training.

These criticisms can be directly related to New Zealand. The NZEF's (1994a) training survey showed only 25% of respondents had recorded training budgets. To quote von Hurst (cited in Kerr, 1994b) "...firms typically waste 50% of their training budget because they do not have rigorous training policies in place" (pp. 2-3). He suggests there is a growing recognition that businesses must take a more active approach in assisting both internal and external trainers by establishing clear investment based policy parameters. RITA's research would indicate very few policies for trainers and managers exist in New Zealand business. The result, to quote McMorland (cited in Du Chateau, 1994), is "because their analysis is not right they resort to training rather than identifying the other organisational factors that may be involved" (p. 37). Clear policies and a greater awareness of training issues by managers would certainly improve training effectiveness.

Business people, Kerr (1994b) exhorts, need to take a very pragmatic, profit driven view of the purpose of training where each proposed training initiative must demonstrate that it is a worthwhile investment, competitive with other investments. At this proposal stage

---

there will be no data one way or the other to support a programme. Instead the focus is, as Campbell (1989) agrees, with identifying training objectives that are most in need of attention and how to design training programmes to attain these objectives in the most effective manner. This is where trainers can show that the investment in training will effect these changes along with possible organisational benefits.

The views of Kerr (1994b) and Campbell (1989) are not too dissimilar. They both agree that it is at the analysis stage where the most leverage for effective training lies. Trainer's lack of ability to demonstrate training's usefulness that upset Hannemann (1993) so much in his article "It's time to stop defending". Managers do need to justify their investment decisions because, to quote von Hurst (cited in Kerr, 1994b):

The worst thing that can happen in training is for management or government to fund training on the blind faith assumption that training is inherently good. This corrupts the need for empirical justification and accountability - the very core of the quality control process. (pp. 2-3)

Training accountability is then the "shared" responsibility of trainers and managers to deliver training which meets objectives identified as closing real skill gaps.

### **1.7 Trainer Effectiveness/ Assessment**

The effectiveness of any training can be examined at two levels: the trainer and the product. As Rae (1993) suggests the skills of the trainer and the content of the training (product) are intertwined. A good trainer with good material will produce a highly effective course; the same trainer with poorer material will produce a poorer course, although not totally ineffective because his skills and experience will help redeem the course. A poor trainer given good material will produce an ineffective learning experience, salvaged only by learners who want to learn and do so despite the trainer. A poor trainer with poor material obviously gives learners little chance. Rae's (1993) analysis is strongly biased toward presentation as the "nub" of training. The ability of

---

the trainer to impart knowledge and skills then is emphasised as the point of leverage to improving learning. With the move to more technologically based delivery the product and not the presenter will come under closer scrutiny (Geber, 1994a). From an assessment perspective Rae (1993) suggests it is the role of the training manager to maintain training standards at a high level. A programme of assessing both the training (product) and the trainer needs to be initiated. Rae (1993) checks this statement by then arguing that any assessment of the training product is subjective, and thereby of little value, because of the nature of training, effectively ending any further examination of a trainer's output by him. The rest of the book is devoted to their solution of assessing trainer performance in large organisations: the Trainer Task Inventory (TTI). The TTI, based on work in Great Britain by the Air Transport and Travel Industry Training Board, is essentially a structured task analysis consisting of a list of all the tasks carried out by trainers that are organised into family groups of related tasks. The TTI contains four levels of work activity: (1) Helping people to learn and develop; (2) helping people solve performance problems; (3) helping people to anticipate needs and problems and formulate policies, and (4) general functions. The TTI includes 17 work areas with 252 associated tasks. The work areas being aspects of training common to the four activities under which common tasks are grouped.

The main use of the TTI is in the assessment of the skills of trainers. It provides a listing of the tasks a trainer should be capable of doing, which can be tailored to relate directly to whatever training role is required. The advantage of the TTI it is argued is its flexibility; while its disadvantages include the complexity of listing all the factors involved and the complexity of understanding the tool. Being competent at a number of tasks does not necessarily transfer to a training product or effective trainer performance. The tool appears to be appropriate for the large bureaucratic organisations in the study used as examples such as the United States Airforce. The TTI's applicability to smaller organisations, appears limited, significantly reducing its value in the New Zealand context.

Another attempt to assess the effectiveness of training is the training audit developed by

---

Murphy and Swanson (1988). This audit seeks to evaluate the training function as a whole rather than individual trainers or their products. This is similar to the NQF's registration and accreditation processes. They identify five areas for auditing: compliance, process, operations and financial, trainees, and business results. The process audit's purpose is to evaluate the framework used to implement programmes and services. The audit looks for procedures which ensure that the correct tasks are performed in the appropriate order. Existing procedures are compared to commonly accepted professional practice; though what 'commonly accepted practice' is, is not given. They compare five areas: needs analysis, design, development, delivery, and evaluation. Their rationale is that examining these processes will highlight critical activities which affect the probability of training success. The activities in the five areas they assess are not given.

There is an underlying assumption that certain activities or tasks will increase the probability of success. As McLagan (1989) argues, the focus on tasks and activities is incorrect because different organisations will successfully use different tasks and activities to produce similar outputs. It is suggested that following a task based approach will stifle improvement because individual trainers will be most effective doing tasks and activities with which they are comfortable and familiar.

The flexible job modelling approach of McLagan (1989), by contrast, allows for the assessment of both the trainer; in the form of competencies, and the training product; in the form of outputs. The flexible job modelling approach need not only apply to training but McLagan (1989) uses training as her example. The two fundamental questions are (a) What is to be produced (the specific outcomes), and (b) what must be mastered (by the people in the organisation) to meet these outcomes? The flexible job design methodology produces five major products: (1) Statement of assumptions about the current and future context within which the business must operate; (2) output menus that specify the outputs for a group or function (such as training); (3) competency menus that specify the knowledge skills and abilities required to produce the outputs; (4) generic job models, and (5) individual job models. The output menus provide a

---

comprehensive list of the products, services, or information that must ultimately become individual or team accountabilities to achieve the organisations goals. The competency menus lists all the competencies that are important for the successful production and delivery of the entire range of an organisation's outputs. With this method, goals and objectives do not specify how the performer will work; that is left to the individual. The key measurement in this approach is, what qualities, subjective or objective, must the output possess in order to satisfy its receivers. The method of measurement does not drive the selection of the goals even though objective measures may not be available. What is important is the qualities, objective or subjective, of the outputs the "receivers" get. Their perception is what counts. A quality training product then is made up of a number of outputs: the needs analysis, the training design, its implementation strategy, and its evaluation designs. All of which can be assessed against quality statements of what quality outputs should look like. These statements can easily be tailored to meet the unique circumstances of each training product (McLagan, 1989). This approach is analogous to Gagne's dictum (cited in McLagan, 1989) that the fundamental question is not about what training techniques or methods will be used, but about what is to be learned. It is only by knowing the precise objectives of training can we reasonably infer what the content will be, and only after specifying the content does it make any sense to ask what methods promote mastery. Training outputs then, drive the tasks used to achieve those outputs. As McLagan (1989, p.385) says "major waste often occurs when people pursue tasks as ends rather than developing better ways of producing the outputs that are the real purpose of the job."

Other approaches to trainer and product assessment are little more than checklists for trainers to ensure they do not neglect anything (Mager, 1991; Flynn, 1994); or, they are a variation on the performance appraisal interview (McLagan, 1989).

### **1.8 Training Evaluation**

The traditional approach of assessing the worth or value of training has been through

---

evaluation which Smith (1992) suggests tries to achieve four objectives: (1) the outcomes specified in the training objectives are met; (2) internally the training is assessed so as to improve its design and delivery; (3) evaluation identifies the costs and benefits the training involves for the organisation; (4) evaluation is used as a means of persuading others that the programme is worth the investment of further resources.

These four objectives in turn have led to the two primary evaluation types: formative and summative (Smith, 1992). Formative evaluation as defined by Tessmer (1993, p.11) is "... a judgement of the strengths and weaknesses of instruction in its developing stages, for purposes of revising the instruction to improve its effectiveness and appeal."

Tessmer (1993) describes five methods for improving instruction: expert review; one to one; small group; and field test evaluations. Formative evaluation is not an activity to prove or validate the effectiveness of a training product (that is the role of summative evaluation), it is part of the product itself. This distinction is important because many organisations still do not perceive formative evaluation as necessary to the training product, seeing it as a waste of resources or a sign of insecurity. The focus of formative evaluation is on the design and delivery of the content of the training product and not the training system as a whole. Anecdotally it appears few trainers engage in a systematic approach to formative evaluation; the norm appears to be that trainers believe they are constantly making improvements anyway (Tessmer, 1993).

Summative evaluation most simply defined "...is an assessment of the outcome of a programme" (Dane, 1990, p.309). The focus is usually on the effect the training programme had on the learners and the organisation. The most popular model used for evaluating training outcomes is Kirkpatrick's four levels of training criteria. They are: (1) reactions, defined as the trainees liking of and feelings for a training programme; (2) learning, defined as principles, facts, and techniques understood and absorbed; (3) behaviour, defined as using learned principles and techniques on the job; (4) results, spoken of simply as the end goals, or (organisational) results desired ... reduction of

costs; reduction of turnover and absenteeism; increase in quality... (Alliger & Janak, 1989). To quote Alliger & Janak (1989, p.331) "the power of Kirkpatrick's model is its simplicity and its ability to help people think about training evaluation (summative) criteria.

Criticism of this model is aimed at the fourth criteria of results. Data for the first three levels can be obtained by survey, tests, and observation respectively. Obtaining data for results is, as Campbell (1989) argues, fraught with difficulties and is best addressed at the analysis stage. Difficulties arise from organisational realities: there are just too many factors that can influence organisational results all of which interrelate with each other and to isolate training's effect is nonsensical. The cost of attempting to measure any effect would be prohibitive and have limited use. It would be better to know what effect you wanted in the first place and designed for it. Summative evaluation data is of little use to purchasers of training unless it is of previous applications of the product in a similar setting. By the time you collect your own summative data the product has been purchased and used. If the data tells you it is deficient it is too late. For this reason summative data is often used in the realm of public agencies to support the continuation of social programmes (Dane, 1990).

### **1.09 Benchmarking**

A new approach to improving training practices is to "benchmark" them against industry leaders. Benchmarking is best defined by Xerox who describe it as "...the continuous process of measuring our products, services and business practices against the toughest competitors of those companies recognised as industry leaders (Rothwell, 1994, p. 21). The idea of benchmarking is that comparing your training practices with industry leaders will lift the quality of your training (Ford, 1993; Rothwell, 1994; Geber, 1994b; Bogan & English, 1994).

Rothwell (1994) argues that with the greater international competitiveness the human resource function has to be able to demonstrate that it is world class in developing

---

people. While there is no standard approach, benchmarking usually involves identifying measures, quantitative and qualitative, that can be used to compare training practices across industry. Quantitative measures regularly include ratio of human resource staff to employees; training time and expenditure; absence; labour turnover; payroll, and a host of other relatively gross measures (Rothwell, 1994; Ford, 1993). For the trainer these measures would have limited value and would be of more use to a training administrator or manager. The difficulties of deriving "meaningful" quantitative measures have led many to concentrate on more qualitative approaches. The difficulty with Rothwell's (1994) analysis is that its focus is so broad in trying to capture all human resource practices that the information of even a qualitative nature is too superficial to be of use to training practitioners.

By contrast the American Society for Training and Development's (ASTD) benchmarking forum has gathered more meaningful comparative data on training practices within industry leading enterprises. The ASTD have gathered together 37 companies and obtained comparative data on areas such as training expenditure; the integration of training into strategy; training's customers; the training workforce; the types of training delivered; the delivery methods used, and how training is measured and evaluated (Kimmerling, 1993). The data generated by the ASTD forum indicates broad trends: the move toward more distributed learning; closer integration of training into strategy, and closer evaluation of training effectiveness (Kimmerling, 1993).

For the training practitioner the value of benchmarking comes from these strategic indicators as to where training products are headed (such as distributed learning). Benchmarking will provide little help in assessing or improving existing training products. The focus must remain on what works for the company and how it improves individual performance; faddish practices, as Campbell illustrates (cited in Goldstein & Buxton, 1982) are the bane of a training practitioners life.

### **1.10 Evaluation of external training products**

Often organisations or individuals are placed in the position of trying to objectively evaluate the quality of a training product that is being developed or promoted to them. An external training product can be defined simply as a training product a prospective purchaser has not developed. The basis of any purchasing decision then is usually from two sources: previous users of the product or its designers or distributors.

Users of a particular training product can be a particularly useful point of reference because they will be able to give an initial indication of the value of the product. The difficulties with approaching users is that the specific need they have is likely to be different to that of another potential user. Secondly a user of a product may not wish to damage an existing relationship and admit they made an error in their purchasing decision.

The second and most likely approach is to the distributor or designer of a training product for evidence to the value of their training product. It would be unrealistic to request validation data provided by rigorous summative evaluations of previous applications of the training product because so few are carried out. Secondly, there are possibly privacy issues where the distributor could only release such information if the purpose of collecting such data was for public distribution in the first place. It is doubtful organizations receiving training would co-operate and release such information.

The usual approach then of distributors (with consent) is to use anecdotal reports of individual successes. Anecdotal reports as nutrition expert Dr Michael Colgan (1993) found are selective and deceiving. When Dr Colgan examined popular weight-loss programmes he found that most who try either drop out before they complete them or regain most or all of the weight lost. Consumers he argued were being deceived by anecdotal reports of a few individual successes which hid the real failure of such programmes. He found cat-walk models who were clinically obese because they had

---

lost weight in terms of muscle, not fat. Colgan's expertise as a nutritionist enabled him to make that analysis.

How is a training purchaser who is often not a training professional, able to make such an analysis. Typically the decision is made 'ad-hoc' by the training purchaser based on the belief in their training competence. A systematic approach that could be used by training purchasers, would be an improvement. Just as the validity of employment interviews improves with a systematic structured interview (Cascio, 1991; Schmitt & Klimoski, 1991), so training product purchasing decisions could improve by systematic structured assessment .

Few examples of external evaluation exist of what to look for when purchasing external training products. Tracey (1993) provides general guidelines in the form of a checklist of fifteen questions which should be asked when purchasing training. The questions, however, are very general.

Phillips (1983) developed criteria for purchasing training programmes using results from a survey of Training and Business Week subscribers by the Instructional Systems Association (ISA) (Lashbrook, 1981). The survey, with a sample of 433 returns, was used to determine how and when HRD professionals make a decision to buy as opposed to developing a programme. Phillips (1983), using this data, identified eight selection criteria: course content, cost, instructional method, supplier reputation, ability to customize, media compatibility, ease of implementation and results orientation. Prospective training products then are gathered together and ranked across the eight criteria with that product with the highest total representing the best programme are Phillip's criteria, although based on empirical data, do not tell users of the criteria what represents quality instruction. What the method does do is focus attention on key areas for investigation.

The issue of identifying quality training products still exists as it did in 1981 not only for business but training establishments such as ITOs. As training coordinators for

industry, ITOs must determine how they will approve the purchase and use of training for their industry. The need for a systematic approach to evaluate external training products has never been more acute. Accepting the word of providers that they have a quality training product is not acceptable. A thorough inspection of any training product should become expected as the business of training intensifies.

The purpose of the present study is to design, run, and formatively evaluate a systematic approach to evaluation of external training products that is accessible to purchasers. At the same time the researcher will collect descriptive data of trainers and their practices to supplement existing data.

## **2. METHODOLOGY - BACKGROUND INTERVIEWS**

### **2.0 Introduction**

The present study is divided into two stages: background interviews, and evaluations of external training products. The present study employed predominantly qualitative research methodologies: in-depth interviews using a semi-structured interview format for the background interviews; and a structured interview used with an external training evaluation tool. In-depth interviews were conducted to explore the training perspectives of informants in their own words, with quotations forming the primary level of analysis. The structured interview was an evaluation of a training product of the informant's choice, using a specially constructed tool.

Note the use of the term "informant" in the present study; this replaces the term "subject" which Minichiello, Aroni, Timewell, & Alexander (1990) argue is more appropriate for quantitative approaches where the researcher elicits and receives information but does not give information. The informant in the present study is the trainer responsible for development of the training product.

### **2.1 Purposeful Sampling**

Nothing captures the difference between quantitative and qualitative methods more clearly than the different logics that support sampling approaches. Qualitative inquiry typically focuses in depth on relatively small samples; even single cases selected purposefully. Quantitative methods typically depend on larger samples selected randomly.

The logic and power of probability sampling depends on selecting a truly random and statistically representative sample that will permit confident generalisation from the sample to a larger population (Marshall & Rossman, 1989).

---

The logic and power of purposeful sampling instead lies in selecting information-rich cases for study in-depth. Information-rich cases are those from which one can learn a great deal about issues of central importance to the research, thus the term purposeful sampling (Patton, 1990). Patton (1990) describes 15 purposeful sampling strategies to obtain information rich cases. Like quantitative sampling practices convenience samples are not acceptable because they are neither purposeful or strategic.

## **2.2 Informants**

For the present study informants were selected for what Patton (1990) describes as a "snowball sample"; the purpose being to obtain suggestions for other informants from those informants already identified. A feature of purposeful sampling is that the sample is determined according to the needs of the study, and not according to external criteria such as random selection (Morse, 1994).

The needs of the present study required two elements: (a) individuals who identified themselves as trainers; (b) individuals who could provide a training product they would allow to be evaluated. By using snowball sampling the researcher was able to identify and gather informants who met the requirements and were prepared to participate in the present study.

Snowball sampling was operationalized in the present study by attending two NZATD meetings of the Manawatu branch and inviting participation from attenders. From those attending the researcher approached potential informants who Patton (1990) calls "well situated people"; in this case people who know what is going on in training in the Manawatu. Through these well situated people the researcher was able to identify and approach potential informants to participate in the present study.

The resulting sample consisted of seven informants, five females and two males, who reside in the New Zealand province of Manawatu. The sample includes representatives from central and local government, and from private enterprise and independent training

consultancies. Informants included both full-time and part-time training professionals; three are members of the New Zealand Association for Training and Development. The objective of the researcher was to be as purposeful as possible within real constraints of time and money. By selecting informants in this way the researcher was able to gather a variety of trainers together and see if there were common themes in their perspectives, and commonality in the quality of their training products.

### **2.3 Summary of Informant Training Products**

#### **Product 1**

The first product was designed to help teams identify systemic blocks to service in their organisation. This product was one module of a larger intervention. The product employed a "factory" simulation along with various discussions and role-plays.

#### **Product 2**

This product's purpose was to help individuals develop job descriptions based on outputs rather than tasks. The product prepared participants before they arrived and followed their post training progress. Mini-lectures, group and individual projects were used to deliver the product.

#### **Product 3**

Helping executives develop cognitive skills to deal with mistakes was the focus of this "takeaway" product. Participants were required to complete a booklet and attend group meetings to share their learning.

#### **Product 4**

This product helped individuals learn the functions of a computer product; a database

that was central to the running of the informant's organisation. Complete with dedicated facility, learners in groups commenced from level one and progressed through competency lists. Learners learnt only that part of the system that was pertinent to their position.

### **Product 5**

Speech communication formed the basis of this product. Through individual and group activities, learners developed their speech communication skills and knowledge; culminating in a final event where learners demonstrated their new competencies.

### **Product 6**

Using simulated customers and accompanied by a trainer, learners using this computer product, developed the skills and knowledge to deal effectively with a multitude of customer requests. Learners could track their own performance at all times.

### **Product 7**

This introductory quality training product was primarily a lecture using the computer software package "powerpoint". All participants answered a pre- and post-survey regarding attitudes toward quality. The purpose of the product was to initiate a drive for change but lack of sponsor support has seen follow-up activities frozen.

## **2.4 Informed Consent**

Informed consent as defined by Dane (1990, p.40) is "...providing potential research participants with all the information necessary to allow them to make a decision concerning their participation". The emphasis is on the relevance, not the comprehensiveness of the information.

In the present study, informants, after the piloting an of initial information sheet, received two documents (see Appendix A.). The first document was a single page information sheet describing the research topic; the separate background and evaluation interviews; the researcher; the rights of informants, and the use of an audio tape recorder. The second document was a supplementary information sheet of two pages that broadly outlined the training evaluation tool the researcher had constructed and would apply in the structured interview. This was done in response to a legitimate concern on the participant's behalf that they would need to prepare in order to participate effectively in the structured interview. Considering the nature of the evaluation tool there was no threat to the research purpose by providing informants with supplementary information, especially when it was requested. In a typical performance appraisal situation for example, it is an essential practice to give informants information and time to prepare (Dessler, 1994).

## **2.5 Background Interview**

The strength of qualitative methods is demonstrated for research that is exploratory or descriptive, and that stresses the importance of context, setting, and informants' frame of reference (Marshall & Rossman, 1989; Patton, 1990). Little is published of the perspective of trainers and the unique contexts that influence the products they design and deliver; rather the emphasis is on individual methods and practices (McMorland, 1990).

Qualitative methods are research methods for finding out what people do, think and feel by observing, interviewing, and analysing documents. The present study used the method of interviewing. The researcher was able to explore the informant's background and training perspectives and not impose on the informant the researcher's personal bias through preselected answer categories (Patton, 1990).

## **2.6 In-depth Interviewing**

An interview is described simply as "...a conversation with a purpose" (Marshall & Rossman, 1989, p.82). The purpose of interviewing is to find out what is on someone's mind. The purpose of in-depth or open-ended interviewing is to not to put things in someone's mind but rather to explore the perspective of the person being interviewed (Minichiello, Aroni, Timewell, & Alexander, 1990; Patton, 1990). In-depth interviews are defined as "... repeated face-to-face encounters between the researcher and informants directed toward understanding the informants' perspectives on their lives, experiences or situations as expressed in their own words" (Taylor & Bogdan, 1984, p.77). There are several underlying assumptions inherent in-depth interviewing. First, the encounters are "repeated", which implies a significant length of time is spent with the informant. Secondly, there is an egalitarian concept of roles which contrasts with the imbalance of power between the roles in survey methods. Researchers using the survey method control the relationship because they determine the questions and the response options. Thirdly, it is the informant's account which is being sought and highly valued, rather than the researcher's perspective. Finally, the researcher tries to access the informant's world by using language that is natural to them. This reduces the possible distorting effect of language which are not part of their everyday usage (Minichiello et al., 1990).

In-depth interviewing embodies the naturalistic perspective, that we need to know what people think in order to understand why they behave in the way they do. What we are actually interested in is people's experience of social reality through their routinely constructed interpretations of that reality. If the researcher develops theories that are not grounded in the informant's experiences then the researcher runs the risk of constructing and imposing on that informant a fictional view of their reality (Minichiello et al., 1990). In the present study the researcher was aware through anecdotal evidence of difficulties practitioners have with academic training terminology. By using a more naturalistic approach the researcher hoped to be able to communicate with the trainers in language familiar to them and also to test the proposition that training practitioners

and training academics do not share a common language.

## 2.7 Interview Procedure

As per the information sheet, a time and place for the two interviews, mutually acceptable to the informant and researcher were set. On all but one occasion the interviews took place at the informant's residence or workplace. Informants were asked to set aside two hours to conduct the interviews. On all occasions the interviews exceeded two hours; some by as much an hour and a half. The interview structure was simple: the background interview was conducted first; followed after a break by the evaluation of the training product using a structured interview.

The in-depth interviewing method used for the background interview in the present study was semi-focused based loosely around twenty open-ended questions the researcher wished to explore with the informant (see Appendix B). The questions for the background interview came from a variety of largely New Zealand, Australian, European and North American sources. Common issues for discussion came through very strongly. Accountability of trainers and the role of trainers appeared to be the most topical (Du Chateau, 1994; Kerr, 1994a; Kerr, 1994b; McMorland, 1990; NZEF, 1994a; Hannemann, 1993; Moy, 1991a; Moy, 1991b; Larsen, 1994; Holden, 1991; de Koning, 1993; Geber, 1995; Campbell, 1989; Cosgrove & Speed, 1995).

The questions in the background interview addressed issues such as, the business trainers were in; what they considered to be their primary role; the model or process of training they used; their perspectives on organisational preparedness for training; training issues that arose frequently; informant perspectives on accountability and improvement, and general questions regarding informant's methods regarding training (see Appendix B.).

The semi-structured in-depth interviewing method was used for the background of the trainer because it gives flexibility to the interview; allowing for follow-up of interesting topics and the use of additional questions. The disadvantage being that the interviews

often run over time.

In the present study all the background interviews exceeded the suggested time limit with the permission of informants who appeared to enjoy the experience. Such is the nature of the in-depth interview method not all informants answered all of the questions, and neither were the questions asked word for word in a predetermined order.

## **2.8 Processing of Interviews**

No matter what style of interviewing is used and no matter how careful one words interview questions it all come to naught if the interviewer fails to capture the actual words of the person being interviewed (Patton, 1990, p.347).

With this in mind all seven background interviews were recorded on audio tape. The researcher transcribed the interviews (background and evaluation) verbatim to word-processor with the aid of a transcribing unit. The layout of the transcribed interview used a split page with the left-hand column containing the dialogue, and the right hand column empty. This empty right hand column allowed the researcher to make comments during analysis. Each cassette took on average eight hours for the researcher to process. As Patton (1990) suggests transcriptions by someone other than the researcher can distort further the dialogue because they often exclude the pauses and other nuances that occur in interviews that are vital for understanding in context: a principle of qualitative research.

## **2.9 Data Analysis**

The primary or fundamental data of in-depth interviews is quotations; what people say, what they think, how they feel, what they have done, and what they know (Patton, 1990; Minichiello et al., 1990).

The objective of the analysis then was to group informant responses (quotations) loosely under the questions that were asked. While many responses could of been placed under multiple questions, they were not, because this would have been inconsistent with the naturalistic inquiry position of letting informants determine their own response options.

From this initial analysis, quotations that illustrated informant perspectives with regards to training issues were identified and summarised.

---

### **3. METHODOLOGY - EVALUATION OF EXTERNAL TRAINING (EET)**

#### **3.0 Introduction**

The second stage of the present study was a field test of the Evaluation of External Training (EET) Tool using a structured interview format.

#### **3.1 Models for HRD Practice**

The basis of EET is a study commissioned by the American Society for Training and Development (ASTD) to develop an integrated model of human resource development called "Models for HRD Practice". The ASTD study drew on the expertise of 800 peer nominated HRD experts. Human resource development (HRD) was defined as "the integrated use of training and development, career development, and organizational development to improve individual, group, and organizational effectiveness" (McLagan & Suhadolnik, 1989, p. 1). The five main objectives for the study were: (1) identify future forces or conditions likely to affect HRD professionals over the next three to five years; (2) determine the outputs (products or services) HRD professionals will produce or provide to others over the next five years, given the context of the future forces and conditions; (3) develop for each HRD output the quality requirements or qualities an output must possess to be considered excellent by those receiving it; (4) determine the competencies, (the knowledge, skill, and abilities), individuals must possess to produce HRD outputs according to the quality requirements; (5) define future roles for HRD professionals.

The results identified 13 future forces for HRD; 11 HRD roles; 74 HRD outputs; 35 HRD competencies, and 13 ethical issues for HRD. The purpose of the ASTD study was to facilitate the work of practitioners and managers, and foster further research by academics (McLagan & Suhadolnik, 1989). The present study aims to do that by using the 74 HRD outputs, identified in the ASTD study, as the basis for the EET tool.

### 3.2 Human Resource Development Outputs

In identifying what HRD work is, the developer of any job analysis tool must select the unit or units of analysis they will focus on. Traditionally HRD work and work generally has been analyzed at the level of behaviours and activities people do in the course of their work (McLagan, 1989). There are other options (see Figure 3.2).

Figure 3.2 HRD Units of Analysis

|  |  |  |   |
|--|--|--|---|
| 1. Individuals have <b>competencies</b> (knowledge, skills, values and attitudes). | 2. They use these competencies to perform a variety of <b>behaviours and activities.</b> | 3. Their behaviours and activities produce products and services ( <b>outputs</b> ) that are provided to others. | 4. The quality of these outputs and the reactions of those who receive them lead to <b>results</b> with consequences that may be positive, negative, or neutral for the organisation and its customers. |
|--|--|--|---|

---

Note: From Models for HRD practice: The Models (p. 17)  
P.A. McLagan, 1989, Alexandria: American Society for Training & Development.

According to Senge (1990) focusing on activities can lead to the learning disability known as "I am my job" whereby the status of the activity is valued more by the employee than real performance. Consequently the employee seeks to protect their

status, and little learning takes place.

Other options include a focus on competencies (knowledge, skills, values, and attitudes that enable performance); outputs (the products of performance), or results (the consequences of performance). The ASTD chose to focus on competencies and outputs; for the purposes of the present study the focus is solely on **outputs**.

The reason the ASTD chose to focus on outputs rather than results was because outputs are more controllable. An individual can produce an output to a standard yet has little control over whether that product or service meets or exceeds the expectations of the purchaser. The complexity of work in organisations means that step-by-step prescriptions of specific behaviours required for HRD success is unrealistic, if not tedious. A HRD practitioner can use a wide variety of behaviours in various combinations in response to a HRD output which remains constant. This respects the individuality of the practitioner and lays to rest the "one best way" approach taken with many fads. Clarity of the HRD output or "deliverables", contributes significantly to the selection of appropriate behaviours (McLagan, 1989).

### **3.3 Output Quality Requirements**

HRD practitioners and users of HRD services are concerned about quality and professionalism in the practice of HRD. The HRD outputs provide a unique focus for developing standards. The key standards question is "What requirements must each output meet in order for HRD experts to agree that it represents quality HRD work?" The quality requirements developed in the ASTD study are the standards that at least 50 percent of the experts who defined an output said are essential for that output.

For the present study the quality requirements then become the criteria by which the researcher evaluates the outputs of training products.

### **3.4 Design and Development of EET**

The purpose of EET is to take a training product (instructor guides and materials), along with a training product representative, and evaluate the product with the goal of making informed purchasing decisions. EET is a tool that could provide an objective and systematic approach to evaluate external training products. Key conditions for use are the reliability of the tool to give the same values when repeated; internal validity, where the values ascribed by the tool are an accurate reflection of the product; external validity, where the results of the tool are generalizable to other samples or groups; and face validity, where the tool is seen as credible by users (Schmitt & Klimoski, 1991; Minichiello et al., 1990).

To test reliability in the present study would require a test-retest. Two administrations of EET by the researcher separated by a suitable time interval would be required (Schmitt & Klimoski, 1991). Considering the evaluation is of the training product this could be very appropriate for future research.

There are three principle strategies for testing internal validity: content, criterion and construct related evidence. Validity refers to the degree to which inferences made from test scores (EET scores) are correct or accurate. The usual source of validation evidence is from measuring the predictive ability (criterion validity) of a tool (Schmitt & Klimoski, 1991). The ability of EET to predict successful versus unsuccessful training products could be appropriate for future research.

Construct validity, Cascio (1991) suggests, would require investigation into whether the constructs (outputs) were actually crucial to performance. The difficulty of operationalizing this and the qualitative approach of the present study means this is not an appropriate strategy. EET is based on an exhaustive study by the ASTD using content experts, it could be reasonably inferred that the content of EET is valid to the extent it reflects the domain of external training products as perceived by experts. This is similar to the Content Validation Index (CVI) described by Cascio (1991) where a Content Evaluation Panel (CEP) perceive overlap between the test (EET) and the job performance domain (training) with only those items considered essential for

performance of a job being included. The present study has identified 18 outputs, from the ASTD study, as being crucial to the performance of quality training (McLagan & Suhadolnik, 1989).

Given the small sample size and the developmental nature of EET the researcher was only able to assess the face validity of the EET; face validity being the general acceptance of EET by trainers (Smith, 1992). Without trainer acceptance of the tool as having face validity no amount of other validation data would persuade training purchasers to use it.

Formative evaluation using field tests is the most appropriate method to test the face validity of EET. A field test is a situated evaluation where the tool is evaluated in the same environments in which it will be used when it is finished. Field tests are often called beta tests or field trials (Tessmer, 1993). Field tests serve three main purposes: (a) confirm the revisions made in previous evaluations; (b) generate final revision suggestions; (c) investigate the effectiveness of the tool (Tessmer, 1993). The situated environment in the present study is the workplace or home of the informant because it will often be here that contact with a possible purchaser will take place. The field test in the present study is the evaluation interview.

### **3.5 Construction of EET**

The framework of EET is based on the instructional systems design (ISD) model of training (see Figure 3.5.1.). One amendment for EET has been the integration of design and development into one component (see Figure 3.5.2.) (Nilson, 1992).

---

**Figure 3.5.1 Instructional Systems Design (ISD) Model**

---

Analyze-----Design-----Develop-----Deliver-----Evaluate

---

Note: From How to start a training programme in your growing business (p. 175) by C. Nilson, 1992, New York: American Management Association.

---

**Figure 3.5.2 Evaluation of External Training (EET) Model**

---

Needs Analysis-----Design-----Implementation-----Evaluation

---

The reason for integrating design and development was simplicity; examples of evaluation tools such as Rae's (1993) trainer task inventory (TTI), or Flynn's (1994) internal evaluation are very complex and essentially incomprehensible to individuals other than users. The goal of the researcher then was to design a tool both researcher and informants can understand without detailed briefings.

As Nilson (1992,) says:

the point of the systems approach is that standards and measurements can be assigned to the products or outputs of each phase of training. By constantly working toward standards, taking measurements, and making modifications to processes and products throughout the system, you build quality into the finished training .(p.175-176.)

As can be seen from EET in Figure 3.5.2., needs analysis is followed by design,

implementation, and evaluation. Each component has outputs which function as inputs for the following component. Outputs of needs analysis, such as a listing of target group characteristics, form part of the input for design. The systems nature of EET and the ISD model in general, means that the outputs of evaluation, such as the learner reactions and learning become the inputs for the needs analysis, forming a feedback loop. Since inputs and outputs are, in essence, the same thing the focus need only be on one or the other. Focusing on outputs emphasises to training designers the control they have over the product they are responsible for creating. A focus on inputs would emphasize dependence. Given the creative nature of training design it was decided to emphasize control rather than dependence.

In the present study 18 outputs of training were identified as being crucial to the success of a training product (see Figure 3.5.3.). McLagan & Suhadolniks' (1989) ASTD study identified 74 outputs for HRD. The distinction that must be drawn is HRD encompasses the outputs of career development and organisational development as well as training. Even within the training field there are outputs that do not relate to a training product itself but rather the roles of training manager, marketing, and research. Outputs were selected with regard to the realities of the New Zealand training environment where trainers are often responsible for all outputs; in contrast to North America where the sharing of responsibility for outputs is common in large training departments.

| <b>Figure 3.5.3 Outputs for Evaluation of External Training (EET) Tool</b> |                         |                            |                           |
|--|-------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------|
| <b>Needs Analysis</b>  | <b>Design</b>           | <b>Implementation</b>      | <b>Evaluation</b>         |
| 1. Target group characteristics  | 1. Programme objectives | 1. Learning environment    | 1. Evaluation designs     |
| 2. Description of performance discrepancy                                  | 2. Content              | 2. Learning events         | 2. Evaluation instruments |
| 3. Tools to measure discrepancy  | 3. Structure            | 3. Test delivery           | 3. Evaluation report      |
| 4. Link to strategy  | 4. Materials selection  | 4. Feedback                |                           |
| 5. Link to individual performance  | 5. Instructor guides    | 5. Individual action plans |                           |

With outputs assigned to the components of needs analysis, design, implementation, and evaluation the next step was developing quality statements that allow users of EET to assess the quality of a training product. Perhaps more importantly the quality statements as Nilson (1992) suggest serve as standards trainers can work to, if the feedback they receive pinpoints areas of deficiency.

For the present study each training output has attached to it three quality statements; each statement representing different levels of quality (see Appendix C.). These statements of quality have been taken directly from the ASTD study with few modifications. McLagan & Suhadolnik (1989) acknowledge that outputs and especially quality statements will need to be customised to fit particular circumstances. The first quality statement describes what an output might look like for training experts to regard

that output as representing quality work. The following quality statements describe successively lesser quality outputs. Application of EET is simply a progression from needs analysis through to evaluation covering each output in the process. See Appendix C. for the complete EET tool.

### **3.6 Structured Interview**

As per the information sheets the structured interview for the evaluation of an informant's training product commenced after a break following the background interview (see Appendix A.). The semi-structured in-depth background interview was to allow informants to discuss a wide range of issues with little or no constraint. This allowed the researcher to develop a rapport with the informants which carried over into the structured interview and enabled the researcher to understand and use language familiar to the informant, eliciting better quality information from the informant about their training product.

Structured interviews usually refer to interviews where the questions and the answers have been pre-determined (Minichiello et al., 1990). That description stands at the opposite end of the continuum from an unstructured in-depth interview. The interview method for the present study is structured to the point that all informants were asked one question about the 18 possible outputs of their training products, with an allowance made for probing and follow-up questions. The questions, however, were not all worded alike. Having established rapport with an informant the use of pre-determined questions and answers would not have provided a fair reflection of the training product. Evidence suggests a considerable variation in terminology exists which would have needlessly confused many informants (McMorland, 1990). This also reflects the reality of a purchasing decision in the business world. In contrast to the background interview the researcher actively directed the informant towards the information being sought. The disadvantage of not using pre-determined answers was the volume of data the interview produced; requiring analysis.

### **3.7 Administration of EET**

In the present study, following the in-depth-interview, the researcher had an established rapport with the informant. This, it was hoped, would make it simpler for the researcher to ask for evidence of the quality of an output in language with which the informant was familiar. Each informant received a copy of the 18 outputs that would be evaluated, but not the quality requirements. This was done for two reasons. Firstly the researcher was interested in the perceptions of trainers and what they thought constituted a quality training output; secondly, the researcher wished to remove the possibility of informants pre-selecting their responses in appearing to look "good". In a real setting a purchaser may not make their criteria available for scrutiny. Conversely in a developmental setting the converse would apply. For the purposes of the present study the setting is assumed to be one of purchaser and trainer. All 18 outputs were covered in the EET interviews.

### **3.8 Processing & Analysis of EET**

In the present study the verbatim transcriptions of the EET interview provide the evidence of quality outputs; transcripts are supplemented with the researcher's notes and observations of the actual training product. This evidence is provided in Appendix D. From the evidence provided in the transcriptions a score of either 3 (excellent), 2 (acceptable), and 1 (deficient) was attached to each output.

The total for each component of needs analysis, design, implementation, and evaluation provided a raw total score that was then adjusted to a score out of 25 for each of the four components using EET (see Table 5.0.), the initial assumption being that each component (needs analysis, design, implementation, and evaluation) is of similar value.

From these adjusted scores different weightings can then be applied to each component to emphasise the relative importance of a component if desired. In the present study four combinations of weightings were used to see if they had any impact on the rankings

of the seven products (see Tables 5.0. & 5.0.1.).

### **3.9 Quality Threshold for EET**

For the purposes of the present study the researcher set the quality product threshold at 75%. This equates to a score of 2.25 per output out of a possible 3.0. This threshold is entirely arbitrary, and reflects the researcher's concern that a product receiving 2.0 (acceptable) for the 18 outputs (66%) could be classified as a quality training product when on the face of it, it is not a quality product. With a field test it is unlikely a tool will be implemented in the most effective way the first time it is used. The results of the present study will allow EET to be improved, using formative evaluation, for future use. Further research may allow the threshold to be set at a point with maximum external validity: where expert assessments of total product quality agree with the EET assessment.

---

## 4. RESULTS - BACKGROUND INTERVIEW

### 4.0 Experience & Education

In terms of experience and education, informants share similar characteristics. Firstly the informants were more likely to commence employment in occupations other than training. Secondly, the first tertiary qualification of informants was likely to be in an area other than training or human resource management. The following quotes highlight these two points.

...um started from the beginning answering phones, opening mail, putting the date stamp on, right through to processing benefits and interviewing customers (pause). Twenty two years - the last seven of those as a trainer.

...my trade is actually aircraft technician (pause) I am more like a supervisor. I got moved into the training side of it, actually teaching people to fix aeroplanes and that is how I got into the training overall.

...it was there that it was recognised that I had a flair you know for being able to instruct, be able to train (pause). I was given the appropriate um education and training by the armed services. (break) I am actually a regional planner!

### 4.1 Trainer Employment

The types of employment the informants were engaged in is best described using the typology in Table 1. The typology shows that in the upper left-hand cell three of the

seven informants were employed as trainers in organisations as their primary employment. That is the informants were employed as trainers first, with other roles taking a lesser priority. No informants in the present study were trainers in a secondary role. For example with on the job training individuals will be required to train others using some form of training product. The top right hand cell shows two informants were external training consultants working primarily from home. The remaining cell describes the two informants who had another primary source of employment and provided training as secondary option.

**Table 4.1 Typology of Trainers in the Present Study**

| <b>Context</b><br><b>Employment</b> | <b>Internal</b>   | <b>External</b>   |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| <b>Primary</b>                      | Trainer<br>(3)    | Consultant<br>(2) |
| <b>Secondary</b>                    | On-the-job<br>(0) | Part-time<br>(2)  |

A significant issue for internal trainers was having to provide training when in their judgement training was not the answer. To quote one informant:

...training is often what they see as a fast solution to something and they don't want to look too closely at their structure or their management style...

...as an employee of an organisation I virtually had to do what I was told and if they insisted that I had to do training then I would do it

(laughing).

From the external trainer's perspective the issue becomes one of providing solutions other than training and possibly losing income for doing so. Informants were divided whether they would provide training under these circumstances. The following two quotes illustrate this issue.

I am ethically strong enough to say I am not prepared to do that.

I'll explain what I think the problem is and if they insist they want their staff trained then I will do that, but I will make it clear I do not think that it is the answer to the problem.

#### **4.2 Fundamental Training Issues**

The time to train individuals to a minimum standard of competence was the single biggest issue for informants in the present study (see Figure 4.3.). The quotations tell the story.

... the one thing that is hard to convince people is that to train someone to really get the results, you need to let that person work away until they have got it, and that is a bit open ended so it is hard for people to (pause) they want something that will fit in with their production schedule, like how long are they going to be bringing them off for. You can say from my experience most people who do this will get through in an average of two hours, but the range is (pause) some have taken, um I don't know, four days and the quickest person got it in ten minutes, so yeah.

...if you have got your objectives and you have got the standards set that they must reach then time takes the back seat (pause) getting people to

see that actual attainment is the crucial bit.

From a logistical point of view they won't release people to come to training -we are too busy. TQM (Total Quality Management) is all about being effective and efficient but they won't release people to come to training because they are working too hard!

... one of the first issues for me is, is it really needed, is this the appropriate outcome, mm fundamental issues (pause) one that affects this place is time...

### **4.3 Accountability**

Informants in the present study defined accountability in terms of delivering what they had agreed to in the training objectives. Informants clearly separated their accountabilities from that of management whom they felt were more accountable for post-training success.

It is a contract, whatever the contract is negotiated, whether it is the objectives or the time frames or um (pause) the accountability lies with coming up with the goods with what you have agreed to do.

I guess accountability if you are the trainer, the person training them is, did that person finally get to do or achieve what you set out to do in the objectives? It is really that simple. Did they meet the standard, did they not?

If they leave the training with skills then that is my job done. If the skills don't get transferred to the workplace then that is not my fault.

My accountability finishes once I have given information, advice and

options (pause) what the unit or the individual of the group does with that is up to them (see Figure 4.3.).

**Figure 4.3 Typology of Informant Training Issues**

| <b>Role \ Issue</b> | <b>Resources</b> | <b>Accountability</b> |
|---------------------|------------------|-----------------------|
| <b>Manager</b>      | Production       | Transfer              |
| <b>Trainer</b>      | Time             | Objectives            |

#### 4.4 Primary Role as Trainer

Generally informants saw presenting and designing as their primary roles as trainer. Two informants did not see training in terms of roles but instead described training in terms of getting individuals to perform. A lone informant said their experience had been of the full range of roles with no primary role standing out. The following quotations represent the general themes.

I think probably for myself is the presentation of training. Why I say that is that sometimes it is quite good to get materials and programmes that have been run, trialed, proven, and developed elsewhere and with a little bit of tweaking actually will fit the bill nicely. So I find myself as a trainer, facilitator, presenter.

I seem to be able to communicate the ideas, I seem to be good at that (pause). But also in my design I think I have been innovative in what I have done...

I suppose I do a bit of both (presenting and designing - very understated comment)

I think as my primary role is to try and get people up and running as quickly as possible - it is people for performance.

... of getting people to perform and do things that they are quite capable of doing but have no idea of how to do it.

#### 4.5 Training Model

Two informants provided evidence of a model they used for training. They were criterion referenced instruction (CRI), and INTROSH (an armed services model). The remaining informants said they did not work from any form of training model and appeared to find the term "model" difficult to relate to. The following quotations illustrate this difficulty.

Okay, I can't identify a model I particularly use, um I know the process...

The model really starts with identifying, meeting with the initiator, the person who wants it and identifying real needs...

Model? I don't think I actually work from a model at all.

I am not using a model and I think that is half the problem.

#### 4.6 Training Policies of Organisations

Informants associated with central and local government spoke encouragingly of the sophistication of training policies in those organisations. One informant remarked that the public sector is where they thought the impetus for training in New Zealand was. The armed forces, an informant pointed out, is essentially one large training organisation because they are always training in preparedness for war. Their training policies have to be sophisticated because the consequences of accidents can be catastrophic. By

---

contrast informants associated with smaller private enterprise organisations were less specific and more likely to suggest training policies were non-existent or very primitive. The following quotations illustrate this contrast.

I think they do, I think ISS is a leader in terms of that (policies) (pause). I know ACC do. The public sector is I think is where the training impetus is.

Hmm I don't know if much exists there of policies, it was a commitment they had that was written into their...(mission statement)

.. for me sometimes as an external provider or consultant to other organisations (pause) they have been really primitive, like they don't have anything...

#### **4.7 Informant Practices**

Given the multitudes of data yielded by qualitative methods, the following is a selection of practices about which informants felt strongly about. The informant's original quotation follows each training practice summarised by the researcher.

##### **General**

##### **1. Never undermine the role of management -**

...I never undermined the role of management particularly the role of the team leaders in relation to their staff. I saw myself as an agent of management, not there instead of them.

##### **2. Document all training received with learner signature -**

... we have had some OOS (occupational overuse syndrome) where people said I never received training on this, this and that and I have been able to prove that yes you did on this date.

3. Allow employees to take ownership of solutions -

I am a great believer in involving, working alongside someone, letting them take the ownership of their own solutions. I give them the advice, I give them options and it is up to them to sort it out what is best for them - okay?

### **Needs Analysis**

1. Research company background -

I'll want to look at their mission statement and what (sic) their philosophies in terms of commitment and service to customers.

2. Seek experts within staff -

Finding out exactly what people need to do what they cannot do already and that means sometimes going to the staff members themselves or the experts within the staff and saying, how do you work?

3. View needs analysis as performance analysis -

Usually they will come to you with a performance problem ... and go through it with them and find out what really is the problem ... training is often the quick fixer as you are probably aware... I mean if people do a performance analysis then why are people doing what they are doing and others are being rewarded for things other than training, or is non-performance in itself rewarding.

4. Look for real versus felt needs -

... that is where you have to be absolutely certain at the beginning whether there is a need or not and asking those types of questions what evidence do you have that this is a need, what is the outcome you are looking for here sort of stuff.

5. Do not raise expectations by asking for training wants -

We raised expectations that could not or would not be met by some of these organisations.

**Design**

1. Learner centred training is about letting the learner determine how long it takes them to attain a skill -

If it is truly learner based ... actual attainment is the crucial bit (not time).

2. Evaluate knowledge by using game show format -

... we had them split into two teams and had them answer questions and they would ... it was like a game show so I just asked them questions out of the content ... so that was really our training evaluation how much did they grasp of the content and it is a fun way of ...

3. Distributed learning for busy executives -

For executives on the run a ... pick up and put down product with a time-frame gives greater flexibility.

4. Value to learner made clear -

In each unit of learning must exist the what is in it for me - why should I bother?

### **Implementation**

1. Make managers accountable for training transfer -

I can see that I can have influence up until the people leave the training course. If the skills don't get transferred to the workplace that is not my fault.

2. Share learning experiences -

... we are introducing through here lunch and learns which is where council staff who have been away on these type of courses, the problems or the futures, and they come back and they are sharing that out.

3. Discussions as a learning tool -

People think that is long-winded but I have seen some real powerful learning come out of hearing what someone has had to say about something ... they feel I have valued what they have thought because I have given them time to express it.

4. "Fluoro" cards for summaries -

We also have little fluoro cards like you see there where you can actually have a summary of everything they have done in the core skills...

5. Buddy system -

You have people who already know the programme (computer) who can help

you out. I will never always be there. That always works quite well.

6. Three action plans -

I cannot have them come to a programme cold (pre-programme). They do a mid-programme action plan that arises out of day one ... Then there is a post-programme action plan which says I will now meet with you as a post-programme follow up to assist you in any area of clarification.

**Evaluation**

1. Training improvement by formative evaluation methods -

After I design them I send them out for comment or they get finalised like they will go to a technical expert and you will also pilot them - they will go to a learner who knows nothing...

2. Measuring learning -

It depends on your objectives, you have got two types, you have got your skills and your knowledge. Your knowledge you are checking mostly by and large recall, and in the skills one, you have to actually see that being done, you can't get skills by asking a person a question such as how do you ride a bicycle?

3. Field of words -

I often chuck at them ... a field of words, circle everyone on there that reflects how you are feeling about how things are going...

## 5. RESULTS - EVALUATION OF EXTERNAL TRAINING (EET)

### 5.0 Training Products

The results of EET were analyzed using descriptive statistics. The seven evaluations show four products (2,3,4 & 6) passed the threshold, of 18.5 (75%) out of a possible 25 (100%), as quality training products.

Product "3", with 21.9 (87.7%), was evaluated as the highest quality training product using EET (see Table 5.0). Regardless of different weightings attached to the various components of needs analysis, design, implementation and evaluation, the rankings of training products changed minimally (see Table 5.0.1).

**Table 5.0 Training Product Scores Using EET**

| Component Weighting % | N<br>25% | D<br>25% | I<br>25% | E<br>25% | Total<br>100% | Grade | Rank |
|-----------------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|---------------|-------|------|
| Product               |          |          |          |          |               |       |      |
| 1.                    | 16.7     | 23.3     | 20.0     | 13.9     | 73.8          | B+    | 5    |
| 2.                    | 16.7     | 23.3     | 23.3     | 16.7     | 79.9          | A-    | 4    |
| 3.                    | 21.6     | 23.3     | 23.3     | 19.4     | 87.7          | A+    | 1    |
| 4.                    | 25.0     | 20.0     | 23.3     | 16.7     | 84.9          | A     | 2    |
| 5.                    | 16.7     | 20.0     | 20.0     | 13.9     | 70.5          | B+    | 6    |
| 6.                    | 21.6     | 25.0     | 21.6     | 13.9     | 82.1          | A     | 3    |
| 7.                    | 16.7     | 18.3     | 15.0     | 13.9     | 63.8          | B-    | 7    |

The three products of 1,5 and 7, that failed to cross the threshold of acceptable quality training products (75%), share the same deficiencies: poor needs analysis and evaluation. The three products coincidentally received 16.7 (66.8%) for needs analysis and 13.9 (55.6%) for evaluation using the basis of equal weightings for components. Across the seven products, the component of "evaluation" had the poorest quality outputs with a mean score of 15.5 (61.9%). The component of "design" had the highest

quality outputs with a mean score of 21.9 (87.5%) over the seven training products. Implementation followed with a mean score of 20.9 (83.76%), and needs analysis (M = 19.3, 77.1%).

Needs analysis with a standard deviation of 3.4 showed the most variability with the range of scores from 25 (100%) to 16.7 (66.8%). By contrast evaluation showed the least with a standard deviation of 2.2 with a range of scores from 19.4 (77.6%) to 13.9 (55.6%).

**Table 5.0.1 Training Products Ranked by Weighting**

| Weightings | Weight 1. | Weight 2. | Weight 3. | Weight 4. | Final Rank |
|------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|------------|
| Product    | -Rank     | -Rank     | -Rank     | -Rank     |            |
| 1.         | 5         | 5         | 5         | 5         | 5th        |
| 2.         | 4         | 4         | 4         | 4         | 4th        |
| 3.         | 1         | 3         | 1         | 1         | 1st        |
| 4.         | 2         | 1         | 2         | 2         | 2nd        |
| 5.         | 6         | 6         | 6         | 6         | 6th        |
| 6.         | 3         | 3         | 3         | 3         | 3rd        |
| 7.         | 7         | 7         | 7         | 7         | 7th        |

**Note.**

Weight 1. Weighting of all components 25%

Weight 2. Needs analysis 40% Design 20% Implementation 20% Evaluation 20%

Weight 3. Needs analysis 30% Design 20% Implementation 20% Evaluation 30%

Weight 4. Needs analysis 40% Design 30% Implementation 30% Evaluation 20%

Four weightings were used to test the proposition that different weightings (emphases) of the four components of needs analysis, design, implementation and evaluation would result in substantially different gradings relative to the other training products. This was based on the assumption that it could be possible to argue some components are more important than others. In the present study needs analysis is deliberately weighted higher reflecting its perceived significance in the current literature. The results indicate

that regardless of weightings the training products evaluated in the present study did not change substantially relative to other training products.

**Table 5.0.2 Example of Scoring Using EET**

| Component                   | Raw Score |   | Weighting |   | Weighted Score   |
|-----------------------------|-----------|---|-----------|---|------------------|
| Needs Analysis              | 11/15     | x | 30        | = | 22               |
| Design                      | 11/18     | x | 20        | = | 12               |
| Implementation              | 13/18     | x | 20        | = | 14               |
| Evaluation                  | 6/9       | x | 30        | = | <u>20</u>        |
| <b>TOTAL WEIGHTED SCORE</b> |           |   |           | = | <b><u>68</u></b> |

## 5.1 Outputs

The results of the eighteen individual outputs identify how informants dealt with the outputs and the methods informants used to provide the outputs.

## 5.2 Needs Analysis

Of the five outputs for needs analysis, informants found it easiest to provide evidence for three outputs: target group characteristics, the tools to measure performance discrepancies and the link to strategy. Target group characteristics were gathered informally by four of the informants, mainly through discussions with managers prior to running of courses. Of the formal methods one informant used a formal checklist, one used information from recruitment, and one used an internal formal request to find out one characteristic of an informant.

Informants for four products used anecdotal methods to gather evidence about individual performance discrepancies. Two products were computer based and assumed all learners started from stage one. Learners could either use the computer software or not: that was the discrepancy. One informant used a survey to gauge a discrepancy while one informant was not given access to information about performance discrepancies. In that

example the informant was following a directive to design and run a product on the basis of a general discrepancy.

All informants were able to link in some way their identified need with the organisation's strategy. For four of the products the link was indisputable: they addressed competencies crucial to the organisation's success. For example, the training product for the computerised call centre system is integral to the success of the organisation whose core business is mail-order.

Few informants were confident giving evidence about what performance discrepancy, or performance problem their product dealt with. Informants had the evidence such as time to process benefits, calls made, and critical incidents but did not provide it in relation to the question about this output.

### **5.3 Design**

The component of design started originally with six outputs: the match of design to resources was removed because this was implicit in each output. For each output there is a cost/benefit attached. Going with the most expensive method to attain an output may not be the best decision when cheaper and more effective methods are available.

Of the design outputs, objectives, structure, materials and instructor guides were easily evidenced. To assess the output of content the researcher asked for indirect sources of the quality of the content rather than read the content of what was to be learnt. The best indirect way to gauge the quality of the content was evidenced through formative evaluation approaches. Six of the informants had experts assess content or piloted it with learners. The two computer products received continuous updates. The remaining informant refined content constantly after courses.

All informants provided objectives in various forms; four informants explicitly evaluated their product against these objectives. The output of training structure gave some

informants difficulty with many asking for a re-phrasing of the question. Two of the informants discussed a skills hierarchy while the rest furnished the researcher with lesson plans or course outlines showing the sequence of their courses.

White-boards, hand-outs and OHP's (Overhead Projections) along with computers were the main materials used. One informant's product was a booklet learners could attend to when it suited the learner. Five informants presented the researcher with complete instructor guides; the remaining two informants said their guides were in process.

#### **5.4 Implementation**

Informants provided evidence of the five implementation outputs most readily. For the output of learning environment three of the informants had dedicated facilities they used. Each informant described in similar ways the layout of the training room for optimum learning. The informant whose product negated the need for such a physical environment left it to the individuals as to where they learned.

A variety of learning events were provided as evidence of the learning event output. Three products (two computer products), used simulations as the primary learning event. One product was entirely a lecture; the "takeaway" or distributed product used reflective exercises, with the remaining products using groups in discussions, role-plays and exercises. The output of feedback was misinterpreted by informants as feedback they got from learners, not feedback they gave to learners. Of the informants who interpreted the question as feedback to learners; two showed how the computer gave instantaneous feedback while another took learners through a checklist of what they should have covered.

The primary source of feedback informants gave learners was reinforcement through informal question and answer sessions. The output of test delivery was operationalized by four of the products in the form of projects that had to be completed. The projects were the completion of a job description, a booklet, a speech presentation and identification

of systemic blocks to service in the learner's organisation. The two computer products required learners to complete competency checklists as well as complete the tasks or tests provided by the simulations. The lecture product as an introduction to the topic of quality required participation in pre and post-course attitude surveys.

Results to the output of action plans are diverse: two informants said they were inappropriate for their product; two passed the responsibility to management or team leaders; one said they had none; one makes a recommendation to the learner; one informally follows up on learners and one informant actively manages action plans.

## **5.5 Evaluation**

The outputs of evaluation were the most poorly understood by informants of the training outputs. Informants required of the researcher definitions for the terms formative and summative evaluation.

Four informants evaluated learning against learner objectives and reactions as the basis of their evaluation design. The remaining informants used learner reactions as the basis of their evaluation design. One informant explicitly used transfer of learning as the third component of their evaluation design .

The evaluation instruments used to collect the data were primarily competency checklists, finished projects (learning), and survey forms (reactions). Informally informants collected data on transfer of learning with managers and learners without linking it to their evaluation.

Reporting of the evaluation results was conducted informally with managers by three of the informants; two provided written reports, and two reported verbally at meetings.

---

## **6. FORMATIVE EVALUATION**

### **6.0 Introduction**

A goal of the present study was to formatively evaluate EET so it could be improved for future use. By using the formative evaluation method of field testing, the researcher aimed to improve EET by testing it in a context for which it could be used. The original context chosen for EET was in a purchasing role with EET evaluating a product for possible purchase. This context could not be created in the present study because informants knew their products were not up for actual purchase by the researcher. The informant's manner therefore could not be generalised to a purchase situation because informants were obviously more open to discussion than they would have been knowing a purchase was at stake. EET therefore was tested in a developmental context of helping an informant improve their training product. This role proved successful and could possibly be its most appropriate application.

### **6.1 Revisions to EET**

Field tests serve three main purposes: (1) confirm the revisions made in previous evaluations; (2) generate final revision suggestions; (3) investigate the effectiveness of the tool (Tessmer, 1993). The significant revision for EET was the reduction of training outputs from 29, provided by McLagan & Suhadolnik (1989), to 18 chosen for the present study. The field test confirmed the researcher's expectations that fewer outputs were appropriate in the present study of New Zealand training products because in general, fewer outputs were provided than requested. Aside from the complexity of dealing with the larger number, the outputs of the training products examined could be captured effectively within the 18 categories. For example, McLagan & Suhadolnik (1989) provide nine outputs under the training role of instructor/facilitator. The majority of these nine outputs in EET are gathered under the output "learning events". Similarly nine outputs under the training role of materials developer are composed into the one

output of materials selection. McLagan & Suhadolnik (1989) provide separate outputs of audio material, computer material, print based material and so on, that share similar quality requirements. A revision for EET is to note these outputs in the quality requirements and so provide a mental cue for the variety of material outputs that are available (see Appendix E for revised EET).

A revision that was not confirmed as convincingly as expected was the use of four component headings: needs analysis, design, implementation and evaluation. Needs analysis and evaluation were conceptually simple to isolate. Design and implementation posed difficulties as there appeared to be no obvious demarcation between them. Where design finished and implementation started seemed arbitrary. The culprit, it was discovered, was the omission of the term "development". The output of materials selection confused the researcher because it took the objectives, content and sequence of instruction and fashioned it into something learners saw: a development output. The output of instructor guides was also a development output. Stating these explicitly in EET as development outputs should end this conceptual confusion. Design now becomes "Design & Development".

The lack of formalised questions for EET was deliberate because the researcher wished to converse in language familiar to the informant. Unfortunately the absence of questions hindered at times the researchers ability to get at the evidence in support of an output because the concept of outputs often confused both informant and researcher. A standard question would at least provide the minimum prompt and start both parties in the desired direction (see Appendix F for suggested questions).

The quality requirements provided for each output vary in their ability to be evidenced, with much dependant on the informant's ability to describe an output that matches in some way the criteria in use. The more concise the quality requirement the easier the administration of each output. As briefly discussed above, the listing of key qualities for detailed outputs would be a significant aid in administration. For example the output of materials selection changes from a paragraph containing many points to a list of key

qualities and examples. See below.

**Materials:**

- clearly communicate the information or concept
- enhance the learning process
- add impact visually, written and spoken
- are technically accurate and complete
- maintain learner interest.

(examples: graphics, video based, audio based, computer based, print based)

## **6.2 Review of Outputs**

The concept of **outputs** forms the basis upon which EET was developed. Outputs are those things that need to be produced and may be produced by a variety of behaviours and activities. In practice it was often difficult to separate training outputs from activities. The researcher was continually separating techniques from outputs. For example feedback could be provided one to one, to groups, or through assessed work; what matters is that the feedback output, packaged in the appropriate form, was delivered. With practice, this distinction was identified, and users of EET could easily be trained to identify this distinction.

### **6.2.0 Needs Analysis**

The needs informants described in the present study, were general descriptions which were difficult to tie to the two outputs of (1) a description of the performance discrepancy, and (2) the link to individual performance. Reviewing the original outputs of McLagan & Suhadolnik (1989) the first output could be better described as: recommendations for needed change in individual, work group, or organizational performance. Likewise the second output could be broadened to: descriptions of desired individual or group performance (see Appendix E for revised EET). The expansion of the outputs to include work groups and organizational factors reflects the reality of what was encountered in the evaluation interviews. The products, informant's provided, often

operate at the work group rather than the individual level even though the failure of the products to tie training to individual circumstances was a flaw. The output of the link to strategy becomes redundant as it is encompassed in the two reformatted outputs. Informants, though, identified a need for the output of pre-testing of learners at the start of training. Upon further analysis the researcher determined that pre-testing forms part of two existing outputs: evaluation design and evaluation findings. A pre-test of learning needs to be followed a post-test so some inference of learning can be made. Again, pre-testing must be designed into the training product. The remaining outputs of target group characteristics, and strategies and tools to identify performance discrepancies, encountered few difficulties apart from a lack of detail from informants.

The difficulty of asking for needs analysis outputs in the present study arose because informants were bringing their product for evaluation, not to solve the researcher's training problem. Informants, though, were to use a previous example to describe the output of their needs analysis efforts. Informants usually arrived at some description of a training need and some description of the learners they were supposed to train. The form of these descriptions usually followed a consistent approach: a general statement of discrepancy identified by informal discussions with management.

### **6.2.1 Design & Development**

Apart from the conceptual difficulty of differentiating design from development the five outputs worked well. One improvement applies to programme objectives. Since the training product is presented to the researcher for inspection the programme objectives can only be general as there is no performance discrepancy to fill. The content of the objective cannot be evidenced but the structure of the objective can. Using Pipe's (1975) objective writing guidelines an objective must possess three components: (1) the conditions of learning, (2) an action, and; (3) the criteria. These three components could be used in addition to what is already provided in the quality requirements for programme objectives.

### **6.2.2 Implementation**

The two outputs of feedback and test delivery provided difficulties in administration. Firstly feedback was often interpreted as feedback from learners; and secondly many of the training products did not incorporate tests. On reflection the administration of these two outputs can be improved with clear questions and broadening of the output itself. Firstly feedback should be labelled feedback "to learners", and test delivery changed to learning assessment. Secondly, the output of learning assessment could be broadened to include a wide variety of appropriate assessment options to act as cues.

### **6.2.3 Evaluation**

The three outputs of evaluation were easily administered due to a lack of sophistication on the part of informants. The output of evaluation report and feedback, can be further clarified by re-naming the output: evaluation report of findings, conclusions, and recommendations.

## **6.3 Effectiveness of EET**

To tackle Tessmer's (1993) third purpose of field trials, requires investigating the effectiveness of EET. As discussed previously, investigating the effectiveness of EET would require validation of EET by assessing whether EET could predict poor and high quality training products. However, the qualitative approach of this research means such validation is not feasible. Another way to validate would be to use EET prescriptively - if informants use the assessment they get to eliminate errors, does it achieve improved quality (as judged by the trainer/informant). For the present study effectiveness was determined by examining the process of administration and the reactions of both informants and the researcher.

Firstly, administration was surprisingly difficult, a lack of prepared questions and initial conceptual confusion with design and development hindered activities. It is clear to the researcher that training knowledge is essential to administration of such a tool because

the evaluator must be able to converse with the informant in training jargon. The simplicity of the tool, from the perception of the researcher, encouraged informants to participate as they knew from the outset what outputs were to be examined. Without the aid of verbatim transcriptions the initial evaluations would have been difficult to assess as it took time for the researcher to become familiar with EET. Some of the quality requirements were too long and could have been improved using the list form of evaluation McLagan & Suhadolnik (1989) provided.

Informant reactions were positive because EET became a developmental exercise. As much as the researcher developed EET for the purpose of evaluating external training products for possible purchase, that environment could not be created; informants knew there was no possibility their product could be purchased.

As a developmental exercise EET appeared effective because it targeted important aspects of training products in a logical manner. Informants identified with the progression from needs analysis through to evaluation as being particularly helpful in preparing for the evaluation interview. To provide a complete developmental exercise the researcher would need to give more timely feedback by detailing specific areas for improvement and develop an action plan with the informant to close specific gaps.

In summary the administration of EET can be simply improved by, (1) clarifying outputs, (2) providing a list of prepared questions, and (3) listing key quality requirements for each output. See Appendices E & F for the revised outputs, quality statements and questions.

In conclusion the formative evaluation method of field testing has improved EET by testing it in a context for which it could be used: a developmental role. Along with revisions to improve EET the field tests have shown its strengths to be, (1) the ability to get to significant training product issues using the output as the unit of analysis, (2) to simplify normally complex evaluations, and (3) detail opportunities for training product improvements.

---

## 7. DISCUSSION

### 7.0 Introduction

The in-depth interviewing method used in the present study brought out the unique perspectives of informant training practitioners. Using their words, instead of pre-determined answer categories, a more descriptive picture of what training is and means to the informants in the present study has been developed. The purpose of the present study is not to generalise these perspectives to other trainers but to describe more fully how informants in the present study go about, and think about their work. By examining these information rich cases a more accurate picture can be built so that future research can better target trainer perspectives avoiding many of the problems of mis-communication encountered by previous exploratory studies (McMorland, 1990).

The in-depth interviews show informants share a similarly circuitous path to training having being engaged in careers not directly associated with training. Similarly informants view accountability as clear cut: the delivery of objectives and no more, is where their accountability starts and ends. Also, informants see getting enough time to develop individuals as one of their fundamental training issues.

The field testing of the Evaluation of External Training (EET) Tool using a structured interview of 18 outputs effectively differentiated the seven training products presented for evaluation. Critical deficiencies of needs analysis and evaluation outputs separated the four products that passed the 75% threshold from the three that did not. The original context for testing, as a purchasing guide, was modified to reflect the more realistic context of a developmental exercise. It is difficult to speculate how much the changed relationship of a purchasing interview would have affected the data collected because informants would still need to satisfy the evaluator of the value of the evidence presented. Certainly the tone of the interview would have been more formal. Finally the formative evaluation of EET has identified significant opportunities for improvement that have been implemented.

## **BACKGROUND INTERVIEWS**

### **7.1 Informant Education & Experience**

That none of the informants in the present study have a first qualification in training or human resource management is not surprising considering informants commenced employment in occupations not directly associated with training. This profile fits previous research of New Zealand human resource managers which showed managers coming to human resource management indirectly without a qualification in the area (Stablein & Geare, 1993). Informants in the present study represent the agriculture, wholesale, and central and local government sectors. Four of the informants became involved in training when superiors recognised they had a talent for training. Their practical experience combined with their training abilities were felt to be a real advantage for trainers. This is analogous to the army pulling out combat experienced troops and using them for training recruits (Schwarzkopf & Petre, 1993). Having line experience, then, is seen as a significant advantage over trainers without such experience (Kaeter, 1995).

To make up for their lack of training education the majority of informants in the present study have or are pursuing training related qualifications to complement the training they have received on the job. Similarly in the United States of America there is a growing demand for HRD qualifications because individuals are finding that to progress in the HRD area they need an HRD qualification and cannot rely on their initial qualification to guarantee promotion. Previously, in the United States, trainers would not get HRD qualifications because they believed they would not add to what they already knew and could do. Ironically, for many, the change in behaviour has nothing to do with wishing to improve training competence (Kaeter, 1995). Informants in the present study appeared to genuinely seek to improve their competencies with the comment that there are few training related qualifications available.

## 7.2 Trainer Roles

The typology of trainers (shown in Table 4.1) was developed to describe informants in the present study. Informants were differentiated by whether training was their primary or secondary employment, and whether they were internal or external to an organisation. The trainer whose primary employment is as trainer and who is internal to an organisation could be described as the "internal trainer". Three of the seven informants are described in this way. These informants would be identified as trainers on an organisational chart and be expected to be responsible for matters of training.

**Table 4.1** Typology of trainers in the present study

| <b>Context</b><br><b>Employment</b> | <b>Internal</b>   | <b>External</b>   |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| <b>Primary</b>                      | Trainer<br>(3)    | Consultant<br>(2) |
| <b>Secondary</b>                    | On-the-job<br>(0) | Part-time<br>(2)  |

McMorland (1990) produced a typology of trainer roles "within" an organisation (reproduced below), which has data added from the present study. The three informants described as internal trainers in the present study are further differentiated below using McMorland's (1990) typology.

**Table 7.2** Typology of Trainers "Within" the Organisation in the Present Study

| Professional Authority \ Organisational Authority | High                       | Low                    |
|---|----------------------------|------------------------|
| High  | Training Manager<br>(1)    | Training Co-ord<br>(1) |
| Low   | Training Consultant<br>(1) | Line Manager<br>(0)    |

**Note:** From The state of training policy in New Zealand enterprises. In P. Boxall (Ed.), *Function in search of a future* (p. 149) by J. McMorland, 1990, Auckland: Longman Paul.

The typology above suggests that internal trainers vary both in levels of professional qualification and experiences, and the organisational status they enjoy. The training manager as described by McMorland (1990) will have a broad overview of their work and delegate much of the actual implementation to specialists. In the present study McMorland's description is an accurate reflection of the one informant. The informant was not only accountable for the training but also knowledgeable about the product. The informant was supported by a training officer who implemented the training product for the organisation.

The training coordinator, as McMorland describes, is one who lacks professional qualifications or experience to bring these into management. The researcher in the present study questions the premise that a training co-coordinator lacks professional qualifications because indications are human resource positions in general now require

---

a tertiary qualification as a minimum (Elkin & Inkson, 1995; Kaeter, 1995). In the present study the informant described best as a training coordinator, played a key role in their organisation by putting staff in touch with training they required, instead of "re-inventing the wheel" as she put it and running training herself. Armed with bachelor's degree, a partly completed training diploma, and years of training experience the informant holds a key role because of being able to establish real versus felt needs instead of blithely agreeing to every request for training. This informant apparently operates with a high degree of professionalism: a level that may not be representative of all in this role.

McMorland's typology suggests that the role of internal training consultant carries with it high professional authority but low organisational authority. The informant representative of this role illustrates this with unnerving clarity. Employed with the armed services this informant was respected as a trainer but could not question the logic of superiors even if there were reasonable grounds to do so. In effect the informant had to follow instructions and nothing more. This example is an extreme case but is corroborated by an informant who formerly worked as an internal training consultant for a government department. This informant would explain why training was not the answer, but proceed if management insisted on it anyway. As an employee in such a position the informant had little choice but to obey "reasonable instructions".

By contrast external consultants can terminate a relationship which threatens their professional judgement with little consequence. To quote Stolovitch & Keeps (1992): external consultants "... arrive, suggest, bless, and depart leaving the internal consultants to follow up and make things happen." Though not directly representative of external training consultants it reinforces the point that external consultants have more flexibility than internal consultants who can be at the mercy of poor management decisions. The informant who described relenting and providing training, subsequently, described incidents of being able to turn the situation around by building a relationship with managers. Elevation to senior management meetings allowed this informant to apply the most leverage and thus conduct effective, targeted training.

The final role described by McMorland is that of line manager who is seen as coach, controller, example setter and guide. This role bears striking resemblance to the role of on-the-job trainer identified in Table 4.1, the difference being the on-the-job trainer does not have to be a line manager or supervisor, just someone knowledgeable in a particular job who trains others. As shown in Table 4.1 this role is not represented in the present study.

Returning to Table 4.1 the trainer whose primary employment is training also, but is external to the organisation is best described as the "training consultant". These trainers are usually brought into organisations under contract to provide solutions for specific problems or projects (Stolovitch & Keeps, 1992). Two informants in the present study are best described as training consultants. The first external trainer in the study has established links in the public sector as well as with community groups. The challenge of marketing outside this "niche" was this informant's biggest challenge. The second informant in this category began as a trainer by designing training for a major agricultural product they were knowledgeable about. That challenge saw the informant gain a specific training qualification in order to perform the job competently. As an external training consultant this informant's niche is primarily training design for agriculture, supplemented by tutoring in agriculture at a private training establishment (PTE).

The next category of trainers are individuals who train externally to the organisation they are employed, or train on a part-time basis. An analogy can be drawn in many ways with sports coaches (amateur) who have primary employment in an unrelated area but who coach sports after work and in the weekends. The nature of employment in the 1990's means there is more flexibility to engage in more than one form of employment (Deeks, Parker & Ryan, 1994). Two informants in the present study represent this role. What differentiates these two informants from the two external training consultants was their perceptions about their role as trainers. The external trainers saw themselves fully engaged as trainers whereas the informants who are described as part-time did not, seeing training was a side-line to other employment and activities. These informants

---

worked from established contacts/clients, with marketing primarily by word of mouth. In the present study both informants were employed part-time with a University as markers and tutors as well as pursuing other activities. Even though they were part-time trainers, both had complete training products which were able to be assessed using EET; a pre-requisite for participation in the present study. The remaining role is the individual for whom training is their secondary responsibility, such as a supervisor or process expert. Training for this individual represents one of a number of tools to improve workplace performance. In this example the individual may conduct on-the-job training for a new employee or train colleagues in a new technique they learned on a benchmarking trip. No informants in the present study represent this cell: they are the least likely to have fully developed and transferable training products that could of been evaluated using EET. In a developmental context EET could be used to help such individuals improve their training outputs.

The typology developed by the researcher, along with McMorland's (1990) typology shows different contexts that trainers in the present study are operating. The internal trainer works within an established culture and must develop relationships with management and staff to deliver effective training. External training consultants, by contrast, has more discretion as to what opportunities they pursue and what they will be accountable for but must navigate the culture of each organisation. Part-time trainers do not see themselves fully engaged as trainers and so have the greatest flexibility in the work they choose to take. Each context has its advantages and disadvantages, providing individuals with a variety of choices.

### **7.3 Outputs of Internal versus External Trainers**

Associated with the training roles described above are training outputs that are different for the internal and external trainers (McLagan, 1989). For the informants in the present study who are described as internal trainers there were the extra outputs of training administration and training management for which training consultants and part-time trainers (external trainers) were less likely to be responsible. A trainer from a

---

consultancy business which employs a number of trainers could be responsible for some of these outputs, such as training administration. Examples of specific outputs provided by informants included upkeep of dedicated training facilities and the keeping of employee training records on database, the purpose of which was to stop employees from claiming in the future they had not received training when in fact they had. This was a very topical issue for one informant faced with an employee who claimed not to have received training in avoiding occupational overuse syndrome (OOS) when in fact the training had been provided. Training consultants in the present study also had the output of marketing to deal with which one informant described as their most pressing issue faced. Part-time trainers in the present study appear less concerned with the output of marketing because they work from established links. In conclusion outputs for trainers are unique to the training context of a particular trainer.

#### **7.4 Fundamental Training Issues**

The fundamental issue that frustrated informants in the present study was the lack of time to train individuals to a minimum level of competence (see Table 4.3). This violated for the informants a fundamental adult learning principle of allowing learners to be self-directed and learn at their own pace in their own way (Zemke & Zemke, 1995). Unfortunately the practice of managers placing pressure on trainers to return their employees to the workplace as soon as possible is a common experience for informants in the present study.

Informants used two strategies to overcome this problem. Firstly, those informants described as internal trainers sought to educate managers about training and the benefits accruing to the organisation. Informants with access to senior management meetings suggested they exerted their influence there most effectively at the senior level. It was there they could explain the logic of why pulling someone out of production for a period would actually benefit the organisation. The second strategy, taken up by three of the informants, was to provide flexible products. Two of these products were computer based and could be operated with a minimum of trainer organisation during off-peak

---

times. The third product was a self study package that gave its target audience (executives) the most flexibility. The four remaining products, in essence were trainer-centred, and required considerable organisation and preparation to run and so had the least amount of "give" in terms of time. In the United States of America this time pressure, the informants have recognised, has led to an increasing growth of what is called "distributed learning". Distributed learning shifts the emphasis from trainer-centred learning to a learner-centred approach, with the content delivered by electronic means across a local area network within an organisation. What needs to be kept in mind though is that distributed learning presently is not appropriate for all learning, so it is unlikely to replace entirely other forms of training delivery (Geber, 1994a; Albright & Post, 1993).

### 7.5 Accountability

The dominant issue identified in the current literature was accountability. Informants perspective of accountability in the present study bears little resemblance to the debate as described in the literature review. Popular debate with regards to accountability argued that trainers were not having real measurable effects on organisational performance. Kerr (1994a), as the strongest critic of trainers, suggested trainers should get back to helping business improve performance. Informants in the present study have retorted (angrily at times) that if you want to improve performance why not design for it through objectives before you even start to look at measurable performance. Informants were clear about their accountabilities with regards to training: to deliver that they had agreed to in the training objectives. Assuming informants do not develop objectives in a vacuum it is here where managers must share responsibility with trainers to identify real needs where training is going to have the greatest effect.

The difficulty in the present study is that even though informants were clear about their accountabilities and the need for measurable objectives there was little data presented supporting the need for training beyond a general description. Whose responsibility is this? A common theme that came through was that informants provided what they were

rewarded or contracted for. If their clients did not specify the need for certain things beyond training delivery, such as evaluation or post-training support, informants would not provide it. Informants thought why spend time on something clients do not want or appreciate. With the increasing money spent on training the training knowledge of managers must increase if they are going to effectively justify that training expenditure.

With one exception, informants saw the post-training environment as the responsibility of management. Informants suggested this is logical as they say cannot influence the structures that support or oppose their training intervention. Informants described as internal trainers supported this view. To try to influence the post-training environment as an internal trainer, they suggest, risks undermining management. Wigley (1988) suggests this does not have to be the case if an organisation's approach to training is based on a close relationship between the training function and management. In this situation Wigley (1988) says a trainer operates as an "internal consultant" working with management to solve problems. By contrast in the "production" approach to training the training function develops or runs training to a schedule they set and offers training to those who want to participate. Consequently training is rated a low priority by managers who do not see it dealing to their immediate or future concerns. When held accountable the training function will point to data such as total training days, number of training days per employee per year, annual training budget, numbers of courses and so on; data that serves no purpose.

The evaluation data provided by the internal consultant, by contrast, focuses on the skills learners have attained, how well they are transferring them to the workplace, and the possible benefits (increased expertise and productivity) it is providing to the organisation; data that has many developmental purposes and illustrates real accountability (Wigley, 1988). This, London (1989) argues, highlights the real advantages for large organisations of having an internal trainer. The advantage of internal training professionals is that they become familiar with the organisation's people, strategies, and methods of operation. McMorland (1990) describes these internal trainers as having low organisational authority and needing to use the attraction of their

personality to forge key political alliances to get things done. Possibly reflecting a lack of training expertise in the 1980's there is no mention of performance being a key factor.

This raises the question, why do internal trainers lack such influence? Is it because trainers in RITA's sample were working from a production orientation and were not contributing in ways valued by managers; or is it simply a reflection of their position on the organisational chart as McMorland surmises? Kerr (1994a) is convinced it is performance, and that the future would be brighter for trainers if they were to develop such relationships as Wigley (1988) describes because they would become champions of productivity. Either way a closer relationship between an organisation's core activities and training is of benefit to all concerned. As McMorland (1990) showed this relationship in the form of recognition in strategic plans was absent in 1987. It would be of interest to see training's status in the 1990's as reflected by its presence in strategic plans.

## **7.6 Public Sector Training Research**

Throughout the present study the researcher was aware of the perception of a commitment by public sector organisations to training. Informants in the present study were involved with mainly large public service organisations or small to medium sized private enterprises (<100 employees). Large private enterprises are not represented. Informants associated with public service organisations perceived they were taking the lead with regards to training. The evidence of public sector training efforts is difficult to assess as they are either lumped together with private sector training efforts (McMorland, 1990; Stablein & Geare; 1993), or omitted entirely (NZEf, 1994a). RITA's research apparently included public sector enterprises but did not separate them out from private enterprises (McMorland, 1990). In the United States for example, public sector training is seen as a distinct field of research (Roback, 1992).

One informant who worked primarily as a trainer for a public service organisation provided consultancy to small businesses and organisations and found very little in

regards to training policy and practice. Informants who provided consultancy to small business as their primary employment supported this perception. The reason given for this lack of training aptitude was that small business very often cannot afford to employ anyone in a human resource development role; a view supported by Elkin & Inkson (1995). It would be useful to test these perceptions against more empirical data and see if the public sector is indeed where the impetus for training lies.

---

## 7.7 EVALUATION OF EXTERNAL TRAINING (EET) INTRODUCTION

A field test of a systematic approach to evaluation of external training products (EET) using a structured interview format has yielded descriptive data of informant training products and practices. The application of EET to training products in the present study showed deficiencies exist within the informant sample with regards to needs analysis and evaluation outputs; a result that was not unexpected. EET has also identified, with regards to the present study, common approaches to needs analysis, design, implementation and evaluation by informants. The value of EET comes from having access to the right outputs: the things that distinguish quality training products. An alternative use for EET, other than as a purchasing guide, is in a developmental role for trainers. It was in this context the EET interviews took place, and informants described them as being of value. The formative evaluation showed informants treated the EET interviews as developmental interviews rather than purchasing interviews because they knew their products were not for actual purchase.

### 7.8 Needs Analysis

The informal and unsystematic approaches used to deliver the five outputs of needs analysis in the present study were not surprising given previous research of training needs analysis in New Zealand by RITA, and overseas (McMorland, 1990; Moore & Dutton, 1978; Saari, Johnson, McLaughlin, Zimmerle, 1988; Larsen, 1994). In RITA's study, although not specified precisely, the identification of training needs was very reactive, often with no thought toward the long-term needs of the organisation. Considering the theoretical linkage between needs analysis and evaluation (Nilson, 1992; Larsen, 1994) the 46 percent of respondents in RITA's study who indicated they had only informal or poor evaluation measures, corroborates the qualitative findings in the present study that poor evaluation reflects poor needs analysis. Larsen (1994) provides matrices for four European countries comparing needs analysis with evaluation and

shows that in general the level of needs analysis and evaluation undertaken are similar. For two of the nations, slightly more needs analysis is carried out than evaluation, and vice versa for the other two nations. The inference is that in RITA's study with 46 percent of respondents who had poor or informal methods evaluation a corresponding number would have similar methods for needs analysis. This, Larsen (1994) suggests, is to be expected because of the interrelated nature of needs analysis and evaluation. Those that fail to evaluate training are described as losing interest or relying on intuition and good luck.

Little mention by informants of specific needs analysis methods or typologies reinforces the perception that there is a gulf between theory and practice in the present study. Informants delivered the outputs such as a list of target group characteristics but, with the exception of one informant, had no systematic means of collecting the data. Consequently the outputs of "tools to measure performance discrepancy"; and "description of the performance discrepancy" received little attention and blank looks from informants who often asked for clarification. Informants appear to look for general performance discrepancies but did not see the need for describing them in detail. Informant methods of conducting a needs analysis for their product involved essentially informal discussions with managers and learners. Little data external to these sources was requested or collected.

Possible explanations for this lack of systemization is the size of the organisation and training audience. The training products of informants are not designed for large audiences and theoretically could be handled competently using informal methods. The nature of the majority of the training products evaluated was such all learners commenced at the beginning with no opportunity to start learners at different levels. The requirement of detailed needs analysis data informants argue is not so crucial. From the learner's perspective this is unrealistic as each learner will come with varying levels of competency. Only the "takeaway" product gave learners real control over their learning. The six remaining products are trainer-centred with the pace and level of learning directed by the trainer. One reason for gathering target group characteristics

---

is to customise learning to individuals so they engage their primary learning style and start at an appropriate level. Informants in the present study agreed it would be good to be able to do such but the nature of their training product meant this was not feasible. Individual skill based training, they suggested, was more easily customised compared to more group based training. Informants argued that within their product the learning events they create allow for learners to direct their own learning. Even where this is so, a thorough examination of learner characteristics could be used to enrich the learning events.

The fact that findings in the present study suggest corroboration with RITA's research (McMorland, 1990) does not allow the researcher to generalise beyond the present study to the larger New Zealand context. All that can be said is that within the sample of the present study there appears to be a similar lack of systemization of training needs analysis.

## 7.9 Training Design

The difference between the academic and practitioner world of training in the present study is illustrated again by a question that was designed to tap the underlying structure or systems on which informants built their training products. Unfortunately informants did not have a structure in mind; they just developed their training. Informants were asked to describe the "model" they used to design their training. Two informants in the present study were able to discuss the model they used for the basis of their training design, though the term "model" visibly bothered informants. The two informants who had a model did not identify it as such and only after much probing was able to identify they did indeed use a model for training. For example one informant used criterion referenced instruction (CRI) as the basis for their training design. CRI as the informant showed the researcher, was a complete training design package. These approaches constitute models because they involve principles and assumptions about learning, hence are more than processes. This informant, like others, was comfortable talking about the **process** they used to develop training. The process informants described was usually

based on a training model based on the "systems" approach such as ISD even though they did not identify it as such because they only used its framework and not underlying principles and assumptions (Goldstein, 1980). One could infer that the informants are theoretically weak with regard to training design. An alternative explanation is that informants are more comfortable discussing a training process than a training model as other training practitioners do. The term model confused informants; the informants tended to react defensively sensing they were being exposed as less than competent. Asking trainers to describe their training processes is likely to access more information than asking about their training models.

The data gained from needs analysis is supposed to drive training objectives that close the skill "gap" identified. An indication of how many of the informants used objectives purposefully is the number that evaluated their training explicitly against those objectives. Four informants evaluated their training specifically against the training objectives they set. This, informants suggest, is the heart of trainer accountability: delivering training set out in objectives. This was the common element missing in the three training products that failed to reach the threshold of quality training products using EET.

In response to a question about the output of training structure two informants responded with evidence about a skills hierarchy: a theory based design technique (Mager, 1991). In that example the informant described how crucial it was that learners tackled objectives in a certain order to aid learning. This sequencing of learning being a key learning principle (Gagne, 1962). The remaining informants had difficulty with the term "structure" and preferred the use of training or course "outlines" or "lesson plans" to describe the sequence of learning events.

### **7.10 Implementation**

Informants provided evidence of the five implementation outputs most readily; a result not unexpected because of the attention implementation issues receive (Tannebaum &

---

Yukl, 1992). Informants worked largely from the paradigm of instructor led training with learning occurring in the classroom away from the immediate work environment. The evidence of learning event outputs provided ranged from one stand-alone lecture to an assortment of role-plays, simulations, exercises, discussions and projects. With regard to the present literature the informant products compare favourably.

Two themes which stand out in the literature are the skill delivery of training and the engagement of learners in training. Marc Rosenberg, in interviews with Beverly Geber (1994a & 1995) suggests the future is with distributed training through technology where training is provided to learners at the time they need it. He cites the example of Hewlett Packard where 65% of training is delivered outside the classroom. Rosenberg does not address the remaining 35% but this could suggest that classroom training will not be entirely eliminated. Training, he believes, will shift to the provision of information. Considering the infant technological state of many New Zealand organisations such tools for the trainer could still be distant.

The concept of providing training in a form (not necessarily using computer technology) when learners need it has merit as shown by one product in the study. In that example a product was designed for executives on a topic that was best delivered individually and non-electronically. The context of learning must be taken into account. Rosenberg uses engineers learning object oriented computer language as his example of distributed learning. Technical topics Rosenberg shows can be easily packaged for electronic media. In the present study this is evidenced by the two computer products provided by informants. Both products have the capacity to provide learning on-line to learners about the software they are using once they have completed the introductory training.

The second theme evident in the literature surrounds the best ways of engaging learners in learning. The traditional approach of training to quote Sorohan (1993, p. 47) is to "open head; insert knowledge." Inserting knowledge by trainers is in the context of a classroom of individuals, learning at the same pace, and listening to the esteemed trainer. Upon leaving the classroom learners are assumed to bridge the gap of theory

---

to application and apply their learning immediately to their workplace (Jeuchter, 1993). Sorohan (1993) suggests 90% of workplace learning is informal or incidental at individual, group and organisational levels. Sorohan (1993) suggests replacing formal training programmes with methods such as self study, computer based training, coaching and project teams. Learning is greatest when it is placed in context within an organisation.

Where does this leave formal training programmes? Firstly, formal training products are an appropriate tool in many circumstances; secondly the growth of the NQF is likely to lead to a proliferation of training programmes, not a decrease. Also New Zealand's participation in tertiary education by international standards is still comparably low and encouragement of learning toward qualifications through formal methods is more desirable than no recognition of learning (Elkin & Inkson, 1995). The lessons gained from the learning insights of Sorohan (1993, p. 47) are "...that effective learning engages both head and hand and requires knowing and doing." Applied to formal training products means the use of learning events that use the learner's experiences and business context. Learners will use training most effectively when it relates directly to their concerns. The majority of informants in the present study do provide such learning events and make efforts to ground the training in learners' experiences. The requirement by informants to complete a job relevant project, is evidence informants were not inserting knowledge but engaging learner motivations.

The output of action plans or provision for training follow-up elicited the most diverse responses of the 18 outputs covered. At one end of the continuum was one informant who developed detailed follow-up plans to make sure that learners were indeed transferring the learning to the workplace. The informant described this as a "hell of a commitment" but worthwhile. At the other end of the continuum informants either did not have any follow up plan or said they were inappropriate for their product. Moving towards the middle of the continuum were informants who informally followed up on learner's progress. Sharing the middle ground were those informants who passed responsibility for follow up explicitly to managers or team leaders. For internal trainers,

informally following up on learners and transferring responsibility to managers are logical approaches because of established training relationships (Wigley, 1988). For training consultants their influence may not have the same impact unless they are specifically contracted, as one informant was, to follow up on learners. The informant in this example made the follow-up an integral part of the product. Informants generally supported the view that management have the most impact on whether transfer of training through follow-up occurs.

Baldwin & Ford (1988) in their framework suggest there are three main training inputs that influence the transfer of training to the workplace: trainee characteristics, training design, and the work environment.

Considering the component of needs analysis in EET deals with trainee characteristics and that "training design" is a component in EET itself, this leaves the input of work environment as the appropriate focus of attention. Baldwin & Ford (1988) suggest that the effect of training design on training transfer has been the most rigorously researched but argue there is still the problem of generalising the results of research to actual organisational settings. The research into trainee characteristics of ability, motivation, and personality and how they affect training transfer is less developed. The focus of research has been on distinguishing individuals who are successful or unsuccessful in transferring skills rather than on placing individuals into programmes that optimally match their characteristics. Given organisations choose individuals for training on the basis of need, and not whether they are most likely to succeed in training, the focus should be to place an individual in a programme that provides optimal learning opportunities.

Characteristics of the work environment that affect training transfer are suggested as supervisory support and the opportunity to use skills learned. Supervisory support is a multi-dimensional construct which could include encouragement to attend, goal setting activities, reinforcement and modelling of behaviours. Empirical work is needed so that supervisory support factors that have the greatest impact on transfer can be identified

(Baldwin & Ford, 1988). In the present study the output of "action plans" is offered to supervisors or managers as an option because the trainer, especially external training consultants, do not expect to have influence once they have delivered their product. Training transfer is a significant issue and one purchasers of training to need be aware of if they are committed to learning.

### **7.11 Evaluation**

The three outputs of evaluation: design, tools to collect data and the evaluation report were poorly evidenced by informants. Evaluation tools and designs for the majority of informants consisted of simply gathering learner reactions during training. Four informants explicitly included assessment against objectives in their evaluation design, with one informant examining post-training behaviour.

The literature on evaluation design often focuses on experimental or quasi-experimental designs that use control groups and collect pretest and post-test data against a number of criteria (Goldstein, 1986; Cascio, 1991). These designs are not considered practical by informants because of two main factors. The first factor is the cost-benefit ratio. The cost of using a formal experimental design to evaluate training is considerable. This extra cost would simply deter New Zealand organisations from engaging a particular product regardless of any benefits. The second factor is expertise: RITA's study suggests only 21.3% of large Auckland businesses (100+ employees) had comprehensive evaluation measures even though over 50% of businesses employed trainers (McMorland, 1990). NZEF's (1994) study showed only 17% of organisations employed specialist staff with 50% of organisations engaging external consultants. Few organisations appear to employ and encourage the expertise that would be required to rigorously evaluate their training interventions. This issue alone highlights a discrepancy between training theory and practice. Practitioners and clients simply do not have the resources to implement complex training evaluation designs.

Alternatives to complex designs exist that are less expensive, but still rigorous to supply

---

quality data to make decisions on (Sackett & Mullen, 1993). Kirkpatrick's (1977) typology of evaluation criteria, Tannebaum & Yukl (1992) suggest, is the most prevalent framework for evaluation because it provides a useful heuristic that practitioners can use incorporating simpler methods that reflect organisational realities. Kirkpatrick's typology includes four levels of training effectiveness: learner reactions, learning (measured against objectives), behaviour (transfer of skill to the workplace) and organisational results. In sum, studies fail to support the direct causal relationship among levels often assumed in Kirkpatrick's typology. In particular learning appears to be a necessary but not a sufficient pre-requisite for behaviour change. The post-training environment, it is argued, plays an important role in determining whether transfer occurs. Learner reactions do not appear to be directly related to other criteria. In other words, liking the training does not imply learning, a finding that highlights the problem of using trainee reactions as the sole criterion of training effectiveness.

Informants in the present study who based their training evaluation on solely learner reactions may be getting a false impression of the effectiveness of their product. A purchaser buying a product on the basis of learner reactions is taking a risk. The output of the evaluation report, summed up the importance of training evaluation in the present study. Reporting was primarily by informal conversation with managers. Only two informants provided written reports. The content of these reports was based around general opinions of informants rather than any systematic collection of data. The question is, why do organisations not employ and reward trainers for providing evaluation data? A possible answer is that organisations simply do not know any better.

---

## **8. IMPLICATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH**

### **8.0**

Implications from the present study fall into two categories, research methodologies and training practice. The use of primarily qualitative research methods in the present study developed a more descriptive picture of trainer practice than could be achieved using traditional survey methods of questionnaires and structured interviews. The obvious disadvantage of such methods being the considerable time devoted to data gathering, analysis and reporting. Qualitative methodologies advantage over more quantitative approaches is that the results reflect how informants see the world; not the world constructed by the academic. This was a particular concern for training practitioners who do not necessarily communicate in the language of training academics. What must be kept in mind is that quantitative and qualitative methodologies are complementary and support each others deficiencies.

The present study revealed a number of further opportunities for research. The small sample used in the present study does not allow for generalizability to the larger New Zealand training population but it did highlight a number of issues. Research using survey methods and a larger sample could further test and develop the training typologies as well as fill a number of gaps in existing research. These gaps include public versus private sector training activities, the post-training environment of New Zealand organisations, and the relationship between trainers and managers during the analysis stage.

The development and application of EET revealed a number of training realities pertinent to the New Zealand training context, including a smaller number of training outputs as compared to the United States, and the prevalent use of informal measures and approaches.

With the completion of the field test of EET, in the context of a developmental interview, the next step is to further validate and refine EET. Validation of EET could be achieved by conducting a larger number of evaluations across a number of evaluators. Face validity or acceptance by training professionals would be the most beneficial for EET's future. Further refinements of EET could include more closely defined quality descriptions and the use of alternative scoring systems such as a five point rating scale.

The use of EET as a purchasing guide is still a possibility because the concept of a systematic approach to external training product evaluation is not diminished by the present study.

---

## References

- Albright, R.C., & Post, P.E. (1993). The challenges of electronic learning. Training and Development, 47(8), 27-29.
- Alliger, G.M., & Janak, E.A. (1989). Kirkpatrick's levels of training criteria: thirty years later. Personnel Psychology, 42, 331-342.
- Baldwin, T.T., & Ford, J.K. (1988). Transfer of training: A review and directions for future research. Personnel Psychology, 41, 63-105.
- Bernhard, H.B., & Ingolis, C.A. (1988). Six lessons for the corporate classroom. Harvard Business Review, 66(5), 40-48.
- Bogan, C. E., & English, M. J. (1994). Benchmarking for best practices: Winning through innovative adaption. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Campbell, J.P. (1989). Training design for performance improvement. In J.P. Campbell, P.J. Campbell, & Associates (Eds.), Productivity in organisations: New perspectives from industrial and organizational psychology (pp.177-215). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Cascio, W.F. (1991). Applied psychology in personnel management (4th Ed.). Englewood Cliffs: New Jersey.
- Colgan, M. (1993). Optimum sports nutrition: your competitive edge. New York: Advanced Research Press.
- Cosgrove, G., & Speed, R. (1995). What's wrong with corporate training? Training, 32(1), 53-56.
- Dane, F.C. (1990). Research methods. Pacific Grove: Brooks/Cole Publishing.

- 
- Dawson, C. (1995). Congratulations on your 21st birthday NZATD. People and Performance, 3(4), 2-3.
- Deeks, J., Parker, J., & Ryan, R. (1994). Labour and employment relations in New Zealand (2nd ed.). Auckland: Longman Paul.
- de Koning, J. (1993). Evaluating training at the company level. International Journal of Manpower, 14(2/3), 85-93.
- Dessler, G. (1994). Human resource management (6th ed.). New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Du Chateau, C. (1994, May). The gravy trainers. Management, pp. 36-39.
- Elkin, G., & Inkson, K. (1995). Employee development. In P. Boxall (ed.), The challenge of human resource management: Directions and debates in New Zealand (pp. 150-177). Auckland: Longman Paul.
- Fitzsimmons, M. (1995). A trainer's warrant of fitness. People and Performance, 3(4), 30-31.
- Flynn, E.B. (1994). Internal evaluation. In W.B. Tracey (Ed.), Human resources management and development handbook (2nd ed) (pp.1343-1361). New York: American Management Association.
- Ford, D.J. (1993). Benchmarking HRD. Training and Development Journal, 47(6), 36-46.
- Gagne, (1962). The acquisition of knowledge. Psychological Review, 59, 513-518.
- Geber, B. (1994a). Re-engineering the training department. Training, 31(5), 27-34.

- 
- Geber, B. (1994b). Benchmarking at Kodak. Training, 31(12), 39-41.
- Geber, B. (1995). A rabble rousing roundtable. Training, 32(7), 61-72.
- Gilbertson, D., Fogelberg, G., & Boswell, C. (1987). Personnel and Industrial Relations Staff in New Zealand. Wellington: New Zealand Institute for Personnel Management Incorporated.
- Goldstein, I.L. (1980). Training in work organizations. Annual Review of Psychology, 31, 229-272.
- Goldstein, I. L., & Buxton, V. M. (1982). Training & human performance. In M. D. Dunnette & E. A. Fleishman (Eds.), Human performance & productivity: Vol.1. Human capability assessment (pp. 135-177). New Jersey: LEA.
- Goldstein, I.L. (1986). Training in organizations: Needs assessment, development and evaluation (2nd ed). Monterey: Brooks/Cole.
- Hannemann, T. (1993). It's time to stop defending. Training and Development in Australia, 20(9), 15-16.
- Holden, L. (1991). European trends in human resource management. The International Journal of Human Resource Management, 2(2), 113-131.
- Jeuchter, W.M. (1993). Learning by doing. Training and Development, 47(10), 28-30.
- Kaeter, M. (1995). HRD Degrees: Who needs them? Training, 32(11), 65-74.
- Kerr, R. (1994a, June). Ten myths about training. Institute for International Research Conference on Skill Development and Industry Training (pp. 159-

- 
- 167). Wellington: New Zealand Business Roundtable.
- Kerr, R. (1994b). Meeting the training investment challenge. People and Performance, 2(4), 2-4.
- Kimmerling, G. (1993). Gathering best practices. Training and Development Journal, 47(9), 28-36.
- Kirkpatrick, D.L. (1977). Evaluating training programs: Evidence vs. proof. Training and Development Journal, 31, 9-12.
- Larsen, H.H. (1994). Key issues in training and development. In C. Brewster & A. Hegewisch (Eds.), Policy and practice in European human resource management: The Price Waterhouse Cranfield survey (pp. 107-121). London and New York: Routledge.
- Lashbrook, V.J. (1981). New training programs: To buy or to build. Training, 18(11), 52-55.
- London, M. (1989). Managing the training enterprise. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- McLagan, P. A., & Suhadolnik, D. (1989). Models for human resource development practice: The research report. Alexandria: American Society for Training and Development.
- McLagan, P.A. (1989). Flexible job models: A productivity strategy for the information age. In J.P. Campbell, P.J. Campbell, & Associates (Eds.), Productivity in organizations: New perspectives from industrial and organizational psychology (pp. 369-387). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- McMorland, J. (1990). The state of training policy in New Zealand enterprises. In

- 
- P. Boxall (Ed.), Function in search of a future: Perspectives on contemporary human resource management in New Zealand (pp. 135-156). Auckland: Longman Paul.
- Mager, R.F. (1991). Making instruction work. London: Kogan Page.
- Marshall, C., & Rossman, G.B. (1989). Designing qualitative research. London: Sage.
- Minichiello, V., Aroni, R., Timewell, E., & Alexander, L. (1990). In-depth interviewing: researching people. Melbourne: Longman Cheshire.
- Moore, M.L., & Dutton, P. (1978). Training needs analysis: Review and critique. Academy of Management Review, 3, 532-545.
- Morse, J. (1994). Designing funded qualitative research. In N.K. Denzin & Y.S. Lincoln (Eds.), Handbook of qualitative research, (pp. 220-235). London: Sage.
- Moy, J. (1991a). What do organisations expect of HRD practitioners? Training and Development in Australia, 18(1), 19-23.
- Moy, J. (1991b). What do organisations expect of HRD practitioners? Training and Development in Australia, 18(2), 21-27.
- Murphy, B.P., & Swanson, R.A. (1988). Auditing training and development. Journal of European Industrial Training, 12(2), 13-16.
- New Zealand Employers' Federation. (1994a, June). Training survey report. Wellington: New Zealand Employers' Federation.
- New Zealand Employers' Federation. (1994b, May). Employer survey on training.

---

Wellington: New Zealand Employers' Federation.

Nilson, C. (1992). How to start a training program in your growing business. New York: American Management Association.

Patton, M.Q. (1990). Qualitative evaluation and research methods (2nd ed.). London: Sage Publications.

Phillips, J.J. (1983). Handbook of training evaluation and measurement methods. Houston: Gulf Publishing.

Pipe, P. (1975). Objectives: tools for change. Belmont: Fearon Publishers.

Rae, L. (1993). Evaluating trainer effectiveness. Homewood: Business One Irwin.

Roback, T. (1989). Personnel research perspectives on human resource management and development. Public Personnel Management, 18(2), 138-161.

Rothwell, S. (1994, Winter). Benchmarking and evaluation of human resources. Manager Update, 6(2), 21-34.

Rudman, R. (1994). Human resource management in New Zealand (2nd ed.). Auckland: Longman Paul.

Saari, L.M., Johnson, T.R., McLaughlin, S.D., & Zimmerle, D.M. (1988). A survey of management training and education practices in U.S. companies. Personnel Psychology, 41, 731-743.

Sackett, P.R., & Mullen, E.J. (1993). Beyond formal experimental design: towards and expanded view of the training evaluation process. Personnel Psychology, 46, 613-627.

- 
- Schmitt, N.W., & Klimoski, R.J. (1991). Research methods in human resource management. Cincinnati: South Western Publishing.
- Schwarzkopf, H.N., & Petre, P. (1993). It doesn't take a hero. Auckland: Bantam Books.
- Senge, P. M. (1990). The fifth discipline: The art and practice of the learning organization. New York: Doubleday.
- Smith, A. (1992). Training and development in Australia. Sydney: Butterworths.
- Smith, P.A. (1994). Reinventing SunU. Training and Development Journal, 48(7), 23-27.
- Sorohan, E.G. (1993). We do; therefore, we learn. Training and Development, 47(10), 47-55.
- Stablein, R., & Geare, A. (1993). Human resource management in New Zealand: Profession and practice. Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources, 31(2), 26-38.
- Statistics New Zealand. (1995). New Zealand Official Yearbook 1995: Te Pukapuka Houanga Whaimana o Aotearoa (98th ed.). Wellington: Statistics New Zealand.
- Stolovitch, H.D., & Keeps, E.J. (1992). The politics of intervening in organizations. In J.B. Duncan & E.S. Powers (Eds.), Handbook of Performance Technology (pp. 79-91). San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Tannebaum, S.I., & Yukl, G. (1992). Training and development in work organizations. Annual Review of Psychology, 43, 399-441.

- 
- Taylor, S.J., & Bogdan, R. (1984). Introduction to qualitative research methods: the search for meaning (2nd Ed.). New York: John Wiley.
- Tessmer, M.(1993). Planning and conducting formative evaluations. London: Kogan Page.
- Toulson, P.K. (1990). Perceptions, practices, and productivity: An assessment of personnel management in New Zealand. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Massey University, Palmerston North.
- Tracey, W.R. (1993) Customising off-the-shelf programmes. HR Magazine, 38(1), 58-60.
- Wigley, J. (1988). Evaluating training: Critical issues. Training and Development in Australia, 15(3), 21-24.
- Zemke, R., & Zemke, S. (1995). Adult learning: What do we know for sure? Training, 32(7), 76-85.

## APPENDIX A

### Information Sheet

#### What is this study about?

We are interested in the concept of a training audit that will allow individuals and organisations to review the effectiveness and the efficiency of their training practices and programs.

Through the training audit we aim to provide a **benchmark** of current practices as well as identify areas for potential improvement. Our primary aim is to use the audit formatively to improve rather than judge training products.

#### What would I have to do?

1. Firstly, we would like to have a taped interview with you to discuss issues that surround the training audit and to brief you on the training audit itself.
2. Secondly, taking a training program of your choice, we would like to conduct the training audit.
3. Thirdly, we would like to discuss with you the results from the training audit; and solicit your opinions on how the training audit be improved.

#### What can I expect from the researchers?

If you take part in the study you have the right to:

- withdraw at any time
- ask further questions about the study that occur at any time
- provide information on the understanding that it is completely confidential to the researchers
- a copy of the findings from the study when it has concluded

#### What will happen if I agree to take part?

When you confirm your agreement to take part in this study a time for an interview, mutually acceptable to both parties, will be negotiated. Participation in the interview means you are giving the researchers the permission to use brief unidentified quotations in our reports. Of course, you retain the right to withdraw at any time by informing one of the researchers.

Thankyou for your time.

Lance Gray, Department of Human Resource Management, ph. 350 4272.  
Phil Ramsey, Department of Human Resource Management, ph. 350 4278.

## APPENDIX B

### Interview Questions

1. What business do you consider yourself to be in?
2. What would you consider to be your primary role as a training professional?
3. What training do you or your organisation provide?
4. What model of training do you work from when you design training courses?
5. Could you describe for me the typical sequence of events in regards to the preparation of a training contract? What happens when you are contacted to do some possible training?
6. How well organised/prepared are organisations when they come to you for training?
7. How sophisticated are the training philosophies, policies and practices of the organisations you deal with?
8. What is the level of competence in training issues do you find among managers?
9. Do you think they should be more competent?
10. Do you ever suggest alternative solutions other than training to clients?
11. Do you ever encounter scepticism from management?
12. What fundamental issues arise with regards to preparing a training solution?
13. Where does the majority of your information come from in regard to a training needs analysis? How is it provided?
14. How would you define or describe accountability with regards to training?
15. Do you consider accountability to be an issue for training professionals?
16. How accountable do you believe training professionals should be?
17. On what grounds are organisations, you work with, funding training?
18. How do you demonstrate that your training is a worthwhile investment?
19. Do you seek to show possible productivity gains?
20. How do you improve your training programs?
21. Do you conduct a formative evaluation of your training products?
22. Do you conduct a summative evaluation of your training products?

## APPENDIX C

### EVALUATION OF EXTERNAL TRAINING (EET) TOOL

#### Needs Analysis

##### Target group characteristics

3. Description of target group characteristics lists such things as age range, sex distribution, educational background, reasons for attending and learning styles. Key stakeholders are involved throughout the process.
2. Description of target group characteristics lists basic demographic information such as age and sex. Informally there is an awareness of some of the learners characteristics.
1. Informally there is an awareness of some of the target group characteristics.

##### Description of performance discrepancy

3. Performance discrepancy identified is important for effective organisational and individual performance; is specific and measurable; accompanied by supporting data and rationales; is understandable to the learners; is linked to observable behaviours; and defines how future performance will be measured.
2. Performance discrepancy identified is reasonably important for effective organisational and individual performance; is vague; is not linked closely to observable behaviours, and does not specify how performance will be measured.
1. Performance discrepancy is not associated with effective organisational and individual performance but with the availability of courses and personal workflows (i.e. can learners afford the time off).

### **Strategies and tools to identify performance discrepancies**

3. Tools are cost effective and efficient, create minimal disruption in the workplace, are seen as fair and applicable and identify and detail significant performance problems. They do not have built in biases favouring particular types of solutions or activities.
2. Tools are relatively cost effective with some disruption to workflows and often do not precisely detail the performance problem.
1. Tools often do not discriminate between training and non-training performance problems. Along with this the tools are disruptive, costly and not seen as fair and applicable.

### **Link to Strategy**

3. Needs identified are clearly and precisely linked to organisational strategy. Those needs identified as being insignificant in regards to the strategy are discarded or given minimal attention. Recommendations are clearly described and easily understood. They include multiple options which identify advantages and disadvantages of each.
2. Needs identified are linked in a general way to the organisation's basic strategy. The specificity of which is not investigated. Only one true recommendation is provided with little analysis as to its advantages and disadvantages.
1. Needs identified are in no way measured or viewed against the organisation's strategy.

**Link to individual performance**

3. Needs identified specifically detail how an individuals current performance discrepancy will disappear with training. There are multiple options provided with the advantages and disadvantages provided with each.
  
2. Needs identified details somewhat vaguely an individuals current performance discrepancy. Only one true solution is provided with little analysis of its advantages and disadvantages.
  
1. Needs identified details vaguely an individuals performance discrepancy that has no impact on overall performance.

## **Design**

### **Program objectives**

3. Program objectives are stated in terms of what the learner will know, value, and or be able to do; they reflect the goals of the organisation and an understanding of learner needs; they reflect desired performance requirements and can resolve the performance discrepancy. They also identify the indicators or measures that can show how each objective has been achieved.
2. Objectives describe for the learners in vague terms the conditions of learning, the actions required of them and the standards they will be measured against. The link to the workplace is tenuous.
3. Objectives described are vague and give the learners no idea about what they will be able to do at the end of training and in the workplace.

### **Designs (content)**

3. Content is technically up-to-date and relevant to the objectives, the learning points are clear, accurate, and organised; examples related to the learning points are provided; presentations are consistent with the program design.
2. Content is technically sound; vaguely applicable to the objectives, with most of the learning points being clear and organised.
1. Content is dated, irrelevant to the objectives and reflecting little understanding of the audience and adult learning principles.

### **Structure/sequencing**

1. Sequencing and structure of learning reflects an understanding of the audience and of adult learning principles; designs support organisational objectives, values and culture; designs reflect an understanding of the application environment; developed with input from key stakeholders; learning resources and methods are appropriate for the objectives; the designs include a plan for evaluation, they can be achieved within time and budget constraints; designs promote learner participation; they include an implementation plan.
  
2. Sequencing and structure reflect some understanding of the audience and adult learning principles; designs vaguely support organisational objectives, values and culture; designs reflect some understanding of the application environment; developed with little input from key stakeholders; learning resources and methods are reasonably appropriate for the objectives; the designs include a basic plan for evaluation, they can be achieved within time and budget constraints; designs promote some learner participation, and includes a very basic evaluation plan.
  
3. Sequencing and structure do not support organisational objectives, culture and values. There is no or little input from stakeholders; resources are inappropriate for the design; there is no learner participation, no evaluation and implementation plan.

### **Materials selection**

3. Materials clearly communicate the information or concept; they enhance the learning process; they add impact either visually, written spoken; they are technically accurate and complete; they maintain learner interest; they meet the customer's specifications and design objectives.
  
2. Materials reasonably clearly communicate the information or concept; they are basically accurate with some mistakes; they maintain some learner interest; they meet most of the customer's specifications and design objectives.
  
1. Materials used are ambiguous and dull with no reference to additional information sources. They do not meet the customer's specifications or the design objectives.

**Instructor guides**

3. Instructor guides are easy to use; support the instructional process; can be tailored to learner and trainer needs; provide key information for learners and allows for easy replicability, and contain references to additional sources of information and resources.
2. Instructor guides are relatively easy to use; can be tailored to some degree; provides most of the key information easily and allows for relatively easy replicability. Contains few additional references and resources
1. Instructor guides are difficult to use; are difficult to tailor to learner and trainer needs; do not provide key information and is very difficult to replicate.

## **Implementation**

### **Learning environment**

3. Physical environment supports learning with appropriate location, seating, temperature and minimisation of distractions such as noise etc. Individuals feel safe to try new skills and behaviours; individual differences are respected; the trainer models behaviour consistent with the goals of the program; and, agreed upon levels of confidentiality and privacy are respected.
2. Physical environment generally supports learning with adequate location, seating, and temperature. Distracting elements though are present. The trainer generally models behaviour consistent with the goals of the program with most individual differences respected. Occasionally individuals are made to feel uncomfortable because of their beliefs and opinions. Individuals generally feel safe to try new skills and behaviours.
1. Physical environment is wholly inappropriate with learners feeling uncomfortable and distracted by outside elements. The trainer often behaves contrary with the goals of the program with many individuals not feeling safe to try new skills and behaviours for fear of ridicule.

### Learning events

3. Individuals understand the event's purpose; individuals' issues, concerns, and expectations about the event are addressed; connections are made between the event and on-the-job issues/problems; the facilitator makes adaptations according to the unique issues of the group; participants are able to identify what they are doing well or might do differently on the job; the trainer and participants discuss and summarise key points; participants are physically and psychologically safe when moving in and out of role plays, simulations and so on; learning events allow learners to reach objectives.
2. Individuals are sometimes unsure of the event's purpose; individuals' issues, concerns, and expectations about the event are generally addressed; connections are not always made between the event and on-the-job issues/problems; the trainer often makes adaptations according to the unique issues of the group; participants are usually able to identify what they are doing well or might do differently on the job; the trainer and participants discuss and summarise most key points; participants are physically and psychologically safe when moving in and out of role plays, simulations and so on; learning events allow learners to reach most objectives.
1. Learning event hinders achievement of objectives leaving learners confused as to the relevance of the event in relation to their job. The trainer refuses to make adaptations for special group needs and often makes it difficult for learners to fully express themselves in role for fear of humiliation.

## **Feedback**

3. Feedback is clearly communicated; it is supported by specific examples; it can be used to make on-the-job behaviour changes; it is given as soon after the behaviour as possible; agreed upon levels of confidentiality are maintained; and, feedback is given in a respectful manner.
2. Feedback is clearly communicated; it is supported by some specific examples; it can be used to make some on-the-job behaviour changes; it is given as soon after the behaviour as possible; agreed upon levels of confidentiality are maintained; and, feedback is given in a usually respectful manner.
1. Feedback is often inappropriate and unhelpful leaving learners unsure as to how they are progressing and how they will apply the learning back to the workplace.

## **Test delivery**

3. Competencies tested are relevant and clearly defined; reasons for testing and uses for test results are clearly communicated; instructions are clear and understood; test items reflect the objectives given to learners at the outset; feedback is timely and relevant; and, agreed upon levels of confidentiality are maintained.
2. Competencies tested are mostly relevant and clearly defined; reasons for testing and uses for test results are often not communicated; instructions are sometimes unclear and mis-understood; test items usually reflect the objectives given to learners at the outset; feedback is mostly timely and relevant; and, agreed upon levels of confidentiality are maintained.
1. Competencies tested are irrelevant and poorly defined with feedback allowing for little or no on the job behaviour changes. The test items bear no resemblance to the objectives.

**Individual action plans**

3. Plan is linked to on the job needs with clearly defined standards, timetables and measurements that can be controlled by the learner. The participant is committed to the plan with supervisory support needs identified.
2. Plan is linked to some on the job needs with some defined standards, timetables and measurements that can be controlled by the learner. The participant is basically committed to the plan with little supervisory support needs identified.
1. There is no learning plan with the learners returning to work unsure of how they will get to use their new skills.

## Evaluation

### Evaluation designs

3. Evaluation designs are cost and time-effective; they can be implemented; key stakeholders support the design; they are relevant to the program's objectives and there is a clear understanding of how results will be used. The criteria for evaluation could include: effectiveness (were the objectives the right ones), efficiency (what objectives were achieved and what were not); meets real defined performance needs; emotional reaction; starts from where the learner was cost efficiency; reinforces existing relationships.
2. Evaluation designs are relative cost and time effective; they can be implemented; some stakeholders but not all are involved. The criteria for evaluating the training includes at least two variables. How the results will be used is reasonably clear.
1. Evaluation designs really only involve the end of course "reactionnaire" of attitudes towards the program.

### Evaluation instruments/processes

3. Evaluation instruments yield accurate information; are time and cost effective; create minimal disruption in the workplace; are seen as fair and applicable; participants understand their roles and responsibilities with management supporting employee participation.
2. Evaluation instruments are relatively time and cost effective with some disruption to workflows. The data collected is usually accurate. Often the applicability and the relevance of the procedure is questioned by staff not aware of what is happening.
1. Evaluation instruments are disruptive, costly and not seen as fair and applicable. The value for the data yielded is questionable.

**Evaluation report/feedback**

3. Feedback is timely and specific enough to make necessary modifications/changes. Feedback is seen as relevant and easily understood by users and presented in a balanced and unbiased way. Feedback covers content, objectives, process and both anticipated and anticipated results.
2. Feedback is usually timely and specific enough to make necessary modifications/changes. Feedback often not as relevant and well understood as desired. Feedback often omits a crucial area.
1. Feedback is often forgotten or hastily conducted with users and participants unaware of report.

APPENDIX D

PRODUCT 1

NEEDS ANALYSIS

List of target group characteristics

1

(This product was developed as part of an ISS Project. Product was aimed at ISS managers who would by all accounts be male or female of varying ages from a variety of ethnic backgrounds)

Description of performance discrepancy

2

(Vaguely aware that delivery of ISS services was hampered by "blocks" in the system and was so designed to give managers the tools to redesign the workplace.)

Tools to measure performance discrepancy

2

(Performance discrepancy measured only in terms of benefits processed, time it took to process benefits. Awareness things could improve. Anecdotal evidence.)

|   |          |
|---|----------|
| <p><b><u>Link to strategy</u></b></p>   | <p>3</p> |
| <p>(The delivery of quality service for 'clients' was "directly" linked to the processing of benefits.)</p> |          |
| <p><b><u>Link to individual performance</u></b></p>   | <p>2</p> |
| <p>(Discrepancy is not individual as the problem is '<u>systemic</u>' in nature).</p>                       |          |

|   |          |
|---|----------|
| <p><b>DESIGN</b></p>  | <p>2</p> |
| <p><b><u>Program objectives</u></b></p>   |          |
| <p>Participants will be able to identify blocks to quality in the delivery of income support, apply methods of re-designing systems to eliminate blocks to quality, and to analyse systems and methods to facilitate systematic continuous improvement (p.1).</p> |          |

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b><u>Content</u></b>  | 3 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• A lot of it is in here (cabinet)... From other people and resources from libraries and things (p.4).</li><li>• This cabinet here is full of resources I have gathered over 7 years (p.1).</li></ul>  |   |
| <b><u>Structure</u></b>  | 3 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Okay let us go to this because: - conjunction with the objectives I have got on outline of the content of the training so this just summarises what happened in the session plans the handouts and the ohps (p.4).</li><li>• (Points) Usually at the beginning of the workshop... really that mini-lecture at the beginning outlines what the learning points are and that is one of the key things I do is give people a framework they could hook onto (p.5).</li><li>• I think that I rely on the fact there is a heap of wealth of experience in the group and my role is to facilitate the sharing of that (p.6).</li></ul> |   |
| <b><u>Materials selection</u></b>  | 3 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• ...My role is to offer resources in terms of handouts and overheads and questions that stimulate thinking but my role is to facilitate and co-ordinate and bring all that information out into the open and then relate it back to the workplace (p.6).</li><li>• I use whiteboards alot, overheads alot, um lots of interactive stuff, lots of case studies, lots of experiential structured exercises and so on, discussions I mean that is often underestimated a bit (p.8).</li></ul>  |   |

**Instructor guides**

3

- Yeah, that is set up for someone else to do (p.5).

**IMPLEMENTATION****Learning environment**

3

- ...I have seen some real powerful learning come out of hearing what someone has had to say about something... they feel I have valued what they have thought because I have given them time to express it (p.8).
- We did get them away from the workplace as far as we could (p.8).
- Big room 'U' shaped seating, plenty windows, plenty seating, room to move around, adjacent rooms.... (p.8).
- What point is there me doing things if I don't do them myself. I am really strong about that (modelling) (p.9).
- We ask people that we set ground rules at beginning of training and say what do you expect of yourselves in terms of behaviour and what do you expect of other people in terms of behaviour. One of things I always ensure comes out is confidentiality (p.9). If it does not come out of the group I make it come out of what I say (p.9).

**Learning events**

3

- The first module the first workshop was a day long simulated factory type of thing (p.3).
- So the rest of it we used that as a model really (factory game) and linked all the other training back to that (p.3).
- Yeah we did in the training course we did simulated ones, make up a problem that you think is an issue for you at work and then imagine how it would go. They would sort of design what they thought it would look like and then we would send them back to work with a project to do and they would address one of the issues, they actually had a live issue in their work discussion (p.5).

**Test delivery and feedback**

2 &amp; 2

- Yeah, well we have objectives say for this one we had a game at the end of it which is like un we split into the teams and had them answer questions and they would - it was like a games how so I just asked them questions out of content... (p.3).
- If people are not participating that is feedback that something is going wrong (p.9).
- More structured feedback comes from little exercises that I do... (field of words) (p.9).
- And that is often with that skillcheck that I do if there are learning points that learners have to make then I check back to be sure they made them at the end (p.10).
- It will often come from the group too if we are doing roleplays (p.10).

**Individual action plans**

2

- They identified their own issue that they want to look at, decide on which tool they are going to use and I make sure they are on the right track and they go away and do it (p.11).
- I am a bit blurry about that, I believe it is managements responsibility (p.11).

**EVALUATION****Evaluation designs**

2

- I know that the simpler you make it, it is going to achieve what you mean to achieve and often it is not so much asking open questions but giving them quite specific questions and maybe putting a continuum down. The simpler you make it because at the end of the course they are usually keen to go home or whatever (p.11).
- The reaction and learning, the transfer of skills to the workplace and the cost-effectiveness (p.11).
- Whether the cost of putting it in place actually had a payoff for the organisation (p.12).

**Evaluation instruments**

1

- It was like a game show so I just, we just asked them questions out of content out of here and had them answer questions and so on so that was really our training evaluation, how much did they grasp of the content and it is a fun way of.... (p.4).

**Evaluation report**

2

On the students or on the training? I used to do that verbally at the management meeting and I would certainly solicit feedback from managers later on (p.12).

**PRODUCT 2**

**NEEDS ANALYSIS**

**List of target group characteristics**

2

- That they are actual employees of an organisation, that is the fundamental characteristic.... and secondly in fact they can write in English (p.2).
- No, no this is one of the beauties of this, it applies universal (p.2).
- No, no I ignore that. The reason being is that I encourage people to work at their pace, the outcome is the written product (p.3).

**Description of performance discrepancy**

2

- There is a whole raft of things that I identify the need for job descriptions um performance problems, conflicts amongst staff um....
- No yes, it does, it is more likely to come to me as a consequence as an outcome of an entirely unrelated topic because they start talking about something about a staff problem and my consultancy questioning reveals they have not got in place some of the management systems (p.3).
- Specific maybe, not measurable, though identifiable (p.4).

**Tools to measure performance discrepancy**

2

- Those in fact that have the job descriptions in place frequently don't want to change, they believe they are okay.... (p.5).

**Link to strategy**

2

- The organisational strategy is actually over-riding of the job-description, unless the organisation has an organisational mission. So the purpose and the outputs must match the strategic plan... (p.6).

**Link to individual performance**

2

(This product is all about identifying and setting individual performance outputs - the link is implicit).

**DESIGN****Program objectives**

3

- ... by the end of the session participants "A" will be able to write two performance statements. From a key task of their job, and secondly, will know the total structure, purpose and benefits of an effective performance based job description.

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <p><b><u>Content</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The content initiated itself from discussions with the um, with a selected group of managers to whom I gave what was the old Labour Department guidelines on writing a job description of the 1970s and we looked at it and said in this panel discussion, this little workshop of only an hour what was right and what was wrong... (p.8).</li> <li>I went totally to outputs. It was a logical. How can someone measure and I will give some credit back to Mike Bebb who in the 80's who was learning training and development referring them to Mager's work... (p.8).</li> </ul> | 3 |
| <p><b><u>Structure</u></b></p> <p>(Learning points) No, I don't um, I have a lesson plan with time frames that have to be met and the learning points are measured by asking questions, developing discussion and they themselves proving within the group to me.... they have understood it (p.8).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The learning points actually are the outputs (p.9).</li> <li>Yep they are given in fact three models... a worst case scenario, a medium to reasonable and a good model example... (p.9).</li> </ul>  | 3 |
| <p><b><u>Materials selection</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is group work, there is individual work, I use the full range of media presentation (p.9).</li> <li>Chart work, whiteboards, overheads, um talk and chalk, and handouts.</li> </ul>   | 3 |
| <p><b><u>Instructor guides</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Read through that lot, you would be able to teach it backwards, the advantage of this output is two things. Firstly it keeps me squeaky clean and it demonstrates, we are trying to talk quality and quality systems (p.10).</li> <li>We have got to demonstrate it, so I am consistent, my quality is here everytime and coconut... (p.10).</li> </ul> <p>(Off tape admitted it would be difficult to pick up and run with product).</p>   | 2 |

**IMPLEMENTATION**

**Learning environment**

3

- Preferably at the organisation, in the organisation, preferably groups no larger than twelve, quiet, full of as many facilities as possible (p.11).
- It is critical in the program's opening. Confidentiality is so much so that some of it stays within the room only. It does not go back to managers. I have been asked but I refused (p.11).
- You can't do it if you have a mixed group, multidisciplinary... (p.11)

**Learning events**

3

- Large studies are the learning event and the development on your own. They then work together in two's to develop quickly the performance linkage (p.12).

**Test delivery and feedback**

3 & 2?

- Feedback in the first day is um trainer led, the feedback on the second day is peer review totally, all I do is facilitate it (p.12).
- Yes, be positive, be critical, help the other person identify the shortcomings in it... (p.12).
- There are two tests, one is the output, the finished job description that is acceptable to the organisation. The second evaluation is the individual past program questionnaire which is done at a time... (p.13).

**Individual action plans**

3

- There are actually three parts to the action plan - before the program they have got to do that. In other words it is a warm up to getting a mind set to what they should be doing. I cannot have them come in cold to a program. I'll never run a program like that. They do a mid program action plan that arises out of the end of day one, go away and develop one. Then there is a post program action plan which says I will now meet with you as post program follow-up to assist you in any area of clarification. That is a hell of a commitment but by golly it works.
- There are three types of supervisory support. The first type of supervisory support is the client contact I have in the organisation. The second area of supervisory support is their manager; and the third area of supervisory support is mine as the supervisor of the program (p.14).

**EVALUATION**

**Evaluation designs**

2

It is very simply. We got a lesson plan of objectives so we meet those objectives. We have a program objective overall that we have on output. The output reflects the lesson plan because the lesson has been designed on the needs of the organisation. That need is based on supporting a strategic plan (p.14).

**Evaluation instruments**

2

The only evaluation of the presenter is repeat business (p.14).

**Evaluation report**

2

(Informal discussions with management - believes reactionaries a waste of time).

## PRODUCT 3

### NEEDS ANALYSIS

#### List of target group characteristics

3

- No I formally sat down and write it out... but I go through the um there is a checklist that I go down each time I write a target group characteristics. Again it comes from the CRI IMD course (p.1).
- There are things in that list that prompt you to think and consider them. Otherwise you might go off the top of your head... (p.1).

#### Description of performance discrepancy

2

- When you do your proposal you know all that comes out when you are doing your proposal for your training and all that went in there then your justification for why you need this is all part of that (p.3).

#### Tools to measure performance discrepancy

3

- Quite often it is talking to um what you call cool face work workers. Those that are involved in perpetuating the problem if you like.... In other words your target population (p.2).
- ... the technical programs were actual formal surveys because you are talking about up and down the country so you have to sample and then do all that sort of stuff (p.2).

|   |          |
|---|----------|
| <p><b><u>Link to strategy</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• You are checking to see there is a fit between what you want to do and what the organisation wants to do and if you don't get that fit then you don't go (p.3).</li> <li>• ... you would of had to look at equivalent costs of doing other things in other ways (multiple options) (p.3).</li> <li>• That was part of it I could not find anything on this either - making mistakes matter - it was hard to come up with anything anywhere (p.4).</li> </ul> | <p>3</p> |
| <p><b><u>Link to individual performance</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The current situation now. Problem warts and all (p.2)<br/>(Describing how the problem would be presented).</li> <li>• In this proposal I did not tend to because I for this course I wanted an assignment for this so I did not get too bogged down in doing that. I had other agenda's as you say for actually developing this.... (p.3).</li> </ul>   | <p>2</p> |

|  |          |
|--|----------|
| <p><b>DESIGN</b></p>   |          |
| <p><b><u>Program objectives</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• You mean like a lesson plan, that it right and so those come out of your objectives. When you are developing it you say, what can't the learner do that already? What don't they know and what do they need to... what skills do they need in order to get to that point (p.5).<br/>(Objectives are the cornerstones of Jean's training)</li> </ul> | <p>3</p> |

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b><u>Content</u></b>  | 3 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Um I try and get that, running it past, finding what I call a technical expert somewhere. Phil was the closest I could get to that in this case, he was like the technical expert (p.4).</li><li>• I got Alan Taylor's support to actually design and develop that (p.6).</li></ul>  |   |
| <b><u>Structure</u></b>  | 3 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• We did not get to the next stage past that the learning points are clear because that comes from the learner (p.4).</li><li>• Yep skills hierarchy and then how you would group them and the order in which they are taught is largely determined by that (p.5).</li><li>• Being able to recognise a mistake, reflecting on the mistake and then they could branch out and go to design alternatives and to responding to mistakes... (p.6).</li></ul> |   |
| <b><u>Materials selection</u></b>  | 3 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Mainly by written material because we were dealing with people who were used to scanning a lot of information quickly and used to articles and journals and things (p.6).</li></ul>  |   |
| <b><u>Instructor guides</u></b>  | 3 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Yeah, this was designed to be purely takeaway and go through. Simply because of the people we were dealing with in that particular instance (p.7).</li></ul> <p>(The study guide was also the instructor guide)</p>  |   |

## IMPLEMENTATION

Learning environment

NA or 3

(Product is for takeaway purposes mainly)

Learning events

3

- .... so it was designed to be a pick up and put down type of thing. But to ensure learning took place there were going to be deadlines to get them altogether for some of the exercises... (p.6).
- Simply because of the people we were dealing with in that particular instance (p.7).

Test delivery and feedback

3 &amp; 3

- The person would of already read the exercise and come along with some solutions and ideas and you would share them around the group um but ... um ... then there might be something like this where there would be a checklist and you would be able to evaluate everyone's ideas through those (p.7).
- Here for the progress check they had to take two descriptions of mistakes that they had previously worked on and then they had to justify their selection - identify something and so on and when they had finished you see you come over and you have got feedback for each case... (p.8).

**Individual action plans**

2

- In this case they did not get an active plan because what they learnt was the skill of reflecting on mistakes (p.9).
- ... if there was going to be any follow-up to that, the way it was going to be done was through the production manager, the boss of all these people following up and seeing they were actually using those skills on their jobs... (p.9).

**EVALUATION****Evaluation designs**

3

- There are a few different levels. One, everytime you put someone through you evaluate whether or not they have got the skill, whether they have attained the skill an the standard like in each objective at the start you will have that. When they get to take the skill check um those standards come up and you give them feedback on how well they have met those.
- Um and then okay also at the end you are evaluating who did and did not get or attain that knowledge and skill, then you are also evaluating your own material to see how well it suits the learner... (p.10).

**Evaluation instruments**

2

(Skill checks carried out to assess skill attainment)

**Evaluation report**

2

(Informal discussions with managers)

**PRODUCT 4**

**NEEDS ANALYSIS**

|  |
|--|
| <p><b><u>List of target group characteristics</u></b> <span style="float: right;">3</span></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If we look at new people coming into the organisation we have got to look at what skill levels do they have. Do they have computer experience, data entry and that sort of thing (p.3).</li> </ul> |
| <p><b><u>Description of performance discrepancy</u></b> <span style="float: right;">3</span></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number of calls, once they are trained the number of calls per hour length of time on the phone... (p.5)</li> </ul>  |
| <p><b><u>Tools to measure performance discrepancy</u></b> <span style="float: right;">3</span></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ... but as time went on you could tell for instance what the length of time they were spending on the phone (p.5).</li> </ul> <p>(Call centre monitors phone use)</p>                          |

**Link to strategy**

3

- Quality fashion, quality service. We have got a quality policy... and then from there in individual departments and objectives have been set with that (p.6).

**Link to individual performance**

3

(Obvious - if you work in the call centre using the system is paramount)

**DESIGN****Program objectives**

2

- No, any training that I will do always set objectives to start with. So, the objective would be that the person um I suppose was competent by the end of the training period (p.6).
- So I am working on a training manual for the trainers based on the objectives having like checklists and things (p.6).

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <b><u>Content</u></b>   | 3 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• I suppose it is um the material is there and it is really I suppose a matter of going back through this here (p.7).</li><li>• Okay the units are really the skills that they are putting into practice and what is required there again. You have got like one unit will be customer maintenance... and then there is also customer service skills, so there is technical based and...</li></ul>  |   |
| <b><u>Structure</u></b>   | 3 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Okay with the competency checks it is a matter of um the training manual itself where you follow the steps that are required to actually train a person so they get to a level and they don't go on to the next one until they have got that (p.7 &amp; 8).</li><li>• For instance like within the call centre you have to learn customer maintenance before you could um take an order but you might have a customer ring in that wants to place an order but you must place them on the mailing list before... (p.9).</li></ul> |   |
| <b><u>Materials selection</u></b>   | 2 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Materials are the computer and the handouts you give I suppose. We actually get people to write their own... (p.10).</li></ul>  |   |
| <b><u>Instructor guides</u></b>   | 2 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Well we have got like the working instructions which has objectives in that... so I am working on a training manual for the trainers based on the objectives having like checklists and things like that within it... (p.6).</li></ul>  |   |

## IMPLEMENTATION

### Learning environment

2

- Within the call centre we do it and we do it at quiet times or we do it outside of normal work times so we haven't got the training facility there but we are getting a full training facility (p.10).
- Yep and we will be going away from one to one training to more like a group and the person doing the training will have all the computers linked together (p.11).

### Learning events

3

(Learners would receive mock inquiries that would develop skills in each particular competency grouping e.g. customers maintenance)

### Test delivery and feedback

3 &amp; 3

- Whether it be questioning or whether it be observation where you actually put invoices into the trolley boxes as it should be or is it a written um sort of test that is required (p.8).
- Basically letting them know how they are going, praising them when you can, making them feel good... (p.11).
- Confidentiality I think is important to building a relationship and a rapport with people... (p.11).

**Individual action plans**

3

- This what you should be working on to develop? Like it they know what their standard is at the time and this is what you are now, and the team leaders will discuss that with tem once the trainer has done their job then that responsibility is passed onto the team leader (p.12).

**EVALUATION****Evaluation designs**

2

- I suppose we are evaluating all the time, the design of it so that is self evaluation, getting feedback from the people as to how they found the training um, we know there is a hell of a lot of that people learn in a short space of time (p.13).
- The learning like what we were looking at doing is like for each task a person is doing to actually sign off once they have got that (p.14).

**Evaluation instruments**

2

(Checklists of competencies and possibly a survey)

**Evaluation report**

2

(Report feedback formally to managers meeting, and informally follow up with team leaders).

## PRODUCT 5

### NEEDS ANALYSIS

#### List of target group characteristics

2

- Well I already know approximately what they might do for jobs, they are employees in this organisation you see... (p.1).
- I would want to know their basic knowledge and education.... I want to know a bit about them. Interestingly I do know some of them which to some extent will give me an idea but... (p.1).
- I know for a fact for example there is someone fairly illiterate in the design area... (p.2).

#### Description of performance discrepancy

2

- ... I have got to differentiate between those people who are already expert or fairly expert at it compared with those people who aren't (p.1).
- Where they are at? What they think they need? What they would like to be able to achieve? (p.1).
- I am not getting it so much from what the organisation needs at the moment... (p.2).

#### Tools to measure performance discrepancy

2

- When it comes to the informal situation there are things that I know that people have said about the way the front counter people operate or something like that (p.3).
- Maybe it should be offered to particular people, particular sections like maybe the design... (a survey) (p.4).

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <b><u>Link to strategy</u></b>  | 1 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ... I don't think I am that interested in formally asking the organisation what they need... (p.2).</li> </ul>   |   |
| <b><u>Link to individual performance</u></b>  | 3 |
| <p>(It was identified that many of the speech communication skills have a direct link to the organisations strategy and that the learner and the organisation regard the discrepancy as important (p.4)).</p> |   |

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>DESIGN</b>   |   |
| <b><u>Program objectives</u></b>  | 2 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Basically I know that it has got to be something concrete we can say we want them to be able to actually do... (p.4).</li> <li>• ... the wording I am going to find it that difficult when I consider that it will be competency (p.4).</li> </ul> |   |
| <b><u>Content</u></b>   | 3 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I have got stuff, I have got readings, I have got practice, I have got a little short lecture most of what I am going to be doing I am hoping will be in a tutorial style which will prevent me from doing all the talking... (p.5).</li> </ul>    |   |

**Structure**

2

(Still to be worked out as product still much in its developmental phase).

**Materials selection**

2

- Aren't materials like the way you teach isn't it? Aren't materials like how are you going to go about presenting it like exercises and roleplays and overheads and... visuals not overheads visuals I mean. Handouts even maybe. I wondered about making a booklet but I think it would be unrealistic for me to make a booklet for these people... (p.5).

**Instructor guides**

3

- Now that instructor guide is something we do when we do our tutor guide and what I do want to be able to do is I want to make sure the tutorials will be written out in such a way that Debbie should be able to go down and do it for me.
- It is not going to be for any fool to go down (p.6) because it will be related sufficiently to our expertise that persons such as Debbie can do it (p.6).

## IMPLEMENTATION

**Learning environment**

3

(For a speech teacher the learning environment is critical and one Myra is very confident in preparing (p.7)).

**Learning events**

3

- I am pretty sure I will do talk structures of some sort - explain how and so therefore do a session.... they will be divided up into 45 minute two hour sessions which might be put together in fact there might be a total of two but they will be two completely different tutorials... (p.7).
- They do it in pairs and then they practice it and then perform it sometimes (p.7).

**Test delivery and feedback**

2 &amp; 2

- Sometimes they report back um... I found we do more reporting back with 14.253 actually where people go and solve something and report it back. A classic example of feedback... say you get people to organise a talk you get them to use a strategy and then perform (p.7 & 8).
- In many ways with speech communication the feedback is implicit within the event (p.8).

**Individual action plans**

2

- Perhaps they might go away knowing where their strengths and weaknesses lie I would hope. In which case I may make a recommendation. On the other hand it would be possible and this is what I am hoping to do. We would actually make another program for them for the future (p.8 & 9).

**EVALUATION****Evaluation designs**

2

- I was thinking of using some kind of feedback sheet and I think.... I really want to know if their needs were met and if not why not (p.9).

**Evaluation instruments**

2

- The instrument would be like a survey (p.9).

**Evaluation report**

1

(Informally seek out reactions to training).

## PRODUCT 6

## NEEDS ANALYSIS

**List of target group characteristics**

2

- I need to know what job they are doing, that is the primary because the system we have set up... is based on their vocation (p.1).
- So for an accounts payable clerk coming in I will need to know obviously their name because we have got to set them up as a user, it is an accounts payable clerk we know they have accounts payable general ledger as a minimum, they may need receivables (p.2)

**Description of performance discrepancy**

2

- They start at enquiry which is level one and they always work whenever we start in the test system. No learner goes live until the trainer is satisfied the learner has grasped not only all of the concepts but has actually demonstrated that they can do actually the things required (p.2).
- They come here stage one... (p.2).

**Tools to measure performance discrepancy**

3

(The system monitors all happenings and so will identify any user who uses the system inappropriately (p.5)).

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b><u>Link to strategy</u></b>   | 3 |
| <p>(VIP is integral to the functioning of the council as it is a property and financial based system (back, p.9).</p>  |   |
| <b><u>Link to individual performance</u></b>   | 3 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• They only do VIP where it is needed for their job. So therefore you would not see a drain layer doing VIP (p.4).</li></ul> |   |

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>DESIGN</b>   |   |
| <b><u>Program objectives</u></b>  | 3 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The objectives as I have said are the competencies, they are known, they are not only known in a written form for the learner before they arrive but they are also verbalised in the introduction and the learner knows when they are actually coming up to the different parts because the whole program follows a logical sequence. I write learning objectives that go given the items needed is able to, the verbs, the criteria (p.5).</li></ul> |   |

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <b><u>Content</u></b>   | 3 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• It is as I have said you review it constantly. Another I tend to do and I know the other trainers do as well to keep it, it is almost like a standard product, it does change with enhancements and that sort of thing (p.6). (A Fujitsu product essentially).</li></ul>                          |   |
| <b><u>Structure</u></b>   | 3 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The structure that I use is explain, demonstrate, practice (p.6).</li></ul>   |   |
| <b><u>Materials selection</u></b>   | 3 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• We also have little fluoro cards like you see there where you can actually have a summary of everything they have done in the core skills and it is just on a card... (p.6).</li><li>• Also written material is done for them in the same sequence in which the course is run... (p.6).</li></ul> |   |
| <b><u>Instructor guides</u></b>   | 3 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Lesson plans, all the trainers write lesson plans for their particular thing and I made it very clear to them because if they are not there someone else may have to take their place (p.7).</li></ul>  |   |

## IMPLEMENTATION

Learning environment

3

- When you are dealing with this type of system there is no such thing as the Privacy Act. You can dig up the dirt on any bugger. But generally the examples do not go out of the classroom (p.7).

(They have a dedicated facility and training room (back, p.7)).

Learning events

3

- I am a great believer in using the accelerative techniques, the more colour, the more everyday examples the better. I sometimes actually use models, I have got one in there now and it is actually a whole bunch of paper tray all joined together and I use that to demonstrate how job casting works... (p.7).
- We can deal with six at a time or one on one (p.3).
- ... the nervous, or the learner who is not sure, what I tend to do is actually, I don't actually spend a lot of time with that person I actually get their buddy to help them... (p.8).

Test delivery and feedback

3 &amp; 2

- A substantial amount of time is spent on the core skills... when the participants can demonstrate that they can actually do the competency and it is observable it is therefore measurable. To actually measure how well they got the answer it is how many (dogs named spot) did you get? Then we move on to the next example (p.4).

**Individual action plans**

2

- I will give it a good month, sometimes two months to see how well the learning has been assimilated. Sometimes I will actually go up to them especially if they are real suss (suspect) I'll say "so, how many dogs named spot are there?" Especially if I have heard they are not applying procedures (p.9).

**EVALUATION****Evaluation designs**

2

- Sometimes the system (VIP) will change with new enhancements (p.9).
- For me it is much like a performance appraisal it is very very much ongoing and when things tend to change... you make the changes to the material as you go (back, p.25).

**Evaluation instruments**

2

(The system itself monitors users so inappropriate use is picked up quickly).

**Evaluation report**

1

(No formal reporting (p.9)).

## PRODUCT 7

## NEEDS ANALYSIS

**List of target group characteristics**

2

- Well I guess.... I don't. I know they will be a range of ranks and it is really the area they come from we target, we say we like them to be in their natural teams that occur at work (p.1).
- I know these people are coming in, I just know that they are like than (pilots and mechanics). It is not like I have never met them before (p.1).

**Description of performance discrepancy**

2

- We know that hardly anyone on base has any contact with quality management. Good question (p.2).
- Well because I have been directed on high to do it (p.2).
- We are I guess it comes down to costs, they are saying it is costing too much to do this work, we are not getting enough flying hours (p.2).

**Tools to measure performance discrepancy**

2

- That is right we can't describe the gap no. because we are not using TQM to measure it. There is nothing to measure it (p.3).
- I am in this situation where I am told to this training but I don't have access to a lot of the information of why on what their decisions are to do this training (p.3).

|   |
|---|
| <p><b><u>Link to strategy</u></b> <span style="float: right;">2</span></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Our vision or mission statement is we support New Zealand Defence... (p.4).</li> <li>• It will, it will identify where our wastage areas view, where we could be doing better (p.4).</li> </ul>         |
| <p><b><u>Link to individual performance</u></b> <span style="float: right;">2</span></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The philosophy is people should be rewarded for initiating quality type things rather than.... it benefits the organisation rather than for their own self interest.... (p.4).</li> </ul> |

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <p><b>DESIGN</b></p>   |  |
| <p><b><u>Program objectives</u></b> <span style="float: right;">1</span></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We break it into three areas, the performance, the standard and the criteria (p.4).</li> <li>• I could not identify objectives because they were not going away to do anything... (p.5).</li> </ul>  |  |
| <p><b><u>Content</u></b> <span style="float: right;">3</span></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I based it on the training done by the Aussies and by Command Staff Qual, that is like the managerial school of officers, but it was so esoteric, ephemeral you could not understand it. So I based it on, well I really just came up with it (p.5).</li> </ul> |  |

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b><u>Structure</u></b>  | 3 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>I really just broke it into the main areas that I was dealing with, and that was the why we are doing TQM - a bit on the history so they can understand where it all came from... the principles of it... (p.5).</li></ul>   |   |
| <b><u>Materials selection</u></b>  | 2 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>I use powerpoint but you know it brings... before I introduce a point I will ask. But yeah it is really a lecture. I am not comfortable doing it like that (p.6).</li></ul>  |   |
| <b><u>Instructor guides</u></b>  | 2 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Well I have just written one so anyone who takes it over can pick it up (p.7).</li><li>It really contains um, we okay time limits, how the classroom should be set up, the program to use. Main points, it is not a word for word, it is just main points - discuss this - outline this and references so they can go on... (p.7).</li></ul> |   |

## IMPLEMENTATION

**Learning environment**

2

- The important thing with the environment is I like to keep the room cold (p.7).
- (Discussion on learning environment reiterates points on cool room - comfortable chairs, walk outside every 40-50 minutes) (p.7).

**Learning events**

1

- I use a lot models to describe the principle of how goals and objectives, key results are set, and I did it like a rugby game... (p.6).
- Through this I would have liked to break it into groups and get them to do goals but the time is restrictive so it is really a lecture, a lecture with questioning. You have to be hard skinned because they are trying to attack it, by the end of it they have moved around into a more... (p.6).

**Test delivery and feedback**

2

- That was with the survey I did at the end. One stage I allowed them to take it away with them and do it but I found I was not getting any back (p.8).

**Individual action plans**

(No action plan as an introduction to the topic only (p.8)).



## EVALUATION

### Evaluation designs

- (Designs encompassed learners reactions to TQM pie and post training) (p.8).

### Evaluation instruments

- (Conducts a pre-survey where he picks up the attitudes and stuff) (p.1).
- That was with that survey I did at the end (p.8).

### Evaluation report

- (A basic report was being written but the report would only express his opinions gleaned from his survey responses and how the course went generally) (p.8).

## APPENDIX E

### REVISED - EVALUATION OF EXTERNAL TRAINING (EET) TOOL

#### Needs Analysis

##### Target group characteristics

3. Description of target group characteristics lists such things as:

- age
- sex
- educational background
- reasons for attending
- learning styles

Key stakeholders are involved throughout the process.

2. Description of target group characteristics lists basic demographic information such as age and sex. Informally there is an awareness of some of the learners characteristics.

1. Informally there is an awareness of some of the target group characteristics.

### Strategies and tools to identify performance discrepancies

3. Tools are:

- cost effective and efficient
- create minimal disruption in the workplace
- seen as fair and applicable
- identify and detail significant performance problems.

They do not have built in biases favouring particular types of solutions or activities.

2. Tools are relatively cost effective with some disruption to workflows and often do not precisely detail the performance problem.

1. Tools often do not discriminate between training and non-training performance problems.  
Tools may be informal and unsystematic.

### Recommendations for needed change in individual, work group, or organizational performance

3. Recommendations provide accurate identification of problems and opportunities.

- changes are clearly described and easily understood
- they address discrepancies between existing and desired performance
- they address organizational or individual priorities

2. Recommendations provide reasonably accurate identification of problems and opportunities

- changes are vaguely described and reasonably understood
- they address some discrepancies between existing and desired performance
- they address some organizational or individual priorities

1. Recommendations not associated with effective organisational and individual performance but with the availability of courses and personal workflows (i.e. can learners afford the time off).

**Descriptions of desired individual or group performance**

3. Descriptions:

- are relevant to organizational goals and objectives
- are understandable to the learner
- are linked to observable behaviour
- define how performance will be measured
- take into account current and future forces.

2. Descriptions:

- are mostly relevant to organizational goals and objectives
- are usually understandable to the learner
- are linked to some observable behaviours
- define how most performance will be measured
- take into account some current and future forces.

1. Descriptions

- are mostly unrelated to organizational goals and objectives
- are not understandable to the learner
- are not linked to observable behaviours
- do not define how performance will be measured
- ignore current and future forces.

## Design

### Program objectives

3. Program objectives:

- are stated in terms of what the learner will know, value, and or be able to do
- reflect the goals of the organisation and an understanding of learner needs
- reflect desired performance requirements
- can resolve the performance discrepancy.
- contain conditions of learning, actions, and criteria

2. Program objectives:

- are stated in vague terms of what the learner will know, value, and or be able to do
- reflect some of the goals of the organisation and an understanding of a few learner needs
- reflect some desired performance requirements
- can resolve some of the performance discrepancy
- contain vague conditions of learning, actions, and criteria

3. Objectives described are vague and give the learners no idea about what they will be able to do at the end of training.

### Designs (content)

3. Content:

- is technically up-to-date
- is relevant to the objectives
- the learning points are clear, accurate, and organised
- examples related to the learning points are provided.

2. Content is technically sound; vaguely applicable to the objectives, with most of the learning points being clear and organised.

1. Content is dated, irrelevant to the objectives and reflecting little understanding of the audience and adult learning principles.

## **Structure and sequencing of training**

### 3. Sequencing and structure:

- reflects an understanding of the audience and understanding of adult learning principles
- designs support organisational objectives, values and culture
- designs reflect an understanding of the application environment
- developed with input from key stakeholders
- designs promote learner participation
- designs include an implementation plan.

### 2. Sequencing and structure:

- reflect some understanding of the audience and adult learning principles
- designs vaguely support organisational objectives, values and culture
- designs reflect some understanding of the application environment
- developed with little input from key stakeholders
- designs promote some learner participation and includes a basic implementation plan.

1. Sequencing and structure do not support organisational objectives, culture and values. There is no or little input from stakeholders; resources are inappropriate for the design; there is no learner participation, and no implementation plan.

**Materials selection**

**3. Materials:**

- clearly communicate the information or concept
- enhance the learning process
- add impact visually, written and spoken
- are technically accurate and complete
- maintain learner interest.

(examples: graphics, video based, audio based, computer based, print based)

**2. Materials:**

- reasonably clearly communicate the information or concept
- are basically accurate with some mistakes
- add some impact visually, written and spoken
- maintain some learner interest

**1. Materials used are ambiguous and dull with no reference to additional information sources.**

**Instructor guides**

3. Instructor guides:

- are easy to use
- support the instructional process
- can be tailored to learner and trainer needs
- provide key information for learners and allows for easy replicability
- contain references to additional sources of information and resources.

2. Instructor guides:

- are relatively easy to use
- can be tailored to some degree
- provides most of the key information
- allows for relatively easy replicability
- contains few additional references and resources

1. Instructor guides are difficult to use; are difficult to tailor to learner and trainer needs; do not provide key information and is very difficult to replicate.

## Implementation

### Learning environment

#### 3. Learning environment;

- supports learning with appropriate location, seating, temperature and minimisation of distractions such as noise etc.
- individuals feel safe to try new skills and behaviours
- individual differences are respected
- the trainer models behaviour consistent with the goals of the program
- agreed upon levels of confidentiality and privacy are respected.

#### 2. Learning environment:

- generally supports learning with adequate location, seating, and temperature though distracting elements are present
- the trainer generally models behaviour consistent with the goals of the program with most individual differences respected. Occasionally individuals are made to feel uncomfortable because of their beliefs and opinions.
- individuals generally feel safe to try new skills and behaviours.

1. Physical environment is wholly inappropriate with learners feeling uncomfortable and distracted by outside elements. The trainer often behaves contrary with the goals of the program with many individuals not feeling safe to try new skills and behaviours for fear of ridicule.

**Learning events**

(examples: simulation, roleplay, discussion, lecture)

3.
  - presentations are directly linked to intended learning objectives
  - individuals understand the learning event's purpose
  - individuals' issues, concerns, and expectations about the event are addressed
  - connections are made between the event and on-the-job issues/ problems
  - facilitator makes adaptations according to the unique issues of the groups
  - participants are able to identify what they are doing well or might do differently on the job
  - the trainer and participants discuss and summarise key points participants are
  - physically and psychologically safe when moving in and out of role plays, simulations and so on
  - learning events allow learners to reach objectives.
  
2.
  - individuals are sometimes unsure of the event's purpose
  - individuals' issues, concerns, and expectations about the event are generally addressed
  - connections are not always made between the event and on-the-job issues of the group
  - participants are usually able to identify what they are doing well or might do differently on the job
  - the trainer and participants discuss and summarise most key points
  - participants are physically and psychologically safe when moving in and out of role plays, simulations and so on
  - learning events allow learners to reach most objectives.
  
1. Learning events hinder achievement of objectives leaving learners confused as to the relevance of the event in relation to their job. The trainer refuses to make adaptations for special group needs and often makes it difficult for learners to fully express themselves in role for fear of humiliation.

**Feedback to learners**

3. Feedback:

- is designed into training
- is clearly communicated
- is supported by specific examples
- can be used to make on-the-job behaviour changes
- is given as soon after the behaviour as possible
- is given in a respectful manner.

2. Feedback:

- is supported by some specific examples
- can be used to make some on-the-job behaviour changes
- is given as soon after the behaviour as possible
- is usually given in a respectful manner.

1. Feedback is often inappropriate and unhelpful leaving learners unsure as to how they are progressing and how they will apply the learning back to the workplace.

**Learning assessment**

3. Learning assessment:

- methods are clearly communicated to learners
- competencies assessed are relevant and clearly defined
- reasons for assessment and uses for results are clearly communicated
- instructions are clear and understood
- feedback is timely and relevant
- levels of confidentiality are maintained.

2. Learning assessment:

- methods are usually communicated to learners
- most competencies assessed are relevant and clearly defined
- reasons for assessment and uses for results are often communicated
- instructions are clear and understood
- feedback is usually timely and relevant
- levels of confidentiality are usually maintained.

1. Assessment methods are irrelevant and poorly defined with feedback allowing for little or no on the job behaviour changes. Assessment items bear no resemblance to the objectives.

**Individual action plans**

**3. Individual action plans:**

- are linked to on the job needs with clearly defined standards
- have timetables and measurements that can be controlled by the learner
- the participant is committed to the plan with supervisory support needs identified.

**2. Individual action plans:**

- are linked to some on the job needs with some defined standards, timetables and measurements that can be controlled by the learner
- the participant is basically committed to the plan with little supervisory support needs identified.

**1. There is no learning plan with the learners returning to work unsure of how they will get to use their new skills.**

## Evaluation

### Evaluation designs

#### 3. Evaluation designs:

- are cost and time-effective
- can be implemented
- key stakeholders support the design
- are relevant to the program's objectives and there is a clear understanding of how results will be used

The criteria for evaluation could include: effectiveness (were the objectives the right ones), efficiency (what objectives were achieved and what were not); meets real defined performance needs; emotional reaction; starts from where the learner was cost efficiency; reinforces existing relationships.

#### 2. Evaluation designs:

- are relatively cost and time effective
- they can be implemented with some changes
- involve some stakeholders but not all

The criteria for evaluating the training includes at least two variables. How the results will be used is reasonably clear.

#### 1. Evaluation designs really only involve the end of course "reactionnaire" of attitudes towards the program.

**Evaluation instruments**

3. Evaluation instruments:

- yield accurate information
- are time and cost effective
- create minimal disruption in the workplace
- are seen as fair and applicable
- participants understand their roles and responsibilities with management supporting employee participation.

2. Evaluation instruments:

- are relatively time and cost effective with some disruption to workflows
- the data collected is usually accurate
- often the applicability and the relevance of the procedure is questioned by staff not aware of what is happening.

1. Evaluation instruments are either unsystematic or disruptive, costly and not seen as fair and applicable. The value of the data yielded is questionable.

**Evaluation report of findings, conclusions, recommendations**

3. Report:

- is timely and specific enough to make necessary modifications/changes
- findings are seen as relevant and easily understood by users and presented in a balanced and unbiased way
- report covers content, objectives, process and both anticipated and unanticipated results.

2. Report:

- is usually timely and specific enough to make necessary modifications/changes
- findings often not as relevant and well understood as desired
- report often omits a crucial area.

1. Report is often hastily prepared with users and participants unaware of its preparation.

## APPENDIX F

### Questions used with EET outputs

#### Needs Analysis

1. What characteristics of the learners do you gather?
2. How do you gather information about individual and organizational performance problems?
3. How did you describe the need for change at the individual, work group or organizational level?
4. How did you describe the individual or group performance you wanted?

#### Design & Implementation

1. Describe the elements of your program objectives using an example?
2. Describe the relationship between the objectives and the content? Also provide some examples of key learning points?
3. Show me the sequence you will present this training product in?
4. Describe for me the mediums you will use to present the training?
5. Could this product be picked up and run by someone other than the developer? May see the instructor guides.