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The study surveys the acceptance of, and support for, results-oriented training activities by upper-level managers and HRD managers in representative companies in Southwest Michigan. The study also examined the agreement between the perceptions of upper-level managers (ULM) and HRD managers (HRDM) concerning results-oriented HRD activities.

The study produced a profile of the support for and/or the acceptance of those activities in the selected organizations. This profile includes both the most-recommended and the least-recommended practices as reported by upper-level and HRD managers. Additional analysis looked at levels of support for the activities across, within and among the four types of organizations represented in the study sample.

A survey questionnaire was administered to a sample of thirty-one matched pairs, consisting of thirty-one HRD managers and thirty-one upper-level managers in each organization. The questionnaire described twenty-two training practices associated with results-oriented HRD programs. Participants were asked to record how strongly they recommended the use of each practice in their organization.
Significant levels of support were found on most practices between the two groups indicating that HRD managers are in agreement with the perceived needs of their upper-level managers, particularly in some of the areas involved with evaluation and team work.

There were, on the other hand, substantial differences between the support for HRD practices involved with other evaluation activities between HRD managers and upper-level managers across the organizations studied.

Overall, 54.5 percent of the twenty-two activities were given "moderately high," or better levels of recommendation by the combined sample of participants in the study; the remaining activities were only "sometimes recommended." However, significant differences in the level of support for results-oriented practices were found between participants representing different types of organizations. Respondents from retail organizations reported the most support for practices, while respondents from utility companies gave the least support.

While there are overall high levels of agreement between upper-level managers and HRD managers, upper-level managers tend to disagree most with practices that would demand more upper-level involvement. Recommendations are made for organizations to seek more agreement in the need for practices that would help HRD achieve more lasting results.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Background and Importance of the Study

It has been stated by many economists that development of human resources is one of the most important factors of the development of the society. Human resources are the ultimate basis of the wealth of a nation. And, the goals of nations' development are the maximum possible utilization of human beings in productive activity and the maximum possible development of skills and knowledge of the labor force (Harbinson, 1964).

In fact, an organization, private or public, can quickly obtain all resources needed — technology, products, markets, methods of sales, and distribution systems — except the human resource (the knowledge, skills, and attitudes of employees) (Craig, 1987).

The employees' training, education, and development, or human resource development (HRD), is seen as vital to the success of most of today's organizations. It becomes an important strategic approach to improve employees' productivity and the efficiency and profitability of the organization.

HRD, as defined by Nadler (1990) is an organized learning experience, over a given period of time, that provides the possibility of performance change on the part of the participant. Chalofsky and
Lincoln (1983) defined HRD as "the study of how individuals and groups in organizations change through learning" (p. 20). HRD is sometimes known also as "training" or "training and development" or "staff development" (Brinkerhoff, 1987). Therefore, "HRD" and "training" will be used interchangeably in this study.

The field of human resources development has grown and developed during the last three decades. It has become an important component of most of today's organizations. So much so, that many corporations have appointed executive-level positions for HRD and spend billions of dollars—an estimated $45.5 billion was spent on formal training by U.S. corporations in 1989 (Lee, 1990). And, the total number of employees who receive formal training annually is more than 39 million (Phillips, 1991).

The increase of investment in HRD and the recognition of its impact have put a great amount of pressure on HRD practitioners to meet the increasing expectations for its effectiveness and worth. HRD people are more frequently being asked to show a return on investment in HRD programs in terms of employees' productivity and organizational profitability and effectiveness.

HRD is responsible for identifying, assessing, and helping develop the three competencies (knowledge, skills, attitudes) in individual employees of an organization which enable them to perform current or future jobs. By that, the organization expects that HRD will make a difference in an organization's overall performance and productivity. It also expects that HRD will result in reducing the
operational costs and contribute to the effectiveness and competitiveness of its products.

The challenge, then, for HRD people, is to present their programs in the most effective manner in order to meet the increasing expectation for HRD effectiveness and worth and the contribution that HRD can make to overall organizational development. The roles and functions of HRD which carry out its activities have to become more efficient and effective in every aspect of HRD operations. It is obvious that organizations are demanding more and more HRD programs, but at the same time, they are looking for quality and results from those programs.

The ultimate purpose of HRD activities is to make a difference in an organization. It is the application of learning in the workplace that can reduce costs and contribute to the overall effectiveness of an organization. The change in skills, knowledge, and attitude can make a difference in terms of closing the gap between the employee's actual level of performance and the desired level. Keeping that in mind, HRD can be utilized to improve individuals and organizational performance (Nadler & Wiggs, 1986).

HRD professionals are under increasing pressure to show that their programs are worthwhile and produce bottom-line results. HRD practitioners are being asked to provide their organizations with more effective HRD activities. HRD practitioners must continue to develop and refine their art if they want to contribute to their organizational development. They must find ways to make the HRD function become more
effective at fostering and maintaining the competence of employees and the whole organization (Brinkerhoff, 1987).

HRD practitioners, then, must be deeply concerned about charges and evidence of failures of the HRD function to prepare workers to work or managers to manage. If HRD is properly carried out, it may ultimately prove critical to the survival of many organizations (Chalofsky & Reinhart, 1988).

One of the criticisms most commonly leveled at HRD professionals is that they do not speak the language of business. Business language requires HRD professionals to consider the return to the organization for dollars spent on HRD. The estimation of training and development budgets for U.S. corporations of one hundred employees or more was more than $45 billion for 1990.

If HRD management wants to be seen as business partners, and to contribute to organizational success, then HRD programs must be tied to business needs, problems, and opportunities. In other words, they must be results-oriented programs.

Results-oriented HRD is a term used by HRD professionals to represent an HRD philosophy which emphasizes results from investment in HRD. It means that HRD programs must be driven by organizational need, and must help organizations achieve their goals.

Results-oriented HRD requires systematic procedures to measure all HRD activities. Systematic procedures, as described by Brinkerhoff (1987): (a) are aimed at important and worthwhile organizational benefits; (b) use the best available and most cost-effective designs
and plans; (c) operate smoothly and efficiently and are enjoyed by participants; (d) achieve important skills, knowledge, and attitude objectives; (e) are used effectively on the job; (f) produce valuable and cost-effective organizational benefits. (p. 4).

Phillips (1991) also characterized results-oriented HRD. The first characteristic is that HRD programs should not be implemented unless tangible results can be obtained — in other words, the impact of the program is measurable. The second characteristic includes measurement of the result of the HRD program in all stages of the program design. The third characteristic suggests that a teamwork method is the best way to measure the results of HRD. (This requires that all HRD staff should participate and share the responsibility.) The fourth characteristic is the involvement of organizational management in the HRD process at all stages which will help the HRD program be successful and communicated. The last characteristic is that of management commitment to support HRD effort.

Results-oriented HRD is a complex activity. It involves answering questions regarding the difference that HRD makes; the participants' acquiring skills, knowledge and attitudes (SKA); the use of acquired SKA; the management support and commitment of HRD program and the transfer of SKA; and the contributions that HRD makes to organizational efficiency and goals.

It is HRD which should be accountable for producing the SKA targeted in its programs. However, the application of acquired SKA on the job is beyond the control of HRD people. It is the organization
that has the power to encourage change and provide the support needed for HRD to pay off. In that sense, results-oriented HRD is a collective effort which should be shared by HRD practitioners and management.

It seems however, that, despite the size of investment in HRD and expected future increase and demands of HRD programs, HRD practitioners and organization management do not get sufficiently co-involved or do not commit to provide the kind of HRD programs that are worthwhile and benefit both individuals and organizations. It is the responsibility of the two partners to move from a so-called "HRD for activity" approach to an HRD approach which brings about change and results in individual productivity and organizational efficiency.

Purpose of the Study

The emphasis on results-oriented HRD is obvious even from a brief overview of HRD literature. It is reflected by the number of models presented by many HRD theorists, all of which call for and show how HRD can result in organizational benefit and return value (Brinkerhoff, 1987; Chalofsky & Reinhart, 1988; Robinson & Robinson, 1989; Phillips 1990). However, despite a variety of efforts and the increased amount of dollars being spent in HRD by all kinds of organizations, it may be that HRD programs are not as successful as they could be when it comes to speaking the language of business and returning the organization's investment in HRD.

This study was an exploratory study. It investigated the
perceptions of upper-level managers (ULM) and HRD managers (HRDM) regarding a results-oriented HRD approach. The researcher investigated if there was a significant difference between the perceptions of the upper-level managers and HRD managers regarding results-oriented HRD programs.

Specifically, the purpose of this study was to explore the acceptance of, and support for, results-oriented training activities by upper-level managers and HRD managers in the target area. A secondary focus of this study was to examine the differences or similarities between the perceptions of upper-level managers and HRD managers concerning results-oriented HRD activities.

Last, this study sought to create a profile of the support for and/or acceptance of results-oriented HRD activities in the target area, that included both the most-recommended and the least-recommended practices within local organizations. This profile, in turn, may be useful for the evaluation of potential areas of need for improving the effectiveness and value of HRD professionals in the target area.

The results of this study will enable HRD practitioners and upper-level managers to gain insight into the perceptions and level of acceptance and support for results-oriented training activities in service organizations in the West Michigan area. HRD managers and upper-level managers may benefit from the study by learning each others' opinion and support of results-oriented HRD. This study may be beneficial to future researchers who may want to do more in-depth studies regarding HRD functions and their impact on today's
increasingly competitive organizations.

Limitations of the Study

This study was limited to service-oriented and retail business organizations. Manufacturing organizations were not included. The sample organizations were selected from part of the state of Michigan (West Michigan), therefore, the ability to generalize the results of the findings is limited. Another limitation of the study was the sample size. Although sixty-five organizations agreed to participate in the study, only 42 organizations sent back the questionnaires they received. From those, only 31 organizations were considered as the study sample.

The survey instruments, Training Manager's Questionnaire and Upper-Level Manager's Questionnaire (see Appendices B and C) consisted of twenty-two statements. Though each statement represented at least one results-oriented training activity and was meant to be a critical activity, the questionnaire items are limited by the length of the instrument to only major results-oriented practices. Finally, the study asked about preferred practices; it did not seek to measure whether results-oriented HRD was actually practiced.

Overview of the Study

This study consists of five chapters. Chapter I presented the introduction and background for the study, the importance of the study, and the purpose of the study.
The second chapter is a review of research and literature related to the study's topic. It presents a brief review of HRD history and development. In addition, the role of HRD managers, as well as management support of HRD activities, are discussed. Results-oriented and HRD evaluation models are briefly reviewed in this chapter. Also, evaluation of HRD programs is discussed with some evaluation models.

Chapter III presents the design of the study. This includes the survey instrument, the sampling procedures, target population, and the statistical methods used to analyze the collected data.

Chapter IV contains the analysis of the collected data. The statistical methods are described and the findings are explained.

The summary of the study, the conclusions, and the recommendations of the study are presented in the last chapter.
CHAPTER II
LITERATURE REVIEW

In the last three decades, HRD became a major component in most organizations' structure, private or public. The reason is that organizations became aware of the need for and value of HRD programs to improve their employees' performance in their present jobs, to acquire skills and knowledge for a new job, and to maintain their career progress. As a result, organizations' investment in HRD has increased. Like investment in any other resources, organizations expect that their investment in HRD will pay off and produce a return to the organization as a whole and to its individuals.

The investment in HRD and the expectation of its return provide a conceptual frame of reference for the literature review. This chapter consists of six sections: (1) a historical overview of HRD evolution and roles, (2) a highlighting of significant results-oriented HRD models, (3) results-oriented HRD models, (4) toward results-oriented HRD, (5) management support of HRD programs, and (6) evaluation of HRD programs and summary.

Historical Overview of HRD

HRD has a long history, but it is generally imbedded in other fields under a variety of other names (Knowles, 1970). The reason is that only since the early 1940s has there been sufficient concern about
the field of HRD, and only since that time can we find written material related directly to the field (Nadler, 1990).

**Early Stage**

Prior to the existence of formal learning programs, employees in organizations were expected to be responsible for meeting their own personnel growth and development need. It was also widely assumed that employees' experience was the essential factor in an employee's preparation for performance at current and higher levels in the organization. Performance skills and abilities were to be acquired through working on the job and through whatever incidental learning experience that individual might encounter (Margerison, 1984).

In the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, the world engaged in what was called the Industrial Revolution. As a result, new technology was introduced and it was no longer appropriate and workable to have the new worker learn by being assigned to an experienced one. The experienced worker also did not have the competencies required to work on the new machinery and new processes. It became necessary to introduce a more formal type of learning for new workers and for experienced workers if they were to retain their jobs (Nadler, 1990).

In the early years of the twentieth century (1900-1920), the United States saw the major thrust in industrial production. It also brought with it an increase in HRD. By the end of this period, the world had experienced World War I. The major outcome of this period, from the viewpoint of HRD people, was the recognition that work
performance could be taught quickly and effectively. It was the first recognition of the contribution that HRD could make to the workplace and to the benefit of the organization (Craig, 1987).

1920-1940

The post World War I period (1920-1940) witnessed more recognition of benefits of HRD from employers. The United States federal government was very active in that era. In 1938, President Roosevelt signed an executive order stating that the government, as an employer, should provide HRD for its employees. In the private sector, some companies began to bring in outside people called researchers. They were asked to consider various ways in which the workplace, including people, could be manipulated to increase production (Nadler, 1990).

World War II Effect

The outbreak of World War II, with its enormous demand for personnel and materials, highlighted the urgent need for HRD. About two million plant supervisors and foremen in America learned methods which helped them train an unskilled workforce including women, the elderly, and the handicapped (Craig & Evers, 1981).

As more people became involved in HRD activities, they felt the need to exchange ideas and experiences. This exchange began when a group of training directors in the petroleum industry started in a meeting in 1939 to speak to others in similar jobs with related
problem. In 1942, the group expanded its membership nationwide to form the American Society of Training Directors (ASTD). Later it was called the American Society for Training and Development (Steinmetz, 1976). ASTD became the national and international spearhead of the HRD profession and its Training and Development journal has become a forum for sharing HRD concepts, skills, and applications.

The post World War II period (1945-1960) saw a slight decline in HRD activities. However, the setback was only temporary. HRD units were given a special task in the 1950s. The emphasis was in "human relations" programs. Those programs focused on getting people to like each other. The thinking was that if people like one another, they would work together more efficiently. In general, HRD was considered to be a soft area in the organization (Nadler, 1990).

1960-1973

The period from 1960 to 1973 witnessed rapid movement in high technology in the United States. The movement was associated with a competition between the Soviet Union and the United States over leadership in the space race. HRD efforts increased to cope with the challenge of the new technology.

This period also witnessed the introduction of organizational development (OD). This was a kind of reaction to HRD functions which seemed to be effective but made little impact on the workplace. In the United States, this period saw increased efforts focused on programs aimed toward the disadvantaged and equal employment opportunity. Among
them were the Manpower Development and Training Act (MDTA), Economic Opportunity Act, and the Comprehensive Employment and Training Administration (CETA). Despite that these activities were government directed and funded, their impact resulted in similar efforts by the private sector (Craig, 1987).

According to Goad (1983), in the 1970s the United States military adopted the Instructional Systems Development (ISD) model which defined a purposeful process for planning and developing training programs for acquisition of knowledge and skills for successful job performance. This closed loop system included evaluation in all phases, interrelating analysis, design, development, implementation, and control. Because this research-based and field-tested model considers alternatives and uses performance objectives, it provides conclusive data, an essential ingredient for making HRD truly results-oriented. ISD introduced the use of significant graphic aids to HRD materials. Its use of matrices, flowcharts, hierarchial, and other visual tools to format and clarify learning facilitates demonstration of results. (See Table 1.)

1980s

The 1980s is the period of economic shift from what are called "smokestack industries" to service operations. The shift led to big changes in society and to further changes in traditional HRD programs. HRD now has to meet the needs of service/knowledge workers (Nadler, 1990).
During the 1980s, many HRD departments began seeking a more valuable barometer of success than the volume of training activities processed, an alternative that would demonstrate the value of their work and positively account for results achieved in terms of on-the-job behavior and organizational impact.

Dana Gaines Robinson suggested in 1984 that, despite the fact that result oriented HRD was not the norm at that time, it would play a major role in the future. She pointed to the ASTD competency study which gave evidence that the HRD professional was moving toward results-oriented training as a standard. This amounts, in her opinion, to an irresistible movement away from activity and toward impact as a measurement standard for HRD success. The same year, the Vice President for professional development of the ASTD, Neal Chalofsky,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning Category</th>
<th>Sub-Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. Mental skill</td>
<td>1. Learning and using rules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Classifying-recognizing patterns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Identifying symbols</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Detecting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Making decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Information</td>
<td>6. Recalling bodies of knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Physical</td>
<td>7. Performing gross motor skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills</td>
<td>8. Steering and guiding; continuous movement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9. Positioning movement and recalling procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10. Voice communicating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. Attitude</td>
<td>11. Attitude learning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Goad, 1983, Nov.)
reiterated this concept in the ASTD's competency study for trainers, saying that in the future, "Trainers will be responsible not only for learning, but also for making sure that learning is applied on the job. Trainers will be responsible not only for identifying training needs, but also for evaluating whether those needs are met," (ASTD, 1983, p. 41).

Highlighting of Models

Managing HRD activities in an organization has been viewed as the most important activity performed by HRD practitioners. HRD manager is the representative of HRD department and its staff to the organization. It is the HRD managers' competence and skill in carrying out HRD tasks that could determine the success or failure of HRD department and the organizational support for its programs.

In the literature there are two major HRD managers' roles models: ASTD (1980) Model and Nadler (1984) Model.

ASTD Role Model

In 1983, the American Society for Training and Development completed a study which proposed that Training and Development field consists of people who perform a different mix of roles. The fifteen key training and development roles are summarized below as it appeared originally in models for excellence (ASTD, 1983):

1. Evaluator: The role of identifying the extent of a program, service or product's impact.
2. Group Facilitator: The role of managing group discussion and group process so that individuals learn and group members feel the experience is positive.

2. Individual Development Counselor: The role of helping an individual assess personal competencies, values, goals and identify and plan development and career actions.

3. Instructional Writer: The role of preparing written learning and instructional materials.

4. Manager of Training and Development: The role of planning, organizing, staffing, controlling training and development operations or training and development projects, and of linking training and development operations with other organization units.

5. Marketer: The role of selling training and development viewpoints, learning packages, programs, and services to target audiences outside one's own work unit.

6. Media Specialist: The role of producing software and using audio, visual, computer, and other hardware-based technologies for training and development.

7. Needs Analyst: The role of defining gaps between ideal and actual performance and specifying the cause of the gaps.

8. Program Administrator: The role of ensuring that the facilities, equipment, materials, participants, and other components of a learning event are present and that program logistics run smoothly.

9. Program Designer: The role of preparing objectives, defining content, and selecting and sequencing activities for a specific
program.

10. Strategist: The role of developing long-range plans for what the training and development structure, organization, direction, policies, program, services, and practices will be in order to accomplish the training and development mission.

11. Task Analyst: Identifying activities, tasks, sub-tasks, and human resource and support requirements necessary to accomplish specific results in a job or organization.

12. Theoretician: The role of developing and testing theories of learning, training, and development.

13. Transfer Agent: The role of helping individuals apply learning after the learning experience.

Nadler Role Model

In 1984 Leonard Nadler proposed his roles model for HRD practitioners. The model indicated three major roles and twelve subroles. Those roles are summarized as the following:

1. Learning specialist:
   1.1 Facilitator of learning
   1.2 Designer of learning programs
   1.3 Developer of instructional strategies

2. Manager of HRD:
   2.1 Developer of HRD policy
   2.2 Supervisor of programs
   2.3 Maintainer of relations
2.4 Developer of HRD personnel
2.5 Arranger of facilities and finance

3. Consultant:
   3.1 Expert
   3.2 Advocate
   3.3 Stimulator
   3.4 Change agent (p. 1.27)

In contrasting the two models, we can find that most of the roles are similar in both models. The two models reveal that these roles can be classified into three general categories. These general categories represent the areas of: program planning and development, HRD administration, and general administration duties.

Gilley and Eggland (1989) stated that the role of HRD manager consists of five components, as follows: (1) Evaluator of the HRD program's impacts and effects on organizational efficiency; (2) Manager of organizational learning system; (3) Operational manager responsible for the planning, organizing, staffing, controlling, and coordinating of the HRD department; (4) Strategist responsible for long-term planning and integrating of HRD into the organization; and (5) Marketing specialist responsible for the advancement of HRD within the organization through well-defined and effective networks (p. 98).

HRD Managers' Competencies

These tasks that the HRD manager should perform require some special and important competencies. The ASTD Model for Excellence

Langen (1980) stated that HRD managers must be competent in the following areas: (a) Individual and organizational needs, (b) Instructional technology, (c) General management skills, (d) Formal education and training experience, (e) External training and education, (f) Program design and development, (g) Learning theory, (h) Management of training and development function, (i) Technical training skills, and (j) Organizational development.

To perform HRD tasks, it is not enough to acquire these competencies; it requires special characteristics as well. Nadler and Wiggs (1986) proposed the characteristics that are necessary for HRD managers to be effective. These will enable HRD managers to develop and implement competent HRD programs. The characteristics include:

1. The ability to plan HRD activities and to aim those activities to the needs of employees and organizations.
2. The ability to envision the needs of HRD activities in the future.

3. The ability to structure an HRD department in an appropriate way.

4. Communication skills to direct and guide HRD staff and to communicate with organizational management.

5. The ability to develop an HRD mission that HRD staff will follow and practice.

6. The ability to practice what he/she preaches. HRD managers should provide an example of their efforts in their daily work.

7. The ability to build a confident HRD staff and allow them to participate in the HRD process.

HRD managers play a crucial role not only in carrying out HRD activities effectively, but also, and, in some way more important, in maintaining the existence and survival of the HRD position in an organization. It is the responsibility of the HRD manager to demonstrate the value, the need, and the impact of the HRD function to the organization.

In HRD literature, there is almost a total agreement among HRD professionals that HRD programs are the first organizational programs budget to be cut. The reasons, according to Brim-Donohoe (1981) as cited by Gilley and Eggland (1989) are: (1) the HRD manager has failed to demonstrate the need for the HRD function, and (2) the HRD manager failed to provide viable programs that are perceived as essential for employees and organizational development.
Obtaining management support for HRD programs is one of the most important strategies that the HRD manager must apply in order to secure and develop his/her efforts, and to be able to make a difference. As Gilley and Eggland (1989) stated, HRD programs can only make a difference if management encourages the utilization of learning as a means to increase employees' productivity and improve their performance.

If management support is a crucial aspect of successful HRD programs, and the HRD manager must obtain that support, then how can the HRD manager obtain such support? Yeomans (1982) identified eight ways for HRD manager to obtain top management support:

1. HRD managers must consider HRD as a part of the business.

2. HRD managers must understand the nature of the organization and its business.

3. HRD managers must consider what line managers want when they (HRD managers) design and develop HRD programs.

4. HRD managers must involve top-level management in the HRD process.

5. HRD managers must make their programs practical and applicable so that organizations as well as employees will benefit from these programs.

6. HRD managers must have an understanding of the return on investment concept so they can apply it in their programs and activities.

7. HRD managers must provide their programs on the basis of
their judgement that HRD is the solution and not on management request only.

8. HRD managers must base their programs on quality instead of quantity. (pp. 22-25)

Thus, managing HRD activities is one of the most important roles in the HRD process. It is important because the manager of HRD is the one who could determine the success and failure of HRD function. If he/she has the skill and competence to demonstrate the importance and impact of HRD, then HRD will get organizational acceptance and support. HRD managers should demonstrate to the organization the contribution that HRD can make to the efficiency, effectiveness, and competitiveness of the organization.

More importantly, HRD managers must demonstrate the return on investment in HRD programs. While it is not easy to demonstrate by numbers the value of HRD programs, HRD managers can demonstrate the effectiveness of the program by the reduction of absenteeism, accidents, tardiness, errors, turnover, and client complaints. The return on investment in HRD may be measured by the increase of employees' productivity and performance, by measuring productivity before and after exposure to HRD programs.

Results-oriented HRD Models

Economic facts emphasize the importance of human resources in organizational success. As a result, today organizations spend more money for human resources than for any other resource. It is estimated
that U.S. corporations of one hundred employees or more spent more than $45 billion in training and development budgets in 1990 (Phillips, 1990).

The investment in HRD, like any other investment, must provide a return to the organization. What benefits accrue to the organization because of investment in HRD need to be enumerated. Robinson and Robinson (1989) stated that HRD has been criticized by management because HRD professionals do not speak the language of business.

To overcome these criticisms and in an attempt to link HRD programs with organizational needs and benefit, HRD literature provides a variety of models for the design and implementation of HRD activities. All of these try to provide the best way of conducting HRD programs and ensuring results from these programs (Brinkerhoff, 1987; Robinson & Robinson, 1989; Chalofsky & Reinhart, 1988; Phillips, 1990; and others).

Six-Stage Model

In his model, Brinkerhoff (1987) explained how to evaluate whether HRD programs are meeting the organizational needs, how their objectives are achieved, and how new SKA are being used on the job and improving employees' performance. He described the process of results-oriented HRD in six stages. Stage I is concerned with the need for HRD programs and whether or not it will make a difference or solve a problem. In Stage II, the concern is about the training program design. It emphasizes the quality of designing the program to make
sure that it can be implemented accurately. Stage III of the model deals with the implementation of the program and whether it is going as it was planned, and if not, what is the reason. In Stage IV, the focus is on the participants. In this stage, the change in SKA will be assessed to determine whether the immediate outcomes of the program have been accomplished. Stage V focuses on the use of new SKA on the job. In Stage VI, the specific charge is to determine the return to the organization by HRD and whether the return is worth the investment.

In general, the model is concerned with the merit and worth of HRD activities. By using the model, one can determine on one hand if an HRD program is well designed, effectively implemented and the participants learn the desired SKA and, on the other hand, if SKA will be used in the workplace and if the organization will benefit from HRD programs. Thus, both dimensions of HRD merit and worth can be assessed by using the model. It provides a results-oriented approach for conducting HRD programs. The model, which focuses on efficiency and effectiveness of HRD programs, uses a problem-solving aspect in evaluating HRD efforts. Unlike other models, the six-stage model emphasizes the evaluation of not only the training outcomes, but also the evaluation of training processes which ensure that HRD is being conducted efficiently.

Training for Impact Model

Robinson and Robinson (1989) presented a twelve-step approach to results-oriented HRD. The model which they called "Training for
"Impact" aimed to link training programs to business needs. The model emphasizes the importance of a collaborative relationship between HRD practitioners and management which will result in management support for HRD efforts. The model viewed HRD professionals as individuals who contribute to performance effectiveness within the organization, rather than as people who deliver HRD programs.

In Step 1, the model is concerned about the identification of the need for HRD programs. In determining the need for training, two different needs may be addressed. One is to solve an existing problem and the other is to determine the projected benefits to the organization. Thus, identifying a business's need for HRD activities is not only a problem-solving approach, but also to determine the business's future opportunities.

Steps 2 and 3 are intended to establish and form a collaborative relationship with the management. Robinson and Robinson believe that both learning experience and the work environment must be examined and managed in a way that will produce the desired result from HRD activities. In these two steps, HRD professionals and managers in different levels are working together to create a positive environment for HRD programs. HRD people should influence the management to recognize the benefit of partnership of HRD with management which will provide the desired result from HRD programs. In other words, HRD by itself and without management involvement will not meet a business need.

Step 4 in the model is a follow-up of Step 1. In Step 1,
business was dealt with in a broad way. In this step, more specific assessment is considered. This step seeks answers for detailed questions such as: What skills and knowledge are required for people to perform successfully? What are the skills or knowledge deficiencies?

Step 5 asks questions about the cause of performance deficiency. HRD professionals in this step try to find other possible reasons for the gap between what is and what should be regarding employees' performance. In many ways, training is not a solution for performance problems. Other causes, such as mismanagement, lack of tools, and lack of department policy may be the main cause. This step is intended to insure that HRD is the solution.

Steps 6 and 7 of the model are to provide a summary report of the previous steps. In those steps, HRD professionals tabulate and interpret data gathered from steps 1-5, then report to management to take action. The report should include what action should be taken. The decision of whether or not to implement HRD programs is a joint decision made by HRD and management, which indicates the benefit of management involvement in HRD process.

In Step 8, the model emphasizes the importance of evaluating the learning experience. This step requires that designing the evaluation occurs before the delivery of HRD programs. The evaluation should be designed concurrently with the program itself.

In Step 9 of the model, the HRD professional is required to design an evaluation system in which the outcomes or the result of the
HRD program can be identified. The evaluation of result should be done with the management. The step asks questions such as: What business problem was being addressed? What business opportunity was to be maximized? The reason for such questions is that results of HRD should be clearly identified and agreed to before HRD programs begin.

Step 10 deals with the implementation of HRD activities. As a result of steps 1-9, the HRD professional is ready to conduct the program.

Steps 11 and 12 are concerned with evaluating and reporting the results of HRD. The use of SKA on the job, the difference that they made, and the benefit the organization gained are measured.

The Robinson and Robinson model provides two important aspects — one is that HRD must be linked to the real needs of the organization. The other is the emphasis of partnership between HRD and management. The model stated that one cannot distinguish between the two aspects. If HRD is intended to benefit the organization and pay off, and if HRD is to provide results to the organization, the two aspects are to be considered. Thus, results-oriented HRD must be a joint effort by HRD and management. The model addresses the important role of the management in HRD process. The model recognizes that the achievement of results from HRD activities is not a responsibility of HRD only; rather, it is a multiple responsibility which involves HRD, management, and participants.

Robinson and Robinson's model demands that the HRD department skillfully design diagnostic systems, use effective consultation skills
to create the group partnership, conduct a systematic work environment assessment, and implement a results-oriented tracking system. The resulting increase in credibility in the eyes of management and the improved use of allocated resources creates a work environment in which management views the HRD department as a partner in organizational growth. Robinson shows that the "training for impact" model will gain increased support for HRD budgets and staffing by demonstrating the value of HRD programs.

Results-oriented Model

Phillips, in his book "Handbook of Training Evaluation and Measurement Methods" (1990) detailed his model that he called "Results-oriented HRD." The model, which consists of 18 steps, stated that the responsibility of achieving results from HRD is not only of HRD people, but rather, it must be shared by HRD and management. The emphasis on results evaluation is the main aspect of the model. It represents a results-oriented approach to designing, developing, and implementing an HRD program.

The model shows how to conduct the needs analysis to determine two elements: performance deficiencies of the target employees and HRD program objectives. Thus, the justification for designing and implementing an HRD program has to be established and the objective has been developed. Identifying the purpose of evaluation is an important step in the model. Phillips stated that evaluation data must be collected prior to the program and after its completion. Evaluation
method, design, and strategy are steps that must be completed before conducting HRD programs.

Unlike most HRD models, calculating program cost and benefits is a major step in this model. Phillips stated that before any course development work is initiated, calculating the approximate cost for developing and conducting must be undertaken, so that the cost of the program can be compared to the potential benefit derived from the program. Another major step in the model is that of selecting HRD program implementation methods. Based on baseline data and the cost of the program, a HRD professional should select what method of delivery should be used. The model also emphasizes the pilot testing of HRD programs which gives the program developers a chance to test the reliability of the program and evaluation methods.

In this model, return on investment (ROI) is considered. ROI should be calculated and compared to a target for the program. This will show the benefit of an HRD program, and will help HRD to gain management support. The model called for communicating the program result among three groups: HRD staff, management, and program participants. The goal of distributing the result report among the three groups is to indicate that HRD success is a shared responsibility.

The model, which focuses on results-oriented and proactive HRD programs, describes how HRD professionals can show top management the profitability of their programs. It is a tool to evaluate and measure the bottom-line effectiveness of HRD programs.
The message emerging from these models is that HRD must be of value to the organization and linked to its needs. One can conclude the following:

1. HRD programs must be driven by business needs.
2. HRD programs must help the organization to achieve its goals and objectives.
3. HRD must provide participants with skills, knowledge, and attitudes needed to improve their performance.
4. HRD must obtain management support and acceptance.
5. HRD must have a measurable result that can be evaluated.

Toward Results-oriented HRD

The purpose of HRD as Gilley and Eggland (1989) stated:

is to bring about the changes that cause the performance improvements that will ultimately enhance the organization... thus learning is transferred to on-the-job performance, reducing costs, improving quality, and increasing organizational competitiveness and/or profitability. (p. 13).

Having this purpose in mind and acknowledging the fundamental change in the way organizations operate in recent years, U.S. corporations take a great interest in the development of their human resources. As a result of that interest, 89 percent of America's largest companies maintain a chief human resource executive. Six out of ten American employees had enrolled in training programs in 1984 and 1985. And, the expenditure of formal and informal training was $210 billion in 1988 (Lombardo, 1989). This is an indication of the
Importance placed on HRD.

But, like any other investment, organizations are looking for a return on this investment. They want to see the result of HRD programs in the employees' productivity and organizational profitability and effectiveness.

A study conducted by ASTD (1988) surveyed a number of leading organizations in business and industrial sections. The study stated that 66 percent of HRD managers in these organizations reported that they are under increasing pressure from upper management to show that HRD programs are producing bottom-line results. However, the study indicated that increased pressure did not mean that upper management doubts the benefit of HRD programs.

The literature suggests that there are three ingredients for HRD programs to be results-oriented: (1) Integration of HRD with organizational goals and plans, (2) Management support of HRD programs, and (3) Evaluation of HRD programs.

Integration of HRD With Organizational Goals and Plans

HRD literature of recent years has emphasized the importance of tying HRD programs to strategic organizational planning. The argument is based on an assumption that strategy-linked HRD programs may be crucial to the success of contemporary organizations challenged by global competition, technological change, economic change, demographic change and new needs for learning by the work force. Catalanello and Redding (1989) indicated that in fact, several leading American
organizations such as Motorola, General Electric, and Hewlett-Packard have credited recent business success to HRD programs. Another study to indicate that HRD provides a competitive advantage was done by the Work in America Institute. As cited by Catalanello and Redding (1989), the study documented training's potential power as a competitive weapon.

HRD programs pay only if they are linked to an organization's business plan, goals, and objectives. As Warshauer (1990) stated, trainers can increase their effectiveness by presenting themselves as partners in the business of the organization. Momeyer (1987) suggested that if HRD efforts are to be successful, they must become more business-oriented and use serious business terms such as "strategic plan", "bottom line", and "profit and loss statement."

According to Beck and Hillmar (1979), the training budget is often first to be cut because managers cannot see contribution of the department to larger organization goals. HRD results are too often summarized in terms of numbers of seminars completed or people trained rather than in terms of organization goals met. Results are a step outside the individual or department while activities are inside. Clarifying this difference in the HRD reporting process can salvage the imminent cutback of the department. When organizational goals are established, valued, and emphasized by managers who hold the HRD department accountable for achieving them, a closer examination of activities will ensure choices of training to achieve demonstrable results.
Drucker extended this concept of organizational goals to the mission statement of the organization which must be couched in terms of results or outcomes for the customer or client. This results approach also enables meaningful evaluation based on the contribution to the organization mission. This accountability is held not only by managers but by all individuals who contribute to the mission, particularly by those who must demonstrate changed behavior to accommodate the new skill or knowledge.

Traditionally, corporate HRD department or training managers in an organization decide who gets what training, when, and how. Then, they propose HRD programs to top management. But, because the HRD professional had no compass other than their own vision of the organizational current and future needs of HRD programs, as Rosoew and Zager (1988) pointed out, training programs proved to be irrelevant. The new notion Rosoew and Zager advocated is that the test of relevance for HRD program must be whether the organizational business strategy requires it. This new notion requires that HRD managers in an organization must become involved in the organization's strategic process, understand the organization's strategy, develop an HRD strategy according to the organization's strategy, and set a clear and specific strategy for HRD itself (Tregoe & Zimmerman, 1984).

Yager (1979) warns that many training programs are bandaid reactions to minor aches and pains of an organization. There is typically little research into organizational goals and how to better meet them, little analysis of long-range expectations requiring HRD
cooperation. This short-sighted approach sets up the HRD program for cutbacks when economic times get tight. Yager proposes a set of principles to guide HRD programs, including analysis of demonstrated needs to show just cause to prescribe a solution, screening of employees who enroll in development programs to ensure there will be a tangible reward for their training, careful consideration of long-range consequences of any HRD program, and assurance that training pays for itself as an investment with a measurable return.

Warshauer (1990) suggested that HRD practitioners can use their research skills, which they developed through the process of program design and evaluating, to learn about the business and goals of their organizations. She proposed two ways for HRD practitioners to understand their companies' business. One is by educating themselves through reading publications, attending conferences, and understanding specific issues related to their companies' business. These external factors, as she called them, will help increase HRD people's credibility and visibility. The other way is by talking to the organization's employees. That way, HRD practitioners will or could become aware of certain issues before they become real problems for an organization. In other words, they will become aware of the needs of the organization's future.

Gordon, Lemke, and Jones (1988) stated that the research aspect of HRD is to identify organizational needs and goals that are not being met. Needs analysis to many managers means another survey, to others a close reading of error data or performance review forms, and to
others, interviews. All of these visions of needs analysis are accurate; their diversity reflects the art-rather-than-science aspect of HRD. Specialized assessment of each unique organization is required. Dependence on a purchased fix-all training program rarely meets the needs of the company in the long haul.

Gainer (1989) stated that HRD professionals can influence the strategic decision-making process and driving training considerations throughout that process by intelligence gathering. The intelligence gathering should include information and understanding of the following issues:

1. The organization's environment. This includes the organization's current business status, evolving or stable, the organization's growth, and the organization's competitors.

2. The organization's business success records. This should include the successful strategies that have been employed, the driving forces of that success, and implementation of the strategy.

3. The organization's plan for using new technology. This includes the time of using this technology, and the process required for implementing the new technologies.

4. The organization's management philosophy and procedures. This includes current and future management philosophy to the organization. (pp. S-5, S-29).

According to Gainer, gathering information and understanding of these issues is a needed tool for HRD to be linked and integrated with organizational plans and goals. He also noted that linking training to
strategic goals of the organization requires a systematic view of training which emphasizes the interconnection of parts of the organization and the organization's relationship to its environment.

HRD professionals are expected to think as business people. They are expected to link their efforts with the organization's business needs and goals. Rolander (1986) suggested eight applications of business involvement that are important for HRD professionals:

1. They must justify HRD programs on an economic return-on-investment level and apply business principles to HRD administration,

2. They must understand the particular business of which they are a part,

3. They must know the strategy, structure, and the power networks of the organization,

4. They should educate organizational management in the HRD's operations,

5. They should learn about general business principles and functions,

6. They must be able to function in task forces and project teams,

7. They must become a part of decision making at top levels of the organization, and

8. They should recognize the global aspects of business operations. (pp. 121-123).

Gordon (1986) stated that HRD professionals must seek a balance between doing a job according to procedure and doing the job in
accordance with what actually happens in the working world. In other words, HRD programs should be done according to the business of the organization's needs. Changing the focus of HRD from the number of workers trained or number of training programs run to the percent of organization performance improved or the number of dollars saved or earned leads to a difference in how management evaluates the training function.

Although HRD professionals may be able to extrapolate the value of training by volume, corporate managers need to see results that are measured in impact on organization performance. For example, Rummler (1977) cites a bank which launched a sales campaign that required tellers to sell bank services, especially loans. The six-month review of the program showed little result; the consequence was that the training department was told to train the tellers to sell personal loans more effectively. Performance analysis of the system showed not a breakdown in the performer, the teller, but in the consequence component. The tellers experienced more errors, including inaccurate balances and more bad checks, from the distraction of trying to sell additional services.

The branch managers could sell one $1 million loan to a small corporation much easier than the tellers could sell several $3,000 personal loans, so there was no incentive for the managers to support the tellers selling. The training department effectively saved an enormous expense on useless training by performing a needs analysis before blindly applying a bandaid to the problem. This highlights the
difficulty of analysis: most organizations are not departmentalized to analyze problems. They are on the contrary organized to solve problems with training, communications, labor-relations, engineering, or wage/salary changes. Until analysis classifies the problem, however, there is often a poorly focused effort to isolate it, resulting in the classic pass-the-buck phenomenon. In order to address all facets of a complex problem, HRD may have to involve multiple departments in a cooperative effort — not always a simple task in competitive companies. Rummler suggests that when RO HRD is implemented, the training department may well become the performance engineering department.

Another factor which will help the integration of HRD with organizational goals and plan is the formulation of HRD plans and policies. It is essential for HRD to formulate its plans and policies, but to be strategic, HRD plans and policies must be shaped and driven by the strategic organization plan.

Hales (1986) proposed a number of propositions on the development of HRD plans and policies:

1. A strategic organization plan must exist before HRD strategic plan can be developed.

2. HRD plan must be developed in connection with organization plan. An HRD plan developed separately from the organization plan will remain short-term and operational in focus.

3. Strategic HRD plans requires top management sanction and involvement. A lack of top management involvement may result in HRD
plan that is not in line with the organization's plan.

4. If the organization considers short-term plans only, HRD plan will reflect similar characteristics.

5. HRD plan considers both strategic business plans and environmental analysis. External and internal analysis forms a base for an HRD plan.

6. HRD plan provides the needed link between the organization's activities and HRD activities. This will help to unify business and HRD approach.

Garavan (1991) suggested a number of reasons why HRD function should engage in policy formulation:

1. It will help organization management to identify and implement needed and appropriate HRD programs.

2. It helps organizational management, in all levels, to be aware of its HRD responsibilities and participate in HRD activities.

3. It helps to define the relationship between organization's objectives and its commitment to HRD functions.

4. The HRD policy can facilitate the establishment of employee career development opportunities. An effective HRD policy will assess the learning needs required for both organization's and employees growth.

5. HRD policy provides a framework for evaluating HRD activities.

Thus, the central feature of results-oriented HRD emerging from the literature is that integration of HRD into a wider organization's
goals and plans. HRD in this context is perceived as a vital factor in business planning and viewed as a major contributor to organization's goals and achievement. The literature explores reasons why traditional training programs have failed. They failed principally because they have not been integrated with the corporate mission, strategy, structure, culture, and the required skills, knowledge and attitude of organization's employees.

Management Support of HRD Programs

Most of HRD activities are concerned with job performance of either present or future job. It is job-oriented and this is the major and most common use of HRD by an organization. However, job performance is affected by many other factors, most of which are beyond the control and responsibility of HRD practitioners. HRD practitioners provide the learning, but the translation of that learning into changed performance is outside the control of HRD people. It is a function of managers (Nadler, 1986).

The manager plays a crucial role in the contemporary corporate world. It is the manager who enforces policies and practices. The managers of the departments are the prime factor in influencing their employees' performance. It is the manager's responsibility to guide their subordinates in setting quantifiable goals and to assess their success in achieving those goals. The role of the manager is to facilitate and provide assistance for subordinates' goal-oriented activities (Bernardin and Beatty, 1984). The managers are those who
make decisions regarding the allocation of resources for HRD programs, participate in program development, allow their employees to attend HRD programs, and enforce what has been learned in these programs.

Phillips (1990) emphasized that HRD department is not primarily responsible for HRD in the organization. He indicated that the management of the organization is ultimately responsible for employees' development through its commitment, support, and involvement that will determine the success of any HRD effort.

Laird (1979) stated that managers understand that organizations must have inputs to get a desired output. These inputs include a unique technology which distinguishes their organization from others, such as a recipe or design. Use of this technology by people, the 2nd input, with the other two inputs of time and material, constitutes the work done by employees assigned to specific tasks. Managers know that the mastery of these tasks and the efficiency of the workers governs the success of the organization, or its output. Demonstration of the value of HRD in increasing the level of mastery and efficiency results in the commitment of management to HRD programs.

The management commitment refers to the top management actions which includes the action to allocate resources and lend support to the HRD effort in an organization. The top management commitment is essential, not only for the success of HRD, but also for its survival. Robinson and Robinson (1989) indicated that it is impossible for HRD practitioner to implement training efforts that result in organizational impact without those who have the most to gain or lose.
from these efforts, those are the top managers.

In many cases, however, top management is not committed to training and development activities. Managers do not value training and development. The reason is that they do not view education activities as an investment that brings significant returns (Gilley, 1989). Another reason is that previous and present generations of top managers were not always systematically trained or developed managers. They tend to devalue training and development and may perceive them as either irrelevant or as a threat to their positions (Garavan, 1991).

To gain top management commitment, Phillips (1990) suggested six elements which can help to increase commitment to HRD in an organization:

1. Result. To convince top management of the worth and impact of HRD, HRD people must make their programs produce measurable results which can be seen as valuable to the organization. Management commitment will increase when HRD programs provide desired results.

2. Management involvement. Management involvement in the process of HRD seems to increase top management commitment. This involvement shows a cooperative effort toward people development in the organization. The involvement which Robinson and Robinson (1989) referred to as a consulting relationship between HRD people and the client (managers). Management involvement will also help to make management share some responsibility of HRD efforts.

3. Professionalism is one factor which can help to increase management commitment to HRD. It means that HRD department should seek
the achievement of excellence when conducting its programs. The department should be perceived as a professional unit in all steps of HRD process. If HRD people consider themselves as professional, then their job must reflect that.

4. Communicating needs. If HRD people can communicate the needs, impact and importance of HRD programs for the overall organizational development, then it is more likely that top management will be more committed to HRD efforts.

5. Resourcefulness. This refers to the ability of HRD department to help solve all kinds of performance problems in an organization. HRD function should cover all of the organization aspects.

6. Practical approach. HRD programs should deal with the reality of the business and organizational needs. Concentrating too much on theories and philosophical views will not help HRD achieve its goals. There should be a balance between theoretical process and practical application.

Lash (1984) suggests using testimony of successful companies with enthusiastic management support for results-oriented HRD. Lash of Avis International shows the company's commitment to HRD as an essential department. Emphasis is on more than skills acquisition; recognition of resulting motivation, minimization of employee frustration, increase in worker commitment to excellence all have demonstrable effect on turnover and customer satisfaction and repeat business. Cost analysis of trained versus untrained new employees
convinces managers who do not perceive value of HRD.

Management support is an important action of organization management toward HRD. Nadler (1980) used the term "support systems" to refer to the range of management action to support the utilization of training. He indicated five components of that support system. These are: organizational involvement, pre-training activities, training activities, job linkage, and follow-up.

HRD programs will make a difference only with the management encouragement and support to the use of HRD activities as a means to increase productivity and improve employees' performance. Top-level management must be involved in the process of HRD (Gilley and Eggland, 1989).

Phillips (1990) presented what he called "Ideal support." Ideal management support will occur when a manager reacts in the following ways:

1. Gives enthusiastic endorsement and approval for participants to be involved in HRD programs.
2. Volunteers personal services or resources to assist in the HRD effort.
3. Makes a commitment with the participant prior to attending the program that outlines what changes should take place or what tasks should be accomplished after the program has been completed.
4. Reinforces the behavior change resulting from the program.
5. Conducts a follow-up of the results achieved from the program.
6. Gives positive rewards for participants who have outstanding accomplishments as a result of attending the HRD program (pp. 306-307).

Robinson and Robinson (1989) suggested a partnership between HRD practitioners and the management. They stated that HRD professional must form a consulting relationship with the client (manager) in order to link training project to business need. They further stated that it is almost impossible for HRD professionals to implement HRD efforts that result in organizational impact without consulting with the very people who have the most to gain or lose from these efforts: the organization management groups.

Spector (1988) stated that gaining the support of top management can help HRD programs achieve their greatest effect. However, he indicated that getting such support is not an easy task. To overcome the difficulty of gaining management support, Spector proposed four strategic steps:

1. Planning. In this step, HRD should gain access to the managers who are in charge of organizational planning. This will help HRD to present its objective and show its readiness to contribute to the organization's plan.

2. Budgeting. This refers to the budget committee membership that HRD manager should seek. If HRD department is represented in budget committee, there is a good chance that management support gains its efficacy. This can happen when HRD bases its budget requests on the result of training evaluation.

3. Educating other managers. Because line and staff managers in
the organization have some great responsibilities in making HRD department more effective, it is very important to inform them of HRD programs and services that can help their departments.

4. Enhancing professional people. It is more likely that top managers will pay more attention to HRD function if they perceive it as professional business. This can be done by demonstrating business sense and expertise in HRD.

The key element of HRD success is the extent to which acquired SKA from HRD programs are transferred into performance at the job site. Helping trainees transfer their new SKA back to the job is one of the most important aspects of management support of HRD activities.

It is the responsibility of HRD professionals to conduct thorough and effective HRD programs which will benefit the participants as well as their organization. But, after the HRD events are completed, HRD have no control over most of the factors that affect the implication of HRD programs results. HRD practitioners provide the learning, but the translation of that learning into changed performance is outside the control of HRD people. It is the function of the managers of the organization's departments (Nadler, 1986).

As Brinkerhoff (1987) indicated, acquiring new SKA is not the end in itself. The ultimate purpose of HRD is to benefit the organization and that will happen by transferring the new SKA to the job performance.

From the organizational perspective, it's also not enough to simply increase SKA of the employees. The organization, which invests
money and time in HRD, wants results in performance improvements, which will enhance the organization's effectiveness and efficiency (Gilley, 1989).

So, it is very obvious that both parties emphasize the transfer of the new skills, knowledge and attitudes to the job. But, while there are factors within the control of HRD practitioners, such as program design, classroom, training materials, and program evaluation, HRD people can't dictate management support of new SKA. If the real goal is to give people the skills to do well in the job, then the HRD program, the job environment, and management support must be pointed in the same direction (Gordon, 1988).

One factor that management controls is coaching. Coaching is a management technique which is the daily process of helping employees recognize opportunities to improve their performance and practice specific skills (Kelly, 1985). Skill transfer will occur more often and more effective when managers coach their subordinates on how to use the new skills (Robinson and Robinson, 1979).

Reinforcement is another tool that managers have to insure skills transfer. Phillips (1990) stated that regardless of how well HRD professionals conduct HRD program, unless it is reinforced on the job most of its effectiveness will be lost. He proposed several ways of providing reinforcement:

1. Help participants diagnose problems to determine if new skills are needed.

2. Discuss possible alternatives for handling specific
situations.

3. Act as a coach to help the participant apply the skill.

4. Encourage participants to use the skills frequently.

5. Serve as a role model for the proper use of the skills.

6. Give positive rewards to participants when the skills are successfully used (p. 313).

Managers can also use the skill-based pay to enhance newly learned SKA usage. According to Feuer (1987), this method is proven to be effective. He cited recent national studies on reward systems. These studies indicated that 5% to 7% of all organizations use skill-based pay to some extent.

In summary, HRD provides skills, knowledge, attitudes and the potential for successful application on the job. But, only the actual transfer of those SKA to on-the-job situations demonstrate the effectiveness and the success of the HRD programs. The management support of the HRD programs' planning, implementation and most important, usage of SKA on the job site is a crucial element of HRD success and effectiveness.

Thus, the essential message emerging from HRD literature is that when management at a broad level perceives HRD as making an important contribution to the development of both organization and employees, then HRD yields a higher profile. HRD must command the support and participation of the organization management. The degree to which management supports HRD efforts is based on how they perceive the worth of HRD. To improve management support, HRD department should work on
improving the relationship with an individual manager as well as management group. The collaboration between managers and HRD practitioners will help the organization to use training and development functions to achieve its goals and objectives.

Evaluation of HRD Programs

The building of HRD operation is one part of HRD practitioners' responsibility to provide effective and adequate HRD programs which would benefit the organization and its employees. The other part is the justification for HRD programs and the impact that HRD had upon the organization and the employees through proving that existing HRD programs are successful and paid off.

The growth of HRD activities in the recent years and the increasing expectation of its effectiveness and worth have not been paralleled by efforts at evaluation of such activities (Brinkerhoff, 1987, Luxemburg, 1980). But, as Kane (1976) indicated, the time when HRD activities were not questioned seems to be gone.

Gilley and Eggland (1989) give four reasons why evaluation of HRD programs is necessary: (1) To determine if the program accomplished its assigned objectives, (2) To determine the strengths and weaknesses of HRD programs (3) To determine the cost/benefit ratio so that organization's management can assess the value of each program, and (4) To establish a data base to be used to demonstrate the productivity and effectiveness of HRD department.

Phillips (1990) suggested six reasons for evaluating HRD
programs: (1) To determine whether an HRD program is accomplishing its objectives, (2) To identify strengths and weaknesses in the HRD process, (3) To determine the cost/benefit ratio of HRD programs, (4) To decide who should participate in the future HRD programs, (5) To reinforce major points made to the learner, and (6) To gather data to assist in marketing future programs.

Brandenburg (1982) reported that evaluation has four major functions: (1) To improve training programs, (2) To provide feedback to HRD practitioners and management, (3) To obtain knowledge about trainees' skill levels, and (4) To provide feedback to the trainees.

One of the most popular purposes for HRD evaluation is to demonstrate HRD's worth to the organization's management. In a study by ASTD (1988) of organization-led training, the investigated organizations stated the following approaches to training and evaluation:

1. Top management is greatly supportive of investments in training, however, management perceptions of training's worth is the critical factor.

2. Line management views training as a strategic element for achieving key business objectives. Evaluation focuses on whether key business objectives improve as a result of training and if so, training receives a share of the credit.

3. An evaluation must demonstrate how HRD programs have made a specific contribution to the business objectives.

Zenger and Hargis (1982) noted that management demands evidence
of the return on the investment in HRD programs. Evaluation of training programs will provide such evidence. In other words, management needs facts about the effectiveness and worth of HRD programs.

Return on investment (ROI) has become a significant controversy in HRD. The proliferation of accounting formulas for calculating ROI in books, magazines, and seminars is an indicator of the interest in the subject. Gordon (1987) suggests that it is not the demands of the "Hard-Nosed Financial Types" which is driving this movement, but rather the hope of HRD professionals that providing bottom-line numbers will increase the likelihood of their programs being approved. Gordon suggests that the impetus for RO HRD is from within, not from upper management.

The controversy centers around the possibility of isolating the final dollar benefits of an HRD project and claiming the results solely for the HRD department. According to Gordon, the top HRD people at companies identified in a 1984 poll of Training readers were interviewed on the issue of whether the quest for bottom-line results brings greater credibility for the department. None of the HRD specialists claimed credit for their department's success was due to specific financial returns, and none recalled ever proposing a program only to have it blocked until bottom-line benefits could be projected. Some felt that the controversy over RO HRD overstated the actual influence of hard numbers on business decisions regarding HRD, but all the professionals interviewed agreed that the origin of the movement to
track financial returns came from the HRD trainers and not from executives and line managers. Several of these highly respected HRD professionals suggested that financial numbers are more likely to be demanded when the HRD people seem to be offering a solution in search of a problem rather than when they are responding to a specific problem in the organization, and that the need for hard financial numbers on results is most likely to be connected to management and sales training rather than to technical training.

Gordon also points out the variety of definitions of the term "bottom line." One person may use bottom line to refer to the company's annual profit-and-loss statement, another means rather the return on a particular training project, and a third uses bottom line to mean an orientation or a philosophy toward HRD that identifies and solves problems in the organization that will increase revenue or cut costs. Gordon insists that the first and last definitions are too nebulous to manage, and that the return on a specific project is the only definition worth addressing.

Gordon questions the honesty of the HRD department claiming that increased net profit is due solely to one of their programs. The support of managers who follow through with support for learned skill is critical to HRD success, surely earning them a share of the credit. Gordon quotes Dana Gaines Robinson, president of Partners in Change, Incorporated, of Pittsburgh, who is an authority on training evaluation, as commenting that "you can't isolate the effects of the training. It's like the wings on an airplane: You need both." (p. 36).
It would be unrealistic for the HRD department to claim an increase in sales was due only to their program for salespeople; what about the advertising department, consumer spending trends, parallel increase in sales by competitors? And what about HRD claims for bottom-line results when the following quarter sales figures go down? Will the HRD department accept sole responsibility for a loss as due to their training program not having a long-range success? Probably not. Gordon's point is that the multiple factors which impact the bottom-line figures make it impossible to claim success or failure as an HRD department a cause/result formula.

A model for RO HRD has been IBM, identified by readers of Training as the most effective company for HRD in 1984. As cited by Gordon (1987), IBM's Jack Bowsher, director for education, says that measurement of results are the key to justifying training. IBM uses four levels of evaluation: the reaction of trainees, the pre- and post-testing of skills and knowledge, the application of skills and knowledge on the job, and the business results for the whole organization. Bowsher claims that only some HRD programs can be measured to the fourth level of dollar impact, mostly cases of technical training. Bowsher concludes that it is irresponsible to build unsupportable assumptions into measurement simply to arrive at a bottom-line figure. He recommends measuring everything possible, but only that which can be realistically measured.

Larry Doxsee, the director of HRD for 3M Company, another of the top ten companies for successful HRD in the 1984 Training poll, agrees,
according to Gordon (1987). Doxsee warns against trying to tie cause and effect together in a scientifically acceptable way. He admits that the establishment of results is a serious concern, and certainly recommends tying training to corporate needs, but some training is done simply because it makes sense, not cents.

Despite this competent insistence on the impossibility of measuring results of all HRD programs accurately in bottom-line terms, there is a camp which claims it can and should be done. According to Gordon, the president of Performance Control Corporation, a consulting firm in Media, Pennsylvania, Jerry Peloquin, adamantly claims that HRD departments must measure the dollar value of training to prevent cutting the department in hard times. He agrees that profits come from complex multiple factors, but that has never stopped other departments from claiming that their efforts increased bottom-line dollars. Peloquin insists that HRD must claim their direct influence on company profits to legitimize their functional value. He recommends negotiation to arrive at formulas for calculating ROI figures for a particular project, sharing the bottom-line figure with all departments involved, for example the improved personnel department screening for new employees or the advertising department's new campaign. And he indicated that there are other times when the HRD program was the only significant variable that can claim the bottom-line change.

Bowsher of IBM, as cited by Gordon (1987), agreed that measurement of benefits is critical, but reiterates that measurement cannot always be in hard numbers. Even in a project as concrete as
building a new plant, management makes as many decisions on gut instinct as on hard numbers. The insistence on hard numbers to gain approval for every program is a demand for black magic that is unsupportable.

Another resistant of the bottom-line numbers to sway decision makers is Clifton Rhodes, the director of corporate training for Honeywell Corporation. Gordon quotes Rhodes as that "In no way will bottom-line data ensure the survival of a training program — at least not in an organization like Honeywell. In no way is that all there is." (p. 41). Honeywell has demonstrated its commitment to evaluating HRD by funding a landmark study on the multiple factors which contribute to the long-term success of managers. Rhodes points out that detailed cost-benefit analysis on a program-by-program basis is not critical to Honeywell's HRD program. He adds that Honeywell has found that an informal coalition of HRD and corporate sponsors with line managers which together determines training needs and relevant programs produces data for judging impact without insistence on the massive paperwork required by a detailed cost analysis environment.

Another model of informal RO HRD is the McDonald's Corporation "Hamburger University" in Oak Brook Illinois. Ron Lessnau, head of corporate training there, says, as cited by Gordon (1987, p. 41), that HRD claims credit and accepts failure right along with operations. Lessnau summarizes by saying that "cost sheets may be a way of life in companies that don't see training as an integral part of operations, but not here. The philosophy is 'Don't let the accountants run the
business; do it because it makes sense.'" His example is illustrative: "When a store manager wants to buy a new $800 toaster, the question isn't 'Where are the accounting sheets with your detailed cost-benefit analysis of the toaster?' it is 'What happens if you don't have the toaster?' If the answer is, 'Bad things happen,' you buy the toaster." (p. 38).

Gordon asks here if HRD professionals should count on good faith support for common sense decisions from management. He suggests having some cost analysis strategies to prove the value of HRD no matter how supportive the current management structure is.

At Walt Disney World in Florida, an exemplary customer service and HRD corporation, Sue Rye is HRD manager. She begins by allowing complaints from guests to shape, change, and refine the HRD program. Yet she insists that the time, money, and effort to create and maintain a tracking system to put a dollar amount on "program X in July caused impact Y in September" (p. 33) is unnecessary. Because of the increase in management training her department had recently undertaken at the time of this interview, however, Rye admits to "struggling to find a sharper correlation between training and the bottom line." (p. 33). Rye's advice is to avoid an obsession with percentage figures for HRD contributions while maintaining a responsible vigilance on the value of HRD programs to organizational goals (Gordon, 1987).

Bill Luithle, division manager for corporate training for AT&T in Basking Ridge, New Jersey, agrees. Despite the development of a course on cost analysis for managers company-wide recently completed by his
department, Luithle says that cost of arriving at a defensible figure for the value of a HRD program would not be worth the time and expense (Gordon, 1987).

Finally, Kenneth Hansen, manager of education and training for Xerox Corporation, points to the dubious value of elaborate cost-benefit analysis on HRD programs. Hansen says that the "return is so wrapped up in other environmental factors that it's impossible to separate and measure." (p. 38). At Xerox, most HRD programs are linked to support an operational strategy or product that will be evaluated as a whole for dollar benefits. There is no need to determine that the HRD programs involved contribute 5% to the new product and thus earn X more dollars. HRD is simply recognized as a vital part of the operational process of bringing that product to market. Hansen concludes that focusing on the operational needs of the organization reduces the issue of ROI (Gordon, 1987).

Evaluation Models

HRD literature provides several training evaluation models proposed by HRD theorists. The models provide means for improving HRD programs and place evaluation into data levels.

Kirkpatrick Model

According to Phillips (1990), the most well-known framework for classifying areas of evaluation comes from Kirkpatrick. Kirkpatrick (1976) has presented a model which assists in determining what data are
to be collected. The model suggests four levels of training evaluation:

1. Reaction. This level is related to the participants' thoughts about the HRD program. It answers the question of whether the participants are pleased with the program.

2. Learning. This level addresses the participants' learning issue.

3. Behavior. The behavior evaluation level is aimed to monitor the change of participants' behavior as a result of HRD program.

4. Results. This level of evaluation deals with expected positive effect on the organization.

Six-Stage Model

The six-stage evaluation model proposed by Brinkerhoff (1987) is another major contribution to HRD program evaluation and effectiveness. The model, which was described early in this chapter, explains how to evaluate whether HRD programs are meeting the needs they were designed to address, how well learning objectives are being achieved, and how new knowledge or skills are being used on the job and whether they are improving employees' performance. The model emphasizes the merit and the worth of HRD program as a main benefit of HRD evaluation. Another aspect of the model is that it provides evaluation not only for the HRD program outcome, but also for the whole process of HRD programs.

Brinkerhoff's model is a practical and conceptual model. It is constructed to be simple and used to assess any HRD activity. The
model, which focuses on efficiency and effectiveness of HRD programs, uses a problem-solving aspect in evaluating HRD efforts. Each stage deals with one step of HRD program's process. Stage I evaluates the need for HRD program; stage II evaluates the HRD program design; stage III evaluates the implementation of the program; stage IV focuses on the participants' reaction in terms of SKA change; stage V addresses the usage of new SKA on the job, and stage VI.

**Warr, Bird and Racham Model**

A third major model for classifying types of evaluation is suggested by Warr, Bird, and Racham (1970). In this model, there are four main stages of evaluation process. Those stages are: context evaluation, input evaluation, reaction evaluation, and outcome evaluation.

Context evaluation, stage I, requires obtaining and using information about the training needs and objectives. To accomplish this stage, there are three types of objectives to be evaluated: ultimate objectives, which refers to the organization's benefit, intermediate objectives, which concerns the change in employees' work behavior, and immediate objectives, which address the new SKA that trainees must acquire. The stage consists of collecting data about the performance problems, the need for HRD program and the objectives of HRD program. Input evaluation stage involves analyzing the available resources and determining how they can be used to bring about change and achieving the desired HRD objectives. The reaction evaluation
stage evaluates the participants' reactions to improve HRD process. The distinguishing feature of this stage is that it relies on the subjective reports of the participants. The final stage of this model is the outcome evaluation. This stage is the most important part. It evaluates the result of HRD program to improve future programs. The model, which is known as CIRO, is a useful approach of evaluation. Its aim is to provide the HRD practitioners with needed information to improve and increase HRD programs' effectiveness and to achieve their objectives.

Although HRD literature is not limited to the three evaluation models presented here and there are many others, the researcher chose these three models as a sample of evaluation models. Also, most of the other models are similar to these three in most of their elements.

In describing these three models for levels of evaluation, one can notice that they are similar in focuses and processes. They share four main levels: organizational needs and participants' reaction at the first level, learning and achievement at the second level, improved behavior and job performance at the third level, and organization results and benefits at the fourth level.

As indicated earlier, the literature proposed many evaluation models, all of which are usable and provide evaluation means for making HRD more effective. The question is, which one is best? There is no right answer (Phillips, 1990). He added that what is best for one organization may be inappropriate for another. The important action is to select a model around which the organization focuses its evaluation.
The most important action however, is that evaluation should account for every component of the HRD program. In other words, evaluation must occur at each of the four major levels and a comprehensive evaluation process should focus on all four levels in each program (Brinkerhoff, 1987; Phillips, 1990; and Gilley & Egeland, 1989). However, according to ASTD research (1988), the actual practice of evaluation doesn't often follow the recommendation of HRD literature. The reason is that many HRD practitioners haven't found those recommendations applicable in their organization.

Phillips (1990) stated that there is a wide agreement among most evaluation experts that emphasis should be on the ultimate outcome evaluation. Kusy (1987) indicated that there is substantial evidence in studies to indicate that the fourth level is a method most desired and receives the most support. In the other three levels of evaluation practices, Robinson (1987) pointed out that over 75% of HRD departments utilize reaction evaluation at least 81-100% of the time. In level II, which is known as learning evaluation, Robinson stated that only 22% of HRD departments use this approach at least 81-100% of the time. Behavior level is conducted by less than 60% of HRD departments.

Rosoew and Zager (1988) stated that few organizations make systematic efforts to evaluate the intended learning and results from HRD programs. They suggested that evaluation of results should involve four groups in the organization: (1) those who have the authority of stating the organization strategy, mainly the top management; (2) the participants of HRD programs; (3) the managers or supervisors of the
participants who are responsible for transferring acquired SKA to the job place; and (4) the HRD department's staff.

A study by ASTD (1988) which surveyed organization-led training evaluation, shows that all the organizations represented in this study evaluate some aspect of their training programs. Seventy-five percent to 100% evaluated training programs at the participant reaction level. Most of the organizations evaluate learning level in some of their training programs. Twenty-five percent of their training programs were evaluated at learning level.

The least measured level in these organizations is the behavior change on the job. Only 10% of the surveyed organizations evaluated training at this level. At the organizational results level, the surveyed organizations evaluated about 25% of the time.

All the organizations that ASTD investigated build evaluation design into the HRD program design. The study findings showed that sophisticated statistical methods or controls for training evaluation are rarely used. Whatever method they use, evaluators are increasingly using multiple data sources — combinations of quantitative and qualitative data (Phillips, 1990).

HRD programs evaluation, if conducted effectively provides essential feedback that can be used to improve HRD programs. It can insure that instruction is well-conducted, and that a program's content is appropriate. Evaluation can insure that acquired SKA transferred to the work place and that money spent on HRD programs produces measurable improvements in employees' performance and organization's effectiveness.
and efficiency. No matter what evaluation model is used and what method and instrument is employed, the critical issue is that evaluation for all HRD programs at all levels and for every component in the program must occur. It must occur for the sake of HRD success and survival and for organizations to get a return for the money and time they invested in HRD activities.

Gordon, Zemke, and Jones (1988) indicated that how evaluation of HRD activities is designed depends on the role assigned to the HRD department in the organization. The philosophy adopted determines the indicators measured, the instruments and data gathering methods, the criteria applied to claim success or failure, and the use that the evaluation results are put to.

Dugan Laird (1979) suggests that there are three main philosophies of evaluation chosen by organizations: (1) The contribution to organization goals made by HRD, which is based on solving organizational performance problems; (2) The achievement of learning objectives approved by the organization, which is measured by comparing pre-training skill or knowledge level with post-training levels; or (3) The perception of the organization of the worth of the HRD programs, as measured simply by the opinions of those involved in all aspects of training. Essentially, the question remains, whether results, learning, or opinion is the focus, What did the organization get in return for the time and money invested in this project?

Finally, evaluation of HRD programs must be viewed from two perspectives. One is an evaluation of each HRD program to determine
the success or failure elements. The other, which is a more global perspective of evaluation and often more challenging one, is the evaluation of the impact of the HRD operation on the organization as a whole. This impact must be analyzed as HRD programs objectives are translated into successful work practices (Goldstein, 1986).

Summary

During the past three decades, HRD emerged as a formal functional area in many organizations. Many corporations have appointed executive-level positions to be responsible for development of human resources. The investment in HRD is growing at a phenomenal rate. An estimation of $45.5 billion was spent on formal training by U.S. corporations in 1989 (Lee, 1990). The total number of employees who receive formal training annually is more than 39 million (Phillips, 1991). This profile indicates the increase of the HRD field and the recognition of its importance and the impact HRD has on U.S. organizations.

The organizations who invest their money and time in HRD seek a return of that investment in terms of employees' productivity and organizational profitability and effectiveness. They are fully aware of the importance and the impact of HRD, but they also expect a result. They expect that HRD will help to reduce costs and contribute to the overall development of the organization.

Thus, HRD professionals are under increasing pressure to show that their programs are worthwhile and produce bottom-line results.
HRD practitioners are being asked to provide their organizations with more effective and results-oriented HRD activities. HRD practitioners must continue to develop their efforts if they want to contribute to their organizational development. They must find ways to make the HRD function become more effective at fostering and maintaining the competence of employees and the whole organization (Brinkerhoff, 1987).

HRD practitioners must be deeply concerned about charges and evidence of failures of the HRD function to prepare workers to work or managers to manage. If HRD is properly carried out, it may ultimately prove critical to the survival of many organizations (Chalofsky & Reinhart, 1988).

One of the criticisms most commonly leveled at HRD professionals is that they do not speak the language of business. Business language requires HRD professionals to consider the return to the organization for dollars spent on HRD.

If HRD management want to be seen as business partners and to contribute to organizational development, then HRD programs must be linked to the business needs, problems and opportunities. They must be results-oriented.

As mentioned earlier, a review of HRD literature reveals a variety of models and approaches in an attempt to provide HRD practitioners with guidelines of how to conduct HRD programs so that these programs will produce bottom-line results to the organization.

From an analysis of those major models, the researcher put together fourteen tasks or activities which characterize results-
oriented HRD. These activities are as follows: (1) Planning HRD programs to reflect the overall organizational needs; (2) Comparing the cost and benefits of the HRD program to be implemented; (3) The HRD department and management jointly make decisions about the type of HRD program needed; (4) The HRD department and management jointly determine the content of HRD programs; (5) HRD programs design and implementation are discussed with management; (6) Participants' evaluation of program content and instructional method during the implementation; (7) Having upper-level managers participate in HRD programs; (8) Evaluation of the implementation of each HRD program by HRD staff to determine how each program is functioning; (9) Evaluating all HRD programs by a formal method; (10) Measuring HRD investment by dollar return through improved performance, productivity, and cost saving; (11) Involving all HRD staff in program evaluation; (12) When employees complete HRD program, they evaluate the program and estimate the benefit of their attendance; (13) To insure the transfer of skills and knowledge, managers give positive rewards to employees who use the acquired skills or knowledge; and (14) Communicating the results of HRD programs to managers, HRD staff and program's participants. See Table 2 below for activities' references.

Research Questions

The purpose of this study was to explore the acceptance of, and support for, results-oriented training activities by upper-level managers and HRD managers in the target area. These findings may be
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Comparing the cost and benefits of the HRD program to be implemented.</td>
<td>Phillips, 1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Evaluation of the implementation of each program by the HRD staff to determine how each program is functioning.</td>
<td>Brinkerhoff, 1987.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13. To insure the transfer of skills and knowledge, managers give positive rewards to employees who use the acquired skills and knowledge.</td>
<td>Phillips, 1991.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

used as a preliminary investigation for future study of the status of actual, current HRD practices in the target area.

A secondary focus of this study was to examine the differences or similarities between the perceptions of upper-level managers and HRD managers concerning results-oriented HRD activities. These findings may be used to explore the use of management-responsive HRD practices in the target area.

Last, this study sought to create a profile of the support for and/or acceptance of results-oriented HRD activities in the target area, that includes both the most-recommended and the least-recommended practices within local organizations. This profile, in turn, may be useful for the evaluation of potential areas of need for improving the effectiveness and value of HRD professionals in the target area.

Based on these purposes, this study sought to answer the following questions:

1. What is the level of support and acceptance of local HRD managers and upper-level managers for representative results-oriented
HRD training activities?

2. What are the similarities and differences between upper-level managers and HRD managers regarding their levels of support and acceptance of each results-oriented HRD activity?

3. What activities received the most support and least support from both groups?

Assumptions of the Study

The study is conducted on the basis of the following assumptions:

1. The researcher assumes that the respondents have a sufficient knowledge base to understand the terminology in the survey instrument.

2. The researcher assumes that the respondents have an understanding of the 22 statements used in the study questionnaire.

3. The researcher assumes that the respondents did provide complete, honest, accurate and truthful answers to the questionnaire questions.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Overview

The study's purpose was to explore the acceptance of, and support for, results-oriented training activities by upper-level managers and HRD managers in the target area. A secondary focus of this study was to examine the differences or similarities between the perceptions of upper-level managers (ULM) and HRD managers (HRDM) concerning results-oriented HRD activities. This study also sought to create a profile of the support for and/or the acceptance of those activities in the target area. This profile includes both the most-recommended and the least-recommended practices for upper-level and HRD managers. A post-hoc analysis looked at levels of support for the activities across, within and among the four types of organizations represented in the study sample.

Sixty-five organizations within the twelve-county selection site agreed to participate in the study. Two survey questionnaires were given to each organization, one to be filled out and returned by the Human Resources Development (HRD) director, the other by the upper-level manager (ULM) to whom the HRD manager reported. The questionnaire described training practices, or activities, that exemplified the fourteen characteristics of results-oriented human
resource development (ROHRD) programs. Respondents were asked to indicate their support for the activities on a five-point scale. Findings of the study were then drawn from the analyses of the returned questionnaires.

Setting

The setting of the study was West Michigan, a geographical area located in the lower peninsula of Michigan between the city of Muskegon in the north and St. Joseph in the south, and between Lake Michigan in the west and Battle Creek in the east. This area includes portions of twelve counties: Ottawa, Branch, Barry, Berrien, Allegan, St. Joseph, Van Buren, Muskegon, Calhoun, Kalamazoo, Kent and Cass.

West Michigan may be considered to be representative of the greater north-eastern portion of the American Midwest (generally described as including the states of Illinois, Indiana, Ohio, Wisconsin, and Michigan). Much of West Michigan is rural; a major industry for the entire region is agriculture. However, four mid-to-large-sized (approximately 100,000+ population) urban areas are included in the study area (in order of size: Grand Rapids, Kalamazoo, Battle Creek, and Benton Harbor-St. Joseph). Within these areas are many service-oriented and retail organizations such as financial corporations, hospitals, universities, insurance companies, and retail store corporations. HRD activities are very well recognized and practiced. The area is a home of one of the American Society for Training and Development (ASTD) local chapters.
Selection of Participants

Because of the highly specific nature of the technical training programs found in manufacturing organizations, it was decided to focus the study on service-oriented and retail organizations. The sample organizations were drawn using the following criteria:

1. Since the literature suggests that HRD is more widely practiced in medium or large organizations (Lusterman, 1977), only organizations employing 500 employees or more were considered for the purpose of this study.

2. It was essential that the selected organizations have established provisions for some form of employee learning.

3. There was someone in the selected organization who bore responsibility for carrying out the HRD functions.

4. Since the study's target was non-manufacturing organizations, the selected organizations were service-oriented or retail organizations.

The researcher contacted the State of Michigan Department of Commerce, and received the January, 1992 "Employment and Earnings by Industry" reports for each of the twelve counties included in the study site. These county profiles listed the principal economic base employers, and included descriptions for such characteristics as the number of employees, and "type" of organization (such as retail, manufacturing, educational, etc.) for each listed organization. These profile reports were used as a reference in the selection of
participants.

Organizations that met the selection criteria were then identified. Though selection was non-random, extensive effort was made to successfully contact representative organizations throughout the study site area. However, due to demographic factors, organizations that met the study's criteria were concentrated in the broader Grand Rapids area, and comprise approximately one-third of the study sample.

Seventy organizations that appeared to meet the study's criteria were contacted by personal telephone calls or visits by the researcher. Three of these organizations upon investigation were found to be manufacturing organizations, thus not meeting the study's sampling criteria. Two organizations declined to participate after discussion with the researcher about the intent and purpose of the study. A total of sixty-five organizations agreed to participate in the study and accepted survey questionnaires. A cover letter explaining the study's purposes and procedures was addressed to each potential participant. The cover letter also included an invitation for respondents to request a personalized, organization-specific analysis of responses, as well as an overall study summary.

The researcher developed a survey administration methodology intended to facilitate and promote the participation of persons within the selected organizations, thus increasing the likelihood of a high response rate within a short period of time. The following strategy was employed:

Because the researcher was concerned that personal contact with
actual targeted participants might inadvertently lead to biased results, personal contact by telephone or, more frequently, personal visit, was made with the major support person (such as administrative aide, secretary, etc.) working with the selected participants in the HRD department of the organization. During the initial contact with the support person, a brief introduction to the study’s intent and purposes was given. Upon receiving preliminary permission to proceed, the researcher gave a fuller description of the study. The researcher requested that the support person perform the following tasks: (1) contact both the HRD manager and the upper-level manager to whom he/she reported, (2) explain the purpose of the study, (3) ask if the managers would agree to participate. If the managers agreed to participate, the support person was then asked to (4) deliver the survey instruments to the managers, and (5) return the completed questionnaires to the researcher. Sixty-five of the sixty-seven support persons so contacted agreed to perform these tasks.

Two questionnaires, cover letters, and self-addressed, stamped envelopes were left at each of the 65 participating organizations. The support personnel at each of the organizations was contacted a maximum of three times by phone or visit for follow-up, if necessary. However, if surveys were still not received after this time, no further contact was made.

It was determined by the researcher that the survey administration methodology as described above proved very effective, allowing for an adequate return-response rate in a relatively short
(six weeks) period of time.

Participants

Seventy organizations were initially contacted, and invited to participate in the study. Of these, three were disqualified for not meeting study requirements; two declined to participate, leaving an original total sample of 65 organizations that agreed to participate. Two participants from each organization were designated to complete surveys, the person in charge of human resources development activities, and the person to whom the HRD manager normally reported ("upper-level manager"). Completed survey responses from 31 upper-level and HRD manager "pairs" were received for use in this survey.

Survey Instruments

The questionnaire was based on the literature in related studies, and used the fourteen characteristics of results-oriented human resource development programs described in Chapter II as the focus. Descriptions of twenty-two training activities that typified the fourteen characteristics were developed for use on the survey instrument. A "questionnaire map" (see Table 3) was drawn up to provide an inventory of the variables of interest and a list of the questions by number that were implemented as measures.

A five-point scale was developed to assess the respondents' level of support for the activities described on the questionnaire, with 1 = "Always Recommended," 3 (midpoint) = "Sometimes Recommended," and 5 =
"Never Recommended." The questionnaire also included questions designed to gather demographic data concerning the type and size of the organization, as well as the number of employees who attend training programs each year. This information was primarily

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Question Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Planning HRD programs to reflect the overall organization's needs.</td>
<td>1, 2, 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Comparing the cost and benefits of the HRD program to be implemented.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The HRD department and management jointly make decisions about the type of HRD program needed.</td>
<td>6, 7, 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The HRD department and management jointly determine the content of HRD programs.</td>
<td>5, 8, 9, 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. HRD programs design and implementation are discussed with management.</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Participants' evaluation of program content and instructional method during the implementation.</td>
<td>11, 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Having upper-level managers participate in HRD programs.</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Evaluation of the implementation of each program by the HRD staff to determine how each program is functioning.</td>
<td>13, 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Evaluating all HRD programs by a formal method.</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Measuring HRD investment by dollar return through improved performance, productivity and cost savings.</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Involving all HRD staff in program evaluation.</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Question Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12. When employees complete HRD program, they evaluate the program and estimate the benefit of their attendance.</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. To insure the transfer of skills and knowledge, managers give positive rewards to employees who use the acquired skills and knowledge.</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Communicating the result of HRD programs to managers, HRD staff, and program's participants.</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

intended to be used as a secondary screening device, by allowing the researcher to verify whether the organization met the study's selection criteria.

The questionnaire was tested for content validity in the following manner: A draft instrument was distributed to a number of HRD experts and graduate students. These persons then examined the questionnaire's items for adequate representation of the hypothesized domain (content sampling), as well as for technical flaws such as faulty grammar or ambiguous wording. Revisions were made to address the concerns identified by the validation group, and the questionnaire was re-submitted. This process was repeated several times, until all members of the validation group agreed on the content and wording of the items contained on the survey instrument.

The questionnaire was pilot tested on 13 people, five of whom were HRD graduate students, and eight of whom were HRD practitioners and managers who worked in positions similar to those of the targeted
study population. It was determined that the reliability of the instrument would be most appropriately estimated by use of the coefficient alpha test. A correlation of .57 was identified as the lower bound of the correlation necessary to ensure adequate reliability. The means of the pilot study participants' responses were calculated for each of the twenty-two items, and a coefficient alpha value of .91 was obtained. Based on this finding, the instrument was considered reliable.

Data Collection and Analysis

Completed surveys were collected from participating organizations over a two to six week period after distribution. Of the sixty-five organizations initially agreeing to participate in the study, thirty-one complete "pairs" of responses from both the upper-level and HRD manager in each organization were received. Nine incomplete sets (i.e., only one of the managers responded) were also received. The thirty-one complete sets of responses were then coded and entered into a computer data base. A mini-computer (MacIntosh Classic II) and statistics program (Statview 512+, 1986) were utilized for the statistical analyses of responses.

The following data for each respondent was entered in the data base: (a) Position (upper-level or HRD manager), (b) Size of organization (described by number of total employees), (c) Number of employees involved annually in the HRD training program, (d) Type of organization in which they are employed (service, retail, utility,
educational), and (e) Level of support reported for each of the twenty-one results-oriented HRD activities described in the questionnaire.

Frequency distributions and mean scores of recommendation levels were calculated on each of the twenty-two activities described on the questionnaire, for the upper-level managers, HRD managers and the combined group. These figures were used to determine the level of support and acceptance reported by upper-level managers and HRD managers for each of the twenty-two activities.

In order to detect possible differences, t-tests were run between the mean responses of each group on each activity. A probability of .05 was selected to be the outward bound of alpha necessary to establish a significant value. The existence of similarities, or patterns of agreement in responses between the groups, were tested by computing matched-pair correlation coefficients on the responses of HRD managers and the upper-level managers to whom they reported. Probability predictions for the correlation coefficients utilized tables published in Galfo and Miller (1965, p. 353). A correlation coefficient value of .349 was determined to be the lower bound of correlation necessary to establish a significant relationship.

Last, the twenty-two activities were ranked by the level of mean recommendation scores given by both groups. The five most-supported and five least-supported activities were identified for both groups. These findings provided the basis for constructing a profile of the acceptance and support for results-oriented activities in the study areas, as well as to identify possible training needs of HRD managers.
in the area of results-oriented practices.

Post-hoc Analysis

While coding and entering the raw data, an apparent pattern of response was evident: The responses of individual participants frequently appeared to generally support, or generally not support, all of the described activities. Two potential sources of effect were hypothesized: (1) Measurement error due to a response-set pattern induced by the number of many, similarly-scaled items; or, (2) systematic error possibly caused by "true" differences in general levels of acceptance and support.

Since measurement error would be expected to affect both groups equally, and thus was not apt to obscure true significant differences between the sample groups, it was decided to re-analyze the data in the attempt to determine if systematic variance due to an unidentified relationship existed. Correlations were run between the combined group and the variables "size of organizations" and "size of training programs." Because "type of organization" was coded as categorical data, a one-way ANOVA procedure was selected to examine the differences/relationship between the type of organization in which participants worked and level of support reported for each of the twenty-two activities. These findings are included in Chapter IV.
Evidence of the acceptance and support for results-oriented HRD practices by upper-level managers and HRD managers was the primary focus of this study. Of secondary interest was the determination of the amount of comparative agreement between HRD managers and upper-level managers for these practices. Last, the construction of a profile including descriptions of the most recommended and the least recommended results-oriented HRD practices among the organizations, as well as of those results-oriented activities in which managers and directors appear to share levels of support, was attempted.

This chapter presents the data for the three research questions, as well as the post-hoc analysis. The post-hoc analysis addresses the research questions from the perspective of different types of organizations -- an issue not raised in the initial analysis.

Seventy organizations were initially contacted, and invited to participate in the study. Of these, three were disqualified for not meeting study requirements; two declined to participate, leaving an original total sample of 65 organizations that agreed to participate.

Survey instruments were received back from 42 organizations. However, eight organizations were dropped from the present sample
because only one of the two questionnaires were received; another one
was dropped because the HRD position was currently unfilled in the
organization. Upon examination of the remaining 33 pairs of responses,
it was found that two additional organizations did not meet the study's
criteria, and so were also dropped from the current sample. A total of
31 organizationally-paired responses were used to compile the findings
of the study, comprising a total sample of 31 HRD managers, and 31
upper-level managers (combined sample of 62 respondents). The response
rate, based on the total number of distributed questionnaires, was 58
percent.

Table 4 shows the breakdown for the type of organizations
represented in the study sample.

Table 4
Organizations Represented in the Study Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Organization</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Service (i.e. bank, insurance, health)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>46.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail (i.e. distribution, store, hotel)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility (i.e. power, water, telephone)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational (i.e. public school, college)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5 shows the size (by number of employees) of the
organizations represented in the study.
### Table 5

Size of Organizations Represented in the Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Employees</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>500 - 1000</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>70.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000 - 1500</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500 - 3500</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3500 - 15000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15000 - +</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6 shows the number of employees involved in training programs at the sampled organizations during the past year.

### Table 6

Number of Employees Involved in Annual Organizational Training at Participating Organizations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Employees Who Participate in Training Annually</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>≤ 250</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250 - 500</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 - 750</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>750 - 1000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000 ≤</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Analyses of the Perceived Value of Results-oriented Human Resources Development Practices

Research Question 1

The first research question was concerned with the level of support and acceptance of HRD managers and upper-level managers for all twenty-two results-oriented HRD activities. To address this question, responses were rank-ordered based on mean scores and grouped according to three categories. Mean recommendation scores were computed for each group and for both groups combined. These findings may be found in Table 7 (p. 94).

On the original questionnaire, subjects were asked to indicate the extent to which they felt each training activity was a recommended practice in their organization. The scale ranged from 1 being "Always Recommended" to 5 being "Never Recommended."

Although the rankings based on mean scores are reported below, for descriptive purposes, the training activities were grouped into the following categories: mean recommendation scores between 1.0 - 1.99 were described as "strong" (always) (depending on the grammatical context); mean scores between 2.0 - 2.49 were termed "moderate" (often); means between 2.5 - 3.49 were described as "occasional" (sometimes); mean scores falling between 3.5 - 3.99, "low" (seldom); and, mean scores between 4.0 - 5.0 were termed "no" (never). The training activities falling into each category are presented below. These activities are also presented in rank-order.
Category One -- Strong Support

Training Activity 1. "Training goals are based on and clearly linked to important business goals." This activity was the only one rated with a mean below 1.99 and fell into this category.

Upper-level managers had a mean score of 1.84 (sd = .78), while HRD managers had a mean score of 1.71 (sd = .90), both indicating a "strong" level of support and acceptance for this activity.

Category Two -- Moderate Support

Ten of the remaining twenty-one activities received ratings between 2.0 and 2.49. They are presented in order of their ranked means for the combined score.

Training Activity 2. "Training objectives are directly linked to job performance."

This item was ranked first in this category and second overall. The mean score of upper-level managers for this activity was 2.03 (sd = .79); the mean score for HRD managers was 2.06 (sd = .93). Both groups were determined to have a high "moderate" level of support and acceptance of this activity.

Training Activity 10. "Training includes practice and feedback on job skills."

The mean score of upper-level managers was 2.09 (sd = .87); for HRD managers, 2.09 (sd = .75), indicating "moderate" support by both
groups. This activity ranked second in this category and third overall.

Training Activity 7. "Training is provided as close as possible to when and where it is needed."

The mean recommendation score of upper-level managers for this activity was 2.09 (sd = .75), and 2.16 (sd = .89) for HRD managers, indicating a "moderate" support for this activity.

Training Activity 8. "Training, whenever possible, is done on the job, in the job place."

This activity was determined to have the "moderate support of both upper-level managers (mean = 2.07, sd = .68) and HRD managers (mean = 2.19, sd = .87).

These two activities had the same combined means. They ranked third in this category and fourth overall.

Training Activity 19. "Training staff are skilled in evaluation and measurement of business and employee performance."

The mean recommendation score for upper-level managers on this activity was 2.35 (sd = .84). HRD managers had a mean score of 2.03 (sd = .98). This indicates a "moderate" level of support and acceptance among both groups for this activity.

This activity ranked fourth in this category and fifth overall.

Training Activity 9. "Training content is highly job specific and uses job-specific examples."
Ranked fifth in this category and sixth overall, this activity was given a mean score of 2.19 (sd = .70) by upper-level managers, while HRD managers had a mean score of 2.23 (sd = .84). This activity was determined to have the "moderate" support of both groups.

**Training Activity 3.** "Training objectives are supported by job performance data."

The mean scores for upper-level managers and HRD managers for this activity (ranked sixth in this category and seventh overall) were 2.19 (sd = .89) and 2.35 (sd = 1.0) respectively. Acceptance and support of this activity was described as "moderate" for both groups.

**Training Activity 13.** "Learning is directly assessed and feedback provided to trainees."

The mean recommendation score of upper-level managers for this activity was 2.35 (sd = .84), and 2.26 (sd = .89) for HRD managers, with a ranking of seventh in this category and eighth overall, indicating "moderate" support and acceptance by both groups.

**Training Activity 20.** "Training department is accountable for impact of training, not just training hours delivered."

Ranked eighth in this category and ninth overall, this activity for upper-level managers had a mean score of 2.32 (sd = .94), and HRD managers had a mean score of 2.40 (sd = .93), indicating a "moderate" level of support of this activity for both groups.

**Training Activity 22.** "There is specific and credible evidence
of high-level management support, such as a high-level manager who makes a presentation as part of training."

Upper-level managers had a mean score of 2.35 (sd = .98), and were determined to have "moderate" support for this activity. On the other hand, HRD managers had a mean score of 2.55 (sd = 1.21), indicating this activity was supported "sometimes." When scores from groups were combined, the obtained mean score was 2.45 (sd = 1.10). Based on this finding, it was determined that this activity was given "moderate" support among the combined group. In any case, the overall ranking was tenth, with a ranking in this category of ninth (although there were ten items in this category, two of them received the same ranking).

Category Three -- Occasional Support

The eleven remaining activities received ratings between 2.5 and 3.49. They are presented in order of their ranked means of the combined score.

Training Activity 18. "Training activities stress a 'partnership' approach between line and training staff."

Upper-level managers had a mean score of 2.61 (sd = .84), giving "occasional" support for this activity. On the other hand, HRD managers had a mean score of 2.19 (sd = 1.01), indicating "moderate" support for this activity. When scores for both groups were combined, the mean level of recommendation was 2.40 (.95), indicating "moderate"
support among the combined group for this activity. The ranks were first and eleventh for this category and overall, respectively.

Training Activity 5. "Line manager from trainee's department is directly involved in making a decision to train."

Activity 5 was "sometimes" supported by both the upper-level managers (mean = 2.61, sd = 1.02) and by HRD managers (mean = 2.58, sd = .96). It ranks twelfth overall and second in this category.

Training Activity 14. "Supervisors explicitly agree to provide after-training coaching and feedback."

This activity ranked third in this category and thirteenth overall. The mean score of upper-level managers on Activity 14 was 2.67 (sd = 1.05), and was 2.60 (sd = 1.00) for HRD managers. It was determined that this activity received "occasional" support and acceptance from both groups.

Training Activity 15. "Measurement after training is done to assess whether and how trainees use their skills."

Upper-level managers had a mean score of 2.80 (sd = .98), and HRD managers a mean of 2.52 (sd = .81) for this activity, indicating "occasional" support of this activity for both groups. This activity ranked fourth in this category and fourteenth overall.

Training Activity 6. "Manager involvement in planning the when, where and how of training."

The mean score of upper-level managers for this activity was 2.71.
This activity ranked fifth in this category and fifteenth overall. Both groups were determined to have "occasional" support and acceptance of this activity.

**Training Activity 4.** "A cost-effectiveness analysis is done that clearly shows the cost of training is less than the cost of not-training before a decision to train is made."

Upper-level managers had a mean score of 2.87 (sd = 1.23) for this activity, while HRD managers had a mean of 2.77 (sd = 1.88), indicating this activity was supported "sometimes" by both groups. This activity ranked sixth in this category and sixteenth overall.

**Training Activity 21.** "Evaluation reports on the impact and cost-effectiveness of training are regularly provided to upper-level management."

The mean score for upper-level managers was 2.87 (sd = .88), and 2.83 (sd = .99) on this activity — the rankings were seventh in this category and seventeenth overall. It was determined that both groups gave this activity "occasional" support.

**Training Activity 11.** "Instruments or procedures to measure job-related performance are built into the training process."

The mean scores (the rankings were eighth in this category and eighteenth overall) of upper-level managers and HRD managers for this activity were 2.93 (sd = .89) and 2.84 (sd = 1.07), respectively.
These findings indicate only "occasional" support of this activity from both groups.

**Training Activity 16.** "Trainee's supervisors receive feedback as to how usefully they have supported training application after training."

This activity received a mean score of 2.93 (sd = .93) from upper-level managers, and 3.03 (sd = .91) from HRD managers — rankings for this category and overall of ninth and nineteenth, respectively. Based on these findings, it was determined that both groups "sometimes" supported this activity.

**Training Activity 17.** "There is measurement of long-term impact of training on business performance."

The mean recommendation scores of upper-level managers for this activity was 2.97 (sd = .91), and 3.26 (sd = .96) for HRD managers, indicating the "occasional" support from both groups — the rankings were tenth in this category and twentieth overall.

**Training Activity 12.** "Measurement instruments and procedures are reviewed by line managers to be sure they are job relevant."

Last both in this category and overall, this activity was determined to receive support "sometimes" from both the upper-level managers (mean = 3.45, sd = 1.03), and the HRD managers (mean = 3.19, sd = 1.01).
### Table 7
Mean Recommendation Scores of Upper-Level Managers and HRD Managers For Results-oriented Training Activities*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>U.L. Managers</th>
<th>HRD Managers</th>
<th>Combined Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rank Activity</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>sd</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Strong Support&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>1.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>2.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>2.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>2.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>2.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>2.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>2.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>2.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>2.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>2.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>2.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Moderate Support&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>2.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>2.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>2.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>2.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>2.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>2.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>2.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>2.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>3.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>3.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>3.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(1 = "Always, 5 = "Never")
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Research Question 2

The second question was concerned with differences and similarities between the two groups. Differences in means for each group were compared using t-tests. Matched-pair correlations were used to examine the similarities. Table 30 contains the data for these comparisons.

Training Activity 1

"Training goals are based on and clearly linked to important business goals." The mean for upper-level managers was 1.84. The mean for HRD managers was 1.71. The t-value comparing the two groups was .849. This difference was not significant.

The correlation between the matched-pairs of each group was .501, p< .01, indicating a significant positive relationship exists between the responses of the HRD managers and the upper-level managers to whom they report.

Training Activity 2

"Training objectives are directly linked to job performance." The means for the two groups were 2.03 (upper-level managers) and 2.06 (HRD managers). The obtained t-value comparing the difference between groups was -1.66. This difference was not significant.

The obtained correlation figure was .268. This value was not significant, indicating no relationship exists between the level of
support reported by HRD managers and the upper-level managers to whom they report.

Training Activity 3

"Training objectives are supported by job performance data." The mean score of upper-level managers was 2.19, and 2.35 for HRD managers. The obtained t-value of -0.776 was found to be not significant.

The obtained correlation coefficient was .286 (non-significant). It was determined there was no relationship between the responses of the two groups.

Training Activity 4

"A cost-effectiveness analysis is done that clearly shows the cost of training is less than the cost of not-training before a decision to train is made." The mean for the upper-level managers was 2.87. The mean for HRD managers was 2.77. The t-value comparing the difference between groups (t = .452) was not significant.

A significant correlation value (r = .476, p < .01) indicated a positive relationship existed between the responses of HRD directors and the upper-level managers to whom they reported.

Training Activity 5

"Line manager from trainee's department is directly involved in making a decision to train." Mean recommendation scores were computed for both the upper-level managers (2.61) and HRD managers (2.58). A t-
value of .171 indicated no significant difference between the means of the groups.

A correlation coefficient of .441 (p ≤ .05) indicated a significant positive relationship exists between the paired respondents from both groups.

**Training Activity 6**

"Manager involvement in planning the when, where, and how of training." Mean recommendation scores were 2.71 for the upper-level managers and 2.77 for HRD managers. No significant difference was found (t = -.29, p ≥ .05) between the means of both groups.

The obtained correlation figure (r = .501, p ≤ .01) showed a significant positive relationship exists between the responses of HRD managers and the upper-level managers to whom they report.

**Training Activity 7**

"Training is provided as close as possible to when and where it is needed." The mean recommendation for upper-level managers was 2.09. The mean score for HRD managers was 2.16. A non-significant t-value (-.349) indicated no significant difference between groups.

No significant relationship was found between groups (r = .225, p ≥ .05).
Training Activity 8

"Training, whenever possible, is done on the job, in the job place." The mean for upper-level managers was 2.07. The mean for HRD managers was 2.19. The t-value (-.751) was non-significant.

The obtained correlation coefficient ($r = .259$) was not significant.

Training Activity 9

"Training content is highly job specific and uses job-specific examples." The mean recommendation score for upper-level managers was 2.19; for HRD managers, 2.23. The t-value (-.197) was not significant.

A non-significant correlation value of .317 was obtained.

Training Activity 10

"Training includes practice and feedback on job skills." Mean score for upper-level managers was 2.09, as it was also for HRD managers. A t-value of 0 (no difference) was found.

The correlation between the groups ($r = -.066$) was non-significant.

Training Activity 11

"Instruments of procedures to measure job-related performance are built into the training process." The mean score for upper-level managers was 2.93; HRD managers had a mean of 2.84. No significant
difference was found between the means ($t = .516, p ≥ .05$).

A significant correlation value ($r = .444, p < .05$) indicated a positive relationship existed between the responses of HRD managers and the upper-level managers to whom they reported.

Training Activity 12

"Measurement instruments and procedures are reviewed by line managers to be sure they are job relevant." The means for the groups were 3.45 (upper-level managers) and 3.19 (HRD managers). The obtained $t$-test value of 1.278 indicated there was no significant difference between the means of the groups.

A significant positive relationship was found ($r = .393, p < .05$) for the paired responses between the groups for this activity.

Training Activity 13

"Learning is directly assessed and feedback provided to trainees." The mean scores for upper-level managers were 2.35, and 2.26 for the HRD managers. No significant difference was found between the means of the groups ($t = .532, p ≥ .05$).

No significant correlation was found between the responses of the groups ($r = .339$).

Training Activity 14

"Supervisors explicitly agree to provide after-training coaching and feedback." The mean scores for this activity were 2.67 (upper-
level managers) and 2.60 (HRD managers). The t-value was .532. This was not significant.

The obtained correlation coefficient ($r = .567, p < .01$) indicated a significant positive relationship existed between the responses of HRD managers and the upper-level managers to whom they report.

**Training Activity 15**

"Measurement after training is done to assess whether and how trainees use their skills." Upper-level managers had a mean of 2.80, while HRD managers had a mean of 2.52. The t-value (1.56) was not significant, indicating no difference existed between the means of the two groups.

The obtained correlation coefficient (.339) was also determined to be non-significant. No relationship was evident between the responses of the two groups.

**Training Activity 16**

"Trainee's supervisors receive feedback as to how usefully they have supported training application after training." A mean of 2.93 was obtained for the upper-level managers' group; 3.03 was the mean score for HRD managers. No significant difference was found between the means ($t = -.551$).

The correlation value of .435 ($p < .05$) showed a significant positive relationship existed between paired responses of the groups.
Training Activity 17

"There is measurement of long-term impact of training on business performance." The mean for the upper-level managers was 2.97, while the mean for HRD managers was 3.26. The obtained t-value (-1.166) indicated no significant difference existed between the responses of the two groups.

A correlation coefficient was computed to determine the relationship between the matched-pair responses (r = .464, p < .01). A significant positive relationship was determined to exist between the responses of HRD managers and the upper-level managers to whom they report.

Training Activity 18

"Training Activities stress a 'partnership' approach between line and training staff." The mean scores for the groups were 2.61 (upper-level managers) and 2.19 (HRD managers). The obtained t-value (t = 2.75, p < .01) indicated a significant difference existed between the mean level of support given to this activity by the two groups. It appears that HRD managers as a group are more supportive of a "partnership" approach than are the upper-level managers sampled in this study.

The correlation value (r = .597, p < .01) provided evidence that a significant positive relationship exists between the level of support given to this activity by HRD managers and the upper-level managers to
whom they report.

The findings above indicate that, though there is a significantly higher level of support for this activity among HRD directors, the stronger this activity is supported by individual HRD managers, the stronger it is in turn supported by the upper-level managers to whom they report.

Training Activity 19

"Training staff are skilled in evaluation and measurement of business and employee performance." The mean recommendation score for upper-level managers on this activity was 2.35; for HRD managers it was 2.03. The obtained t-value (2.27, p < .05) indicated a significant difference existed between the mean responses of the two groups.

A significant positive relationship (r = .633, p < .01) was found between the matched-pair responses. These findings may be similarly interpreted as those for Activity 18: Though this activity was more strongly accepted by HRD managers, the greater the level of support given by an individual HRD manager, the more likely was a correspondingly stronger support given by the upper-level manager to whom he/she reported.

It is possible that those HRD managers who value their expertise in evaluation are more active and/or visible in this role by engaging in evaluative efforts that are valued by the managers to whom they report.
Training Activity 20

"Training department is accountable for impact of training, not just training hours delivered." The mean response for upper-level managers was 2.32; for HRD managers it was 2.40. The t-value (-.328) indicated no significant difference existed between the responses of the two groups.

The obtained correlation figure (.309) was not significant.

Training Activity 21

"Evaluation reports on the impact and cost-effectiveness of training are regularly provided to upper-level management." The mean scores for the groups were 2.87 (upper-level managers) and 2.83 (HRD managers). The obtained t-value (0) indicated there was no difference between the responses of the groups.

A low positive correlation (.359) was found to be significant (p < .05). This finding somewhat supports the implications discussed under Activity 19, i.e., that in the cases where HRD managers support evaluative activities, their managers in turn are more likely to value these activities.

Training Activity 22

"There is specific and credible evidence of high-level management support, such as a high-level manager who makes a presentation as part of training." The mean recommendation score for upper-level managers
was 2.35. The mean score for HRD managers was 2.55. A non-significant t-value (-.701) was obtained for the differences between the groups.

A correlation value of .027 indicated no significant relationship existed between the responses of the groups.

Research Question 3

The third question was concerned with determining which results-oriented HRD activities received the most, and which received the least, support and acceptance from both groups. For this purpose, it was decided to identify the five activities receiving the highest support, and the five receiving the lowest support for each group.

Upper-Level Managers

Mean levels of recommendation for the results-oriented training activities described on the survey instrument were used to determine an overall profile of the use/support of upper-level managers for the designated activities. In order to determine which results-oriented HRD training activities were the most strongly recommended by the upper-level managers who participated in this study, the five activities receiving the highest mean scores were identified. These activities are shown in rank order in Table 9.

In order to determine which results-oriented HRD training activities were the least recommended by the upper-level managers who participated in this study, the five activities receiving the lowest mean scores were identified. These activities are shown in rank order
in Table 10.

Table 8
Correlation and t-Values Between the Paired Responses of Upper-Level Managers and HRD Managers in Sample Organizations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>U-L Managers</th>
<th>HRD Managers</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>.501**</td>
<td>.849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>.268</td>
<td>-1.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>.286</td>
<td>-.776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>.476**</td>
<td>.452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>.441*</td>
<td>.171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>.501**</td>
<td>-.290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>.225</td>
<td>-.349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>.259</td>
<td>-.751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>.317</td>
<td>-.197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>-.066</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>.444*</td>
<td>.516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>.393*</td>
<td>1.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>.319</td>
<td>.532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>.567**</td>
<td>.571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>.339</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>.435*</td>
<td>-.551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>.464**</td>
<td>-1.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>.597**</td>
<td>2.75**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>.633**</td>
<td>2.27*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>.309</td>
<td>-.328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>.359*</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>-.701</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p ≤ .05

**p ≤ .01
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Table 9

Five Most Highly-Recommended Results-oriented HRD Training Activities by Upper-Level Managers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training Activity</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) &quot;Training goals are based on and clearly linked to important business goals.&quot;</td>
<td>(1.84)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) &quot;Training objectives are directly linked to job performance.&quot;</td>
<td>(2.03)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8) &quot;Training, whenever possible, is done on the job, in the job place.&quot;</td>
<td>(2.07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) &quot;Training is provided as close as possible to when and where it is needed.&quot; (tie)</td>
<td>(2.09)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10) &quot;Training includes practice and feedback on job skills.&quot; (tie)</td>
<td>(2.09)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10

Five Least-Recommended Results-oriented HRD Training Activities by Upper-Level Managers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training Activity</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(12) &quot;Measurement instruments and procedures are reviewed by line managers to be sure they are job relevant.&quot;</td>
<td>(3.45)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(17) &quot;Specific Supervisor practices to support after-training usage of skills and knowledge are a part of the training plan.&quot;</td>
<td>(2.97)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(11) &quot;Instruments or procedures to measure job-related performance are built into the training process.&quot;</td>
<td>(2.93)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(16) &quot;Trainee's supervisors receive feedback as to how usefully they have supported training application after training.&quot;</td>
<td>(2.93)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(21) &quot;Evaluation reports on impact and cost-effectiveness of training are regularly provided to upper-level management.&quot;</td>
<td>(2.87)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
HRD Managers

Mean levels of recommendation for the results-oriented training activities described on the survey instrument were used to determine an overall profile of the use/support of HRD directors for the designated activities.

In order to determine which results-oriented HRD training activities were the most strongly recommended by the HRD directors who participated in this study, the five activities receiving the highest mean scores were identified. These activities are shown in rank order in Table 11.

Table 11

Five Most Highly-Recommended Results-oriented HRD Training Activities by HRD Managers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training Activity</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) &quot;Training goals are based on and clearly linked to important business goals.&quot;</td>
<td>(1.71)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(19) &quot;Training staff are skilled in evaluation and measurement of business and employee performance.&quot;</td>
<td>(2.03)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) &quot;Training objectives are directly linked to job performance.&quot;</td>
<td>(2.06)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10) &quot;Training includes practice and feedback on job skills.&quot;</td>
<td>(2.09)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) &quot;Training is provided as close as possible to when and where it is needed.&quot;</td>
<td>(2.16)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In order to determine which results-oriented HRD training activities were the least recommended by the HRD managers who participated in this study, the five activities receiving the lowest mean scores were identified. These activities are shown in rank order in Table 12.

Table 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training Activity</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(17) &quot;Specific supervisor practices to support after-training usage of skills and knowledge are a part of the training plan.&quot;</td>
<td>(3.26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(12) &quot;Measurement instruments and procedures are reviewed by line managers to be sure they are job relevant.&quot;</td>
<td>(3.19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(16) &quot;Trainee's supervisors receive feedback as to how usefully they have supported training application after training.&quot;</td>
<td>(3.03)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(11) &quot;Instruments or procedures to measure job-related performance are built into the training process.&quot;</td>
<td>(2.84)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(21) &quot;Evaluation reports on impact and cost-effectiveness or training are regularly provided to upper-level management.&quot;</td>
<td>(2.83)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comparisons Between Groups

Of the five most recommended results-oriented training activities by both groups, the upper-level managers and HRD managers identified four of the same activities (i.e., Activities 1, 2, 7, and 10),
indicating a shared, high level of support for these practices. However, each group gave strong support for an activity that was not shared by the other: Upper-level managers gave Activity 8 a "moderate" recommendation ("Training, when possible, is done on the job, in the job place"); HRD managers gave "moderate" support for Activity 19 ("Training staff are skilled in evaluation and measurement of business and employee performance").

The upper-level managers and HRD managers who participated in this study shared the same least-recommended activities (i.e., Activities 11, 12, 16, 17, and 21), indicating a generally low support in both groups for these results-oriented practices.

**Total Group Findings**

Combined mean levels of recommendation of both groups for the results-oriented training activities described on the survey instrument were used to determine an overall profile of the organizational use/support for the designated activities.

Overall, 54.5 percent, or twelve, of the twenty-two results-oriented training activities were given "moderate" or better (1.0 - 2.49) levels of recommendation by the combined sample of participants in the study (Activities 1, 2, 3, 7, 8, 9, 10, 13, 18, 19, and 20). Only one results-oriented practice, Activity 1, was given a "strong" (1.0 - 1.99) level of recommendation. The remaining 44.5 percent of the activities were identified as "sometimes recommended" (2.5 - 3.49). No activities received mean scores indicating a "low" to "no" level of...
recommendation.

It was determined that, though a substantial number of activities were found to be only "occasionally" supported, a majority of the results-oriented HRD activities are well-accepted and supported by upper-level and HRD managers in the target area. Figure 1 was constructed to represent a profile of the support and acceptance of upper-level and HRD managers for these activities.

* solid = U-L Managers

* striped = HRD Managers

Figure 1. Profile on the Support and Acceptance of Results-oriented HRD Activities by Upper-Level and HRD Managers.
Post-Hoc Analysis

During the coding and data-entry process, a pattern of responses was seen that had not been anticipated in the original design of the study: The responses of individual participants appeared to show generally strong support, or generally low support, for the activities described overall. In other words, it appeared that the observed variance of the responses to each item, and between separate items, was less related to the specifically-described activities *per se*, and was more related to the individual respondent's overall level of support and acceptance of results-oriented HRD activities, as indicated by a general pattern of acceptance/non-acceptance for all activities.

It was believed that two possibilities might account for the observed patterns: (1) Measurement error, and (2) systematic variance.

1. The survey instrument may have been flawed, in that its design did not compensate for the known tendency of examinees to establish a "response-set" pattern when responding to many, similarly scaled survey items. It is possible, then, that this phenomenon could have contributed to the high reliability coefficient alpha value (.91) obtained from the pilot test. If this indeed were the case, the effect of this measurement error would be expected to have a random effect on individuals from both sample groups, thus affecting the mean responses of both groups equally. In other words, this effect would likely not obscure results, were there a "true," substantial difference in the level of support for the activities between the two groups.
2. Alternately, it was possible that there was a systematic difference between individual respondents' overall support and acceptance of results-oriented HRD activities. The evidence of a substantial number (11, or 50 percent) of significant correlations between the matched-pairs of upper-level and HRD managers suggested that this hypothesized difference may be attributable to dimensions in the workplace. If so, comparing the differences between the mean responses of groups defined by the differences in their workplace might possibly indicate an unpredicted effect that systematically contributed to variance in item responses, yet obscured the actual pattern/profile of support and acceptance of results-oriented HRD activities.

Demographic data which described a limited number of dimensions of the workplace had been solicited as part of the survey instrument. These data were used to define new groups, as is described below.

1. Size of organization. In order to determine whether a relationship existed between the size of the organization for which an individual respondent worked and the level of support reported, correlations were run between organization size (as defined by the number of workers employed by the organization) and responses of all participants to each of the activities. No significant correlations were obtained; in fact most correlation values were extremely low (.19 - .01).

2. Size of training program. Correlations were run between the reported average number of employees in each organization trained in one year and participants' level of support for each activity. Again,
the obtained values were extremely low and not significant.

3. Type of organization. Because the variable "organization type" was nominal (qualitative) data and there were four categories, a one-way ANOVA procedure was chosen to examine this dimension. One-way ANOVAs were run between identified type of organization for which each respondent worked and responses to each activity. This analysis provided the mean and standard deviation of responses for those participants in each type of organization. Observation of these groups' means and deviations identified a noticeable difference between the overall level of acceptance and support of the activities given by each group. Obtained $F$ values indicated a significant difference between these groups existed for Activities 1, 4, 5, 11, 12, and 15. These figures are shown on Table 13.

A total mean score and standard deviation was computed for each group on the responses to all the activities combined. These means are graphically presented on Figure 2.

![Figure 2: Mean Level of Recommendation by Organization Type](image-url)

Figure 2. Mean Level of Recommendation by Organization Type.
Table 13
Differences Between Mean Level of Recommendation for Results-oriented HRD Training Activities Between Types of Organizations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Retail</th>
<th>Utility</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>2.876*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>.742</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>3.404*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>3.776**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>.364</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>.773</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>2.928*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.530*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>4.14**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>.281</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Mean Score

2.57(.42) 2.27(.29) 2.98(.57) 2.5(.50)

* p < .05
** p < .01
It was concluded that the type of organization for which respondents work could have acted as a mediating variable, contributing systematic variance to item responses.

Limitations/Discussion

It must be noted that, in doing the above ANOVA procedure, the basic assumption of random selection was not met. Therefore, these findings must be interpreted with caution. However, the findings indicated that one possible source of variance of response to items may well by systematic; that is, it is possible that the type of organization for which respondents work is related to the support and acceptance given to various results-oriented HRD activities by those in the workplace. Support for these activities may be influenced by the needs and traditions of the specific organization for which an individual works. Based on the results of the post-hoc analysis, it is believed that an examination of the use and acceptance of results-oriented HRD organizations within different types of organizations would be of potential use in understanding the overall level of support given to these activities in the sample area.

Post-hoc Profile

A second profile on the support for results-oriented HRD activities was constructed using the data obtained from the post-hoc analysis. Because representatives from different organizations appeared to have different patterns in the level of support given to
these activities, it was believed a profile based on type and number of organizations would allow for a broader perspective and understanding of the support and acceptance for results-oriented HRD activities in the sample area. These data may be found in Tables 14-18.

Table 14

Results-oriented HRD Practices Receiving Moderate to Strong Mean Levels of Recommendation by Types of Organizations Sampled Activities Recommended by All Types of Organizations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Retail</th>
<th>Utility</th>
<th>Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Training is provided as close as possible to when and where it is needed</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training, whenever possible, is done on the job, in the job place</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 15
Activities Recommended by Three Types of Organizations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Retail</th>
<th>Utility</th>
<th>Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Training goals are based on and clearly linked to important business goals</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>(2.67)</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Training objectives are directly linked to job performance</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>(2.67)</td>
<td>2.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Training content is highly job-specific and uses job-specific skills</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>(2.50)</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Training includes practice and feedback on job skills</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>(2.50)</td>
<td>2.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Training staff are skilled in evaluation and measurement of business and employee performance</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>(3.00)</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 16

Activities Recommended by Two Types of Organizations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Retail</th>
<th>Utility</th>
<th>Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 Training objectives are supported by job performance data</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>(2.67) (2.62)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Line manager from trainee's department is directly involved in making decision to train</td>
<td>(2.89)</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>(3.33) 2.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Training activities stress a &quot;partnership&quot; approach between line and training staff</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>(3.00) (3.00)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Training staff regularly interact with line management (versus spend all time in training unit)</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>(2.50) (2.50)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 There is specific and credible evidence of high-level management support (presentations)</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>(2.83) (3.00)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 17

Activities Recommended by One Type of Organization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Retail</th>
<th>Utility</th>
<th>Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>84 Cost-effectiveness analysis is done before a decision to train is made that shows the cost of training is less than the cost of not training</td>
<td>(3.00)</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>(3.83)</td>
<td>(2.75)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Learning is directly assessed and feedback provided to trainees</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>(2.50)</td>
<td>(2.67)</td>
<td>(2.50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 There is measurement of long-term impact of training on business performance</td>
<td>(2.68)</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>(3.50)</td>
<td>(2.50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Measurement after training is done to assess whether and how trainees use their skills</td>
<td>(2.96)</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>(3.33)</td>
<td>(2.87)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Evaluation reports on impact and cost-effectiveness of training are regularly provided to upper-level management</td>
<td>(3.07)</td>
<td>(2.72)</td>
<td>(3.00)</td>
<td>2.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities</td>
<td>Service</td>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>Utility</td>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Manager involvement in planning the when, where and how of training</td>
<td>(2.64)</td>
<td>(2.61)</td>
<td>(3.00)</td>
<td>(3.62)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Instruments/procedures to measure job-related performance are built into the training process</td>
<td>(3.11)</td>
<td>(2.50)</td>
<td>(3.50)</td>
<td>(2.62)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Measurement instruments and procedures are reviewed by line managers to be sure they are job relevant</td>
<td>(3.36)</td>
<td>(2.83)</td>
<td>(4.17)</td>
<td>(3.75)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Trainee's supervisors receive feedback on usefulness of their training support efforts</td>
<td>(2.75)</td>
<td>(3.11)</td>
<td>(3.33)</td>
<td>(3.25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Specific supervisor practices to support after-training usage of skills and knowledge are a part of the training plan</td>
<td>(3.21)</td>
<td>(2.78)</td>
<td>(3.67)</td>
<td>(3.37)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter will summarize the study purpose, methodology, data collection procedures and results. Also, based on the results, the study conclusions and recommendations will be stated.

Summary

The field of Human Resource Development has grown and developed during the last three decades. It has become an important component of most of today's organizations as evidenced by these factors: many corporations have appointed executive-level positions for HRD or training. Organizational investments in workers' knowledge, skills, and attitudes are increasing, as an estimated $45.5 billion was spent on formal training by U.S. corporations in 1989 (Lee, 1990). The total number of employees who receive formal training annually is more than 39 million (Phillips, 1991).

The investment in employees' training, education and development, like any other investment, is expected to provide a return to the organization. HRD leaders are more frequently being asked to show the return on investment of HRD programs in terms of employees' productivity and organizational profitability and effectiveness. By that, the organization expects that HRD programs will make a difference in the organization's overall performance and productivity. It also
expects that HRD will result in reducing the operating costs and contribute to the effectiveness and competitiveness of its products.

Thus, HRD professionals are under increasing pressure to show that their programs are worthwhile and produce bottom-line results. HRD practitioners are being asked to provide their organizations with more effective and results-oriented HRD activities. They must find ways to make HRD programs become more effective at fostering and maintaining the competence of employees and the whole organization (Brinkerhoff, 1987).

Results-oriented HRD is a term used in professional literature to represent HRD approaches that emphasize results from investment in HRD programs. It means that HRD programs must be driven by the organizations' needs and must help the organizations to achieve their goals. Results-oriented HRD requires a systematic procedure to develop and measure all HRD activities: a systematic procedure which will make HRD programs more effective and bring about change and results in individual productivity and organizational efficiency.

It is HRD which should be accountable for positively impacting the learning objectives presented in its programs. However, the use of the acquired learning is beyond the control of the HRD organization. It is the organization as a whole which has the power to encourage change and provide the support needed for HRD to result and pay off. Results-oriented HRD, therefore, is a collective effort which should be shared by HRD practitioners and management. However, despite the size of investment in HRD programs and the expected future increase and
demands of its functions, it is possible that HRD practitioners and organization management do not see eye-to-eye regarding acceptable training activities. The purpose of this study was to explore this possibility.

More specifically, the study sought to explore the acceptance of, and support for, results-oriented training activities by upper-level managers and HRD managers in the study target area. A secondary focus of this study was to examine the differences or similarities between the perceptions of upper-level managers and HRD managers concerning results-oriented activities. Third, the study sought to create a profile of the support for and/or use of results-oriented HRD activities in the target organizations. This profile included both the most-recommended and the least-recommended practices within the local target organizations. It also included an examination of the level of support for results-oriented HRD activities among the four types of organization represented in the study sample.

The main research questions were as follows: (1) What is the level of support of local HRD managers and upper-level managers for the characteristics of results-oriented HRD activities, (2) What are the similarities and differences between the level of support of upper-level and HRD managers for ROHRD activities, and (3) Which RO HRD activities are the most supported and which are the least supported by both groups?

Based on literature in related studies and using the research questions as the focus of attention, fourteen results-oriented HRD
activities were defined. Those fourteen characteristics were operationalized into twenty-two activities in the form of a questionnaire. The questionnaire was developed to investigate the perceptions of, and support for results-oriented HRD practices. The questionnaire also sought demographic data concerning the type and size of the organization as well as of their respective training programs.

The setting of the study was the West Michigan area, a geographical area located in the lower peninsula of the state of Michigan. Sixty-five organizations within the twelve-county selection site agreed to participate in the study. Two survey questionnaires were given to each organization, one to be filled out by the HRD manager, the other by the upper-level manager. The questionnaire described training practices, or activities, that exemplified the fourteen characteristics of results-oriented HRD programs. Respondents were asked to indicate, on a 5-point rating scale, the extent to which they recommended each practice in their respective organizations.

Data were collected between two to four weeks after the initial contact of participating organizations. Questionnaires from organizations that did not return both completed surveys were discarded. Responses were then entered into a computer base, then further analyzed.

Frequency distributions and mean scores of recommendation levels were used to rank each of the twenty-two activities described on the questionnaire for the upper-level managers, HRD managers, and total group. These analyses helped to assess the relative perceived value of
these activities held by each group and those practices most and/or least recommended by the participants. These results were also used to investigate the evident prevalence and acceptance of results-oriented HRD practices in the study site.

A t-test for independent means were performed on each variable to detect significant differences between the means of both groups. Correlation coefficients were also computed between the matched pairs of each variable in order to examine patterns of relative agreement on activities between the pairs.

Mean responses were ranked to identify the top five most-recommended activities, and the five least-recommended activities for each group. This analysis was used to construct a profile on the acceptance and support for results-oriented HRD activities in the study area.

A post-hoc analysis was undertaken to examine possible factors contributing to the relationship between the responses of the upper-level and the HRD managers. One-way ANOVAs were computed on the mean scores for each activity for participants in different types of organizations. These analyses indicated that levels of support may be related to the type of organization in which a manager works.

Conclusions

In this section, the complete findings of the study are first summarized as they pertain to each research question. Next, a synthesis-discussion is presented in order to facilitate a broader
understanding of the study's findings.

Summary of Findings

Research Question 1

Based on the combined mean levels of support for both groups, the twenty-two activities were ranked. Only one activity received "strong" support and acceptance: "Training goals are based on and clearly linked to important business goals."

Ten activities were given moderate support ("often recommended"). Overall, the eleven top-ranked activities generally fell into three broad areas of concern: (1) Practices that supported and linked the purpose and content of training to specific, important business and job performance goals (Activities 1, 2, 3, and 9); (2) Practices that supported the feasibility of implementation and the effectiveness of specific staff training (Activities 7, 8, 10, 13, and 19); and (3) A practice that apparently defined the two groups' most-agreed-upon description of the role/responsibilities for HRD staff (Activity 20, "Training department is accountable for impact of training, not just hours delivered."). HRD managers also ranked Activity 19 (described below in research question 3) very high, yet this activity was not supported by upper-level managers.

The eleven activities that were given only "occasional support fell into two broad categories: (1) practices that described active roles and responsibilities of upper-level managers in actual training,
support, evaluation, and decision-making in the HRD program (Activities 18, 5, 6, 12, 16, and 17); and (2) practices that involved and/or supported the assessment of long-term training impact, cost-effectiveness and analysis of organizational needs (Activities 4, 11, 14, 15, and 21).

Research Question 2

Correlational analyses showed that for a majority (12, or 54.5 percent) of the described activities, a positive significant relationship existed between the responses of the upper-level and HRD managers. These correlations do not imply strong recommendations of these activities, but rather indicate that agreement, or shared understanding, exists between pairs of HRD managers and the upper-level managers to whom they report.

With the exception of Activity 1 (quoted in last section), practices that showed a significant correlation between the matched manager pairs were related to two broad categories: (1) practices that involved wide-range HRD evaluation activities (Activities 19, 14, 4, 11, and 21); and (2) practices concerned with upper-level manager involvement in program and evaluation decisions and/or training (Activities 18, 6, 17, 5, 16, and 22).

It may be noted that a majority (75 percent) of the activities on which managers' paired responses were correlated are also those activities that received only "occasional" levels of support and acceptance (as determined by overall mean levels of recommendation).
There is less agreement on activities that receive stronger levels of support. It is likely that support for results-oriented HRD activities is somehow contingent upon, or related to, the HRD needs or traditions within the individual organization in which an upper-level and HRD manager is employed. This premise is explored more fully in a post-hoc analysis summarized later in this section.

Research Question 3

Based on the mean levels of recommendation, the five most-recommended activities for each group were identified. The two groups shared the following four top-ranked activities:

"Training goals are based on and clearly linked to job performance." (Activity 1).

"Training objectives are directly linked to job performance." (Activity 2).

"Training is provided as close as possible to when and where it is needed." (Activity 7).

"Training includes practice and feedback on job skills." (Activity 10).

Activity 18 ("Training, whenever possible, is done on the job, in the job place") was also identified as one of the five most-supported activities by the upper-level managers only; Activity 19 ("Training staff are skilled in evaluation and measurement of business and employee performance") was a top-ranked activity for HRD managers.

Both groups shared the same five least-recommended activities:

"Evaluation reports on impact and cost-effectiveness of training are regularly provided to upper-level management." (Activity 21).
"Trainee's supervisors receive feedback as to how usefully they have supported training application after training." (Activity 16).

"Instruments or procedures to measure job-related performance are built into the training process." (Activity 11).

"Specific supervisor practices to support after-training usage of skills and knowledge are a part of the training plan." (Activity 17).

"Measurement instruments and procedures are reviewed by line managers to be sure they are job relevant." (Activity 12).

In an effort to better understand the meaning of the correlations between managers, the researcher explored the available data for additional clues concerning possible factors affecting these relationships. Specifically, it seemed curious that 75 percent of the activities in which significant correlations between groups were found had overall low mean levels of support; yet, in order for a correlation to be present, it is necessary that at least some manager-pairs rated these activities higher.

It was hypothesized that support for these activities might be related to dimensions of the workplace. Correlational analyses on the relationship between the size of both the overall organization and the training program, to the level of support showed no relationships existed between these factors. One-way ANOVAs between the type of organization and level of support showed a significant difference between organizational groups on six activities (1, 4, 5, 11, 12 and 15).

Inspection of the obtained mean scores on activities for these groups provided a different interpretation and profile on the support
and acceptance of results-oriented HRD activities; i.e., that support and acceptance for many activities may be substantially related to the type of organization in which the managers are employed. These findings indicate that future studies on the differences in support for results-oriented activities may provide valuable insight on the role and effectiveness of HRD activities in different types of organizations.

Synthesis-Discussion of Findings

Upper-level Managers' Support for ROHRD Activities

Eleven (50 percent) of the results-oriented HRD activities described on the survey instrument received moderate or higher (1.0 - 2.49) mean levels of recommendation from upper-level managers sampled. Among the most strongly recommended activities were those advocating training strategies tightly focused on job-specific content, as well as goals and purposes closely linked to important and specific business goals (Activities 1, 2, 3, and 9). The provision of feedback to trainees about the success of their efforts was also recommended (Activities 10 and 13). Other practices receiving moderately high recommendations were those advocating training in close proximity to the workplace, when needed (7 and 8). Upper-level managers also recommended that HRD managers be skilled in the evaluation and measurement of business and employee performance (19) (possibly to support giving valuable feedback to trainees); that training staff...
regularly interact with line management (20); and that managers show their support for training programs by such examples as presentations at training sessions (22).

Among those activities that received lower levels of recommendation were those that were concerned with overall evaluation of the training program and needs/costs assessment (14, 4, 15, and 21), as well as those concerned with manager involvement in training/evaluation decisions and practices (5, 6, 12, 16, 17 and 18). These findings suggest that upper-level managers value training activities designed to support specific, important business goals that are convenient and feasible to implement. However, upper-level managers gave less recommendation to practices that directly involved them in training practices and decisions, as well as those that described long-term impact and cost analysis. This finding may suggest that upper-level managers demand that HRD managers should be held accountable for their jobs and prove its contribution to the organizational goals, while they (line managers) should be less involved in accountability and transfer activities.

**HRD Managers' Support for ROHRD Activities**

Eleven (50 percent) of the results-oriented HRD activities described on the questionnaire received moderate or higher mean levels of recommendation by the HRD managers sampled in the study. As was found with upper-level managers, HRD staff gave strongest recommendations to practices that supported a focused, job-specific
content and basis, that was linked clearly to important business goals (Activities 1, 2, 3, and 9). Feedback to trainees about the success and effectiveness of their efforts (10 and 13) was given moderately high recommendation, as were practices that stressed a convenient, feasible location and implementation (7 and 8). HRD managers recommended relatively strongly (2.09) that training staff be skilled in the evaluation and measurement of business and employee performance (19).

Though HRD managers, like upper-level managers, recommend regular interaction between the two groups (20), HRD managers recommend a partnership approach (18) more strongly than do managers. However, they only "sometimes" recommend practices that described additional involvement of supervisors in training or evaluation activities and decisions (5, 22, 6, 12, 16, and 17). In addition, evaluation activities concerned with cost-effectiveness/analysis and long-term impact (14, 4, 11, and 21) were also only "sometimes" recommended. This may suggest that HRD managers resist other managers' involvement in the activities that are considered by them as a professional job. This, however, does not mean that HRD managers resist management support.

Overall profile of support for ROHRD activities in study area: When responses of both groups were combined into mean total group responses, twelve (54.5 percent) of the twenty-two results-oriented HRD activities received moderate or stronger (1.00 - 2.49) mean levels of recommendation. As was seen in the findings described for the separate
groups, two broad categories of practices received the highest level of recommendation: (1) Practices that supported and linked the content and purpose of training to specific and important business and job performance goals (1, 2, 3, and 9); (2) Practices that supported the feasibility of implementation and effectiveness of specific staff training (7, 8, 10, 13, and 19).

A third area defined the "moderately" recommended relationship between and responsibilities of the HRD managers and upper-level managers in employee training (18, 20, and 22). This third category of recommended practices perhaps bears further examination. The only results-oriented activity in this category that received "moderate" (2.0 - 2.49) mean levels of recommendation from both groups was Activity 20 ("Training staff regularly interact with line management"). Training activities which "stress a partnership approach between line and training staff" (Activity 18) received a moderately strong recommendation (2.19) by HRD managers, but was only "sometimes" recommended (2.61) by upper-level managers. However, upper-level managers gave a higher level of recommendation (2.35) to showing "specific and credible evidence of high-level management support", (such as presentations by managers during training), than did HRD managers, who only "sometimes" (2.55) recommended this practice.

Furthermore, activities that described additional involvement of the management in actual training, support, evaluation and decision-making (5, 6, 12, 16, and 17) were only "sometimes" recommended by both groups. These findings suggest there is some tension between HRD
managers and upper-level managers concerning the roles/relationships of each in the training program, as well as some resistance of both to the increased participation of management in program decision-making and responsibilities.

A fourth broad category of activities was only "sometimes" recommended by both groups: Activities that involved the assessment of long-term training impact, cost-effectiveness, and analysis of needs, and the utilization of measurement procedures/instruments to support these assessments (Activities 4, 11, 14, 15, and 21). It is possible that HRD managers may be reluctant either to assume the additional burden or increased accountability that use of these practices may incur. In addition, it may also be possible that these practices have not traditionally been accepted by both groups as falling within the typical role or responsibility of the HRD manager and department.

Relationships Between Upper-level and HRD Managers' Support

Overall, there was agreement in the amount of recommendation given by individual pairs of HRD managers and the upper-level managers to whom they reported. Correlational analyses showed that, for a majority (12, or 54.5 percent) of the activities described on the questionnaire, a positive, significant relationship existed, indicating that HRD managers' recommendations were more likely to be in accord with the strength of the recommendations of the upper-level managers to whom they reported.

This finding suggests that organizational policy and/or
expectations concerning these twelve activities are more explicit or commonly understood — whether highly recommended or not — by the personnel within the organizations studied. To reiterate this point, it is important to note that the evidence of a significant, positive correlation on these activities does not imply strong recommendation of these activities (in fact, many of these activities were given relatively low recommendations), but rather indicate agreement or responsiveness between the pairs of managers and HRD managers studied. With the exception of Activity 1, the activities that showed significant correlation between responses involved wide-range HRD evaluative practices (19, 14, 4, 11, and 21) and those concerned with supervisor involvement in program and evaluation decisions and training (18, 6, 17, 5, 16, and 12).

Factors Contributing to Support of ROHRD Activities

In an attempt to better understand the acceptance of, and support for, results-oriented activities in the sampled organizations, participants' responses were divided by the type of organizations represented by each. One-way ANOVAs run on this basis revealed significantly different patterns of responses between the four types of organizations represented in the study. As these findings are based on non-stratified, unequal, chance selection, inferences from the data must be treated with caution. However, the differences were sufficiently provocative as to bear further examination: (1) Participants from retail organizations (n = 18) gave moderate or
stronger mean levels of recommendation to 68 percent of the results-oriented practices described on the survey instrument; (2) Service organization representatives (n = 28) similarly supported 54.5 percent of the activities; (3) Those representing educational institutions (n = 8) gave moderate or stronger support to 40.9 percent; and, (4) Participants from utility companies (n = 6) gave moderate or stronger recommendations to only 9.1 percent of the described activities.

A second profile of the acceptance and support of results-oriented HRD activities was constructed from the data obtained from this last analysis (see Table 37). Only two activities (7 and 8) received moderate or stronger mean levels of recommendation from representatives of all four types of organizations, whereas five activities (6, 11, 12, 16, and 17) were rated as "sometimes" or less recommended by all organizations represented in the study.

These findings suggest that the acceptance of and support for results-oriented activities may be related to the unique and specific needs of different types of organizations; e.g., it may be that educational institutions are less concerned with cost-effectiveness as a primary basis for training decisions, though this factor may be of prime importance to those in retail organizations. Further examination of the effectiveness, feasibility, utility of, and support for, results-oriented HRD practices in different types of organizations is warranted by the preliminary results found in this study.

Finally, these findings, in general, suggested that results-oriented HRD activities are favorably perceived by both HRD managers
and upper-level managers in the sample organizations. The findings also indicated that there is a considerable level of agreement between the two groups.

Recommendations for Further Research

This study was concerned about the fact that organizations increased their investment in HRD programs, expect that these programs will make a difference in the employees' performance and productivity, and ultimately get a return from that investment. That put HRD practitioners under increasing pressure to show that their programs are worthwhile and their efforts will produce bottom-line results. This study revealed several important issues that need to be addressed in future studies.

1. HRD practitioners must take the lead and work more closely with the organizations' management, both upper-level and line managers, to provide HRD programs that are related more directly to business goals and are linked to job performance. The two groups should work together in order to plan HRD programs that help solve immediate problems and to relate these programs to the organizational achievements and goals. There is a need for an in-depth study to examine the partnership approach between management and HRD staff. This kind of study should examine and explore how the two groups can effectively work together.

2. The evaluation process of HRD programs is an expensive and time-consuming one. However, evaluation of HRD activities is a vital
and critical element of the success and survival of HRD function. HRD literature provides many evaluation models and approaches which lay down the guidelines, and in some cases, in-depth details, on how to evaluate training programs. A study is needed to examine the applicability of these models and what the obstacles are, if any, that may prevent HRD practitioners from using these models. This kind of study will reveal reasons and suggestions regarding the use of scientific evaluation models and will help HRD professionals to gain insight into the real practices and evaluation methods in the workplace.

3. This study is an attempt to explore the participants' perception regarding some training activities. The result of the study is limited to the geographic area and the small population that the study represented. A similar study with a larger population and covering a wider geographic area could be more helpful to answer the study concern. A nation-wide study on the same topic will result in more understanding of results-oriented HRD.

4. Another study may be conducted to explore the acceptance of, and support for results-oriented HRD activities among different types of organizations (i.e., service organizations, manufacturing organizations, non-profit organizations, etc.) to compare different organizations' practices of HRD and to examine whether the acceptance of and support for results-oriented HRD activities are related to the unique and specific needs of different types of organizations as this study suggested.
5. Although this study is limited in terms of its setting and population, the results may encourage other researchers to further validate its results by using other methods of investigation to determine the role of HRD or training departments in an organization and its relation with other departments. A study of an organization whose HRD department is involved and participates in the planning and overall function of the organization, and a study of an organization whose HRD department have the traditional roles and performs as a service department are recommended. This kind of study may provide a better understanding of HRD's impact on the success of an organization.
Appendix A

Cover Letter
Date, December 10, 1992

Dear

I am writing to ask for your participation in an important research project that is part of my doctoral study. Earlier, I obtained your organization's agreement to participate in this study and you were designated as the appropriate person to fill out the enclosed questionnaire.

The study concerns training programs and their benefits for the organization as well as the employees. More specifically, the purpose of this study is to compare upper-level management's perceptions of preferred approaches to training to the perceptions of training managers. Thus, you are asked to (a) respond to the enclosed instrument entitled "Training Manager's Questionnaire," then (b) to provide the other copy entitled "Upper Level Manager's Questionnaire" to the person outside of your training department or unit to whom the people in the training department report.

The enclosed questionnaire consists of two parts. Part I asks for demographic data, information about your organization's type of business or service, and number of employees and trainees. Part II asks about your perceptions of selected training activities, "training" being defined as "systematic provision of learning activities intended to provide job-related skills and knowledge."

Please fill out your questionnaire and return it as soon as you can, and give the other one to the appropriate upper-level management
The data reported from this study will be kept confidential. There is a code number in the upper righthand corner so I can keep track of both questionnaires from each company. Stamped, self-addressed envelopes are provided to help you and the other person in returning the questionnaires.

As a special enticement for you to complete and return these instruments, you may request a customized analysis for your company. This will have two parts:

(A) It will summarize differences between your perceptions and the perceptions of your upper-level manager.

(B) Your customized report will let you compare your individual opinions to the average response of all other study respondents.

You might find this customized report a useful tool for stimulating discussion both within and outside your training department. I hope that the opportunity to receive this fully confidential and anonymous report will encourage you to help me by participating in this study.

Thank you for your time and cooperation. If you have any questions, please call me (collect) at (616) 372-7004.

Sincerely,

Abdulmohsin Al-Luheid
3410 Kenbrooke Court
Kalamazoo, MI 49007
Appendix B

Training Managers' Questionnaire
Training Manager's Questionnaire

Part I

Directions: This part of the questionnaire includes some demographic questions. These questions are to give the researcher information about you and your organization so he can group the respondents accordingly. Please answer all the questions.

1. Your position: ________________________________

2. Approximate number of employees in your organization: __________

3. Approximate number of employees in your organization who attend any type of training or developmental activities (training program, seminar, workshops, conference, etc.) each year: ___________.

4. Your organization type is (check one):

   ____ Service Organization (financial institute, insurance, health care, etc.)

   ____ Retail Trade (distribution, hotels, restaurant, department store, etc.)

   ____ Utility (power, telephone, water, etc.)

   ____ Education Institution (public school, college, university, etc.)

5. Would you like to receive an individualized analysis comparing your responses to your training colleagues' responses?

   ____ yes  ____ no

   If yes, please give your name and address:

   ______________________________________

   ______________________________________

   ______________________________________
Part II

Directions: In this part of the questionnaire, there are twenty-two statements. Each represents a main activity of training. Please read each statement carefully and select a response that best represents your opinion by circling one number among the five numbers (1 through 5) provided between the two choices of answers. Please note that choosing number 1 would indicate that the activity is always a recommended practice for training in your company; choosing number 5 would indicate that the activity is never a recommended practice for training in your company; and choosing number 3 would indicate that the activity is sometimes a recommended practice in your company.

1. Training goals are based on and clearly linked to important business goals:

   Always a recommended practice for training in our company
   1 2 3 4 5
   Never a recommended practice for training in our company

2. Training objectives are directly linked to job performance:

   Always a recommended practice for training in our company
   1 2 3 4 5
   Never a recommended practice for training in our company

3. Training objectives are supported by job performance data:

   Always a recommended practice for training in our company
   1 2 3 4 5
   Never a recommended practice for training in our company

4. Cost-effectiveness analysis is done before a decision to train is made that shows clearly that cost of training is less than the costs of not training:

   Always a recommended practice for training in our company
   1 2 3 4 5
   Never a recommended practice for training in our company
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5. Line manager from trainee's department is directly involved in making a decision to train:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Always a recommended practice for training in our company</th>
<th>Never a recommended practice for training in our company</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Manager involvement in planning the when, where and how of training:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Always a recommended practice for training in our company</th>
<th>Never a recommended practice for training in our company</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Training is provided as close as possible to when and where it is needed:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Always a recommended practice for training in our company</th>
<th>Never a recommended practice for training in our company</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Training, whenever possible, is done on the job, in the job place:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Always a recommended practice for training in our company</th>
<th>Never a recommended practice for training in our company</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Training content is highly job specific and uses job-specific examples:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Always a recommended practice for training in our company</th>
<th>Never a recommended practice for training in our company</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10. Training includes practice and feedback on job skills:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Always a recommended practice for training in our company</th>
<th>Never a recommended practice for training in our company</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. Instruments or procedures to measure job-related performance are built into the training process:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Always a recommended practice for training in our company</th>
<th>Never a recommended practice for training in our company</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. Measurement instruments and procedures are reviewed by line managers to be sure they are job relevant:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Always a recommended practice for training in our company</th>
<th>Never a recommended practice for training in our company</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. Learning is directly assessed and feedback provided to trainees:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Always a recommended practice for training in our company</th>
<th>Never a recommended practice for training in our company</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. There is measurement of long-term impact of training on business performance:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Always a recommended practice for training in our company</th>
<th>Never a recommended practice for training in our company</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
15. Measurement after training is done to assess whether and how trainees use their skills:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Always a recommended practice for training in our company</th>
<th>Never a recommended practice for training in our company</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. Trainee's supervisors receive feedback as to how usefully they have supported training application after training:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Always a recommended practice for training in our company</th>
<th>Never a recommended practice for training in our company</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. Specific supervisor practices to support after-training usage of skills and knowledge are a part of the training plan:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Always a recommended practice for training in our company</th>
<th>Never a recommended practice for training in our company</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. Training activities stress a "partnership" approach between line and training staff:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Always a recommended practice for training in our company</th>
<th>Never a recommended practice for training in our company</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. Training staff are skilled in evaluation and measurement of business and employee performance:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Always a recommended practice for training in our company</th>
<th>Never a recommended practice for training in our company</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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20. Training staff regularly interact with line management (versus spend all their time in training unit):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Always a recommended practice for training in our company</th>
<th>Never a recommended practice for training in our company</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21. Evaluation reports on impact and cost-effectiveness of training are regularly provided to upper-level management:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Always a recommended practice for training in our company</th>
<th>Never a recommended practice for training in our company</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22. There is specific and credible evidence of high-level management support, such as a high-level manager who makes a presentation as part of training:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Always a recommended practice for training in our company</th>
<th>Never a recommended practice for training in our company</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C

Upper-Level Managers' Questionnaire
Upper-Level Managers Questionnaire

Part I

Directions: This part of the questionnaire includes some demographic questions. These questions are to give the researcher information about you and your organization so he can group the respondents accordingly. Please answer all the questions.

1. Your position:_____________________________________

2. Approximate number of employees in your organization: ________

3. Approximate number of your organization's employees who attend any type of training or developmental activities (training program, seminar, workshops, conference, etc.) each year: ____________.

4. Your organization type is (check one):
   ____ Service Organization (financial institute, insurance, health care, etc.)
   ____ Retail Trade (distribution, hotels, restaurant, department store, etc.)
   ____ Utility (power, telephone, water, etc.)
   ____ Education Institution (public school, college, university, etc.)

5. Would you like to receive an individualized analysis comparing your responses to your management colleagues' responses?
   ____ yes    ____ no

   If yes, please give your name and address:
   __________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________
Part II

Directions: In this part of the questionnaire, there are twenty-two statements. Each represents a main activity of training. Please read each statement carefully and select a response that best represents your opinion by circling one number among the five numbers (1 through 5) provided between the two choices of answers. Please note that choosing number 1 would indicate that the activity is always a recommended practice for training in your company; choosing number 5 would indicate that the activity is never a recommended practice for training in your company; and choosing number 3 would indicate that the activity is sometimes a recommended practice in your company.

1. Training goals are based on and clearly linked to important business goals:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Always a recommended practice for training in our company</th>
<th>Never a recommended practice for training in our company</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1  2  3  4  5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Training objectives are directly linked to job performance:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Always a recommended practice for training in our company</th>
<th>Never a recommended practice for training in our company</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1  2  3  4  5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Training objectives are supported by job performance data:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Always a recommended practice for training in our company</th>
<th>Never a recommended practice for training in our company</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1  2  3  4  5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Cost-effectiveness analysis is done before a decision to train is made that shows clearly that cost of training is less than the costs of not training:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Always a recommended practice for training in our company</th>
<th>Never a recommended practice for training in our company</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1  2  3  4  5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. Line manager from trainee's department is directly involved in making a decision to train:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Always a recommended practice for training in our company</th>
<th>Never a recommended practice for training in our company</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Manager involvement in planning the when, where and how of training:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Always a recommended practice for training in our company</th>
<th>Never a recommended practice for training in our company</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Training is provided as close as possible to when and where it is needed:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Always a recommended practice for training in our company</th>
<th>Never a recommended practice for training in our company</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Training, whenever possible, is done on the job, in the job place:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Always a recommended practice for training in our company</th>
<th>Never a recommended practice for training in our company</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Training content is highly job specific and uses job-specific examples:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Always a recommended practice for training in our company</th>
<th>Never a recommended practice for training in our company</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10. Training includes practice and feedback on job skills:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Always a recommended practice for training in our company</th>
<th>Never a recommended practice for training in our company</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. Instruments or procedures to measure job-related performance are built into the training process:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Always a recommended practice for training in our company</th>
<th>Never a recommended practice for training in our company</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. Measurement instruments and procedures are reviewed by line managers to be sure they are job relevant:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Always a recommended practice for training in our company</th>
<th>Never a recommended practice for training in our company</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. Learning is directly assessed and feedback provided to trainees:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Always a recommended practice for training in our company</th>
<th>Never a recommended practice for training in our company</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. There is measurement of long-term impact of training on business performance:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Always a recommended practice for training in our company</th>
<th>Never a recommended practice for training in our company</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
15. Measurement after training is done to assess whether and how trainees use their skills:

Always a recommended practice for training in our company

1 2 3 4 5

Never a recommended practice for training in our company

16. Trainee's supervisors receive feedback as to how usefully they have supported training application after training:

Always a recommended practice for training in our company

1 2 3 4 5

Never a recommended practice for training in our company

17. Specific supervisor practices to support after-training usage of skills and knowledge are a part of the training plan:

Always a recommended practice for training in our company

1 2 3 4 5

Never a recommended practice for training in our company

18. Training activities stress a "partnership" approach between line and training staff:

Always a recommended practice for training in our company

1 2 3 4 5

Never a recommended practice for training in our company

19. Training staff are skilled in evaluation and measurement of business and employee performance:

Always a recommended practice for training in our company

1 2 3 4 5

Never a recommended practice for training in our company
20. Training staff regularly interact with line management (versus spend all their time in training unit):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Always a recommended practice for training in our company</th>
<th>Never a recommended practice for training in our company</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21. Evaluation reports on impact and cost-effectiveness of training are regularly provided to upper-level management:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Always a recommended practice for training in our company</th>
<th>Never a recommended practice for training in our company</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22. There is specific and credible evidence of high-level management support, such as a high-level manager who makes a presentation as part of training:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Always a recommended practice for training in our company</th>
<th>Never a recommended practice for training in our company</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Human Subjects Review Board Approval
Date: December 7, 1992  
To: Abdulmohsin Al-Luheid  
From: M. Michele Burnette, Chair  
Re: HSIRB Project Number: 92-12-27

This letter will serve as confirmation that your research protocol, "Result-oriented HRD: An investigation of the perceptions of HRD managers and upper-level managers" has been approved under the exempt category of review by the HSIRB. The conditions and duration of this approval are specified in the Policies of Western Michigan University. You may now begin to implement the research as described in the approval application.

You must seek reapproval for any changes in this design. You must also seek reapproval if the project extends beyond the termination date.

The Board wishes you success in the pursuit of your research goals.

xc: Brinkerhoff, EL

Approval Termination: December 7, 1993
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Permission to Collect Data
December 10, 1992

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN:

Mr. Abdul Al-Luheid is a doctoral student in the Department of Educational Leadership. He is currently conducting research for his dissertation and he has obtained University and Department permission to collect his data.

Sincerely,

Charles C. Warfield
Interim Chair
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