

UNIVERSITY OF CAPE COAST

A STUDY OF THE PERCEPTION OF SENIOR STAFF ON THE TRAINING  
AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMMES OF UNIVERSITY OF CAPE COAST

BY

EMMANUEL AFREH OWUSU

This thesis submitted to the Institute for Educational Planning and Administration of the Faculty of Education, University of Cape Coast, in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the award of Master of Philosophy Degree in Administration in Higher Education.

JULY 2010

## DECLARATION

### **Candidate's Declaration**

*I hereby declare that this thesis is the result of my own original research and that no part of it has been presented for another degree in this university or elsewhere.*

Candidate's Signature: ..... Date: .....

Name: Emmanuel Afreh Owusu

### **Supervisors' Declaration**

*We hereby declare that the preparation and presentation of the thesis were supervised in accordance with the guidelines on supervision of thesis laid down by the University of Cape Coast.*

Principal Supervisor's Signature: ..... Date.....

Name: Dr. George K. T. Oduro

Co-Supervisor's Signature: ..... Date: .....

Name: Dr. Emmanuel Oheneba Agyenim-Boateng

## ABSTRACT

Training and development of staff is one sure way to deal with the recent challenges such as increasing enrollment and use of technology facing Ghanaian universities. Unfortunately, in spite of the cost involved, training programmes do not always result in improved performances. The study therefore aimed at finding out the perception of senior staff on the training and development programmes provided by the University of Cape Coast and whether they actually result in improved performances.

The study adopted the case study design. Data were collected through questionnaire, interviews and study of relevant documents. From a population of 240 senior staff who had undergone training and development programmes, stratified random sampling procedure was used to select a sample size of 151. Also, five Heads of Department and one key staff from the Training and Development Section of the University were purposively selected to respond to interviews. Software Package for Service Solution (SPSS) was used to analyse data using means and frequencies. ANOVA was used to determine the level of differences in the responses and a post hoc test was conducted to determine where these differences occur.

The study revealed that senior staff generally perceived that the training and development programmes had a positive influence on their performance. However, the programmes were more favourable to the other categories of staff like Research Assistants and Health Staff compared to the Administrative staff. Also, while senior staff perceived long term academic oriented programmes to have more influence on their performance, management thinks otherwise.

Based on these findings, the study recommends that the training process for administrative staff should be reconsidered, and also that training should be made the responsibility of the departments with the Training and Development Section playing the role of coordination.

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

A good number of persons and individuals have contributed in no small measure to the completion of this study. Although it is impossible to mention all of them, I wish to express my profound gratitude to my Principal Supervisor Dr. G. K. T. Oduro and Co-supervisor, Dr. E. O. Agyenim-Boateng, for sacrificing their precious time and the patience with which they shepherded this work to a successful completion.

I am again indebted to all my respondents, senior staff who responded to the questionnaire and especially the Senior Members of the University who granted me audience during the interview sessions. I am most grateful. Also worthy of recognition are all the teaching staff of I. E. P. A. for their teaching, support and counselling which have impacted this work. Again, I appreciate the cooperation and support received from the administrative staff of the Training and Development Section.

Finally, I wish to thank all my mates, especially Mr. Wisdom Agbevu and Mr. Isaac Adom-Konadu for their moral support and the wonderful time.

## **DEDICATION**

To my late mother, Ms. Rosina Pokua, whose sacrifices have brought me this far.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
DECLARATION	ii
ABSTRACT	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iv
DEDICATION	v
LIST OF TABLES	x
CHAPTER	
ONE	
INTRODUCTION	1
Background to the Study	1
Statement of the Problem	11
Purpose of the Study	12
Research Questions	13
Research Hypotheses	14
Significance of the study	14
Delimitations	15
Limitations	15
Definition of Terms	16
Organisation of the Study	17
TWO	
REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	18
Training and Development	18
Reasons and Benefits of Staff Training and Development	22

Responsibility for Training	24
Training Process	26
Performance Appraisal	29
Methods of Appraisal	32
Potential Errors in Performance Appraisal	35
How to Overcome the Errors	36
Training Needs Assessment	39
Methods of Needs Assessment	42
Theories/Models of Needs Assessment	45
Importance of Needs Assessments	46
Types and Methods of Training	49
Approaches to Staff Training and Development	53
Learning and Learning Principles	55
Factors that Influence Transfer of Training	59
Evaluation of Training Programmes and Performance	64
Criteria for Performance Evaluation	66
Summary	71
<b>THREE METHODOLOGY</b>	<b>73</b>
Research Design	73
Population	74
Sample and Sampling Procedure	75
Research Instruments	79
Pilot-testing of Instruments	82

	Data Collection Procedure	84
	Data Analysis	86
FOUR	RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	88
	Biodata of Respondents	88
	Research Question One: What kind of Training and Development Programmes are Provided for Senior Staff Employees of the University of Cape Coast?	94
	Research Question Two: What Influence Senior Staff to Undergo Training and Development Programmes?	102
	Research Question Three: How Relevant are the Training and Development Programmes the Needs of Senior Staff?	108
	Research Question Four: How Appropriate are the Training Procedures to Promote Transfer of Training?	111
	Research Question Five: What is the Perception of Senior Staff on how the Training and Development Programmes Influence their Performance	114
	Obstacles to Transfer of Training	118
	Research Question Six: What is the Perception of Senior Staff on how Training and Development Programmes can be Improved?	120
	Hypothesis One: There are no significant Differences in Responses according to Categories of Staff	125
	Hypothesis Two: There are no Significant Differences in Responses according to Type of Programmes Attended	131



FIVE	SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	138
	Summary of the Study	138
	Summary of Findings	140
	Conclusions	143
	Recommendations	144
	Suggestions for Future Research	145
	REFERENCES	146
	APPENDICES	
A	Questionnaire for Senior Staff	154
B	Interview Guide I – For Heads of Departments	163
C	Interview Guide II – For Training and Development Section	165
D	Letter of Introduction from Director, IEPA	168
E	Application Letter for Permission to Conduct Interviews	169
F	Training and Development Schedule for 2009	170
G	Letter from Training and Development Section Advertising Training Programmes Available in a Particular Year	172
H	Letter from Training and Development Section Requesting for Training Needs of Staff	173
I	Evaluation Report Sheet on Staff after Participating in Training Programmes	174
J	Letter from Making the Training of Administrative Staff the Responsibility of Central Administration	175

## LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1 Population, Sample Size Selected and Return Rate of Instrument	77
2 Reliability Coefficients after Pilot Study	84
3 Gender Distributions of Respondents	89
4 Age Composition of Respondents	90
5 Working Experience of Respondents	91
6 Staff Categories of Respondents	92
7 Educational Qualification of Respondents	93
8 Number of Training and Development Programmes Attended by Respondents	95
9 Number of Training and Development Programmes Attended by Categories of Respondents	97
10 Number of Training and Development Programmes Attended on the Basis of Duration of Programmes	99
11 Number of Training and Development Programmes Attended by Categories of Staff and Duration of Programmes	100
12 Types of Programmes Attended by Respondents	101
13 Factors Determining the Selection of Senior Staff to Participate in Training and Development Programmes	103
14 Responses of Senior Staff on Relevance of Training and Development Programmes to their Needs	109

15	Senior Staff's Perception of the Appropriateness of Training Procedures	112
16	Senior Staff's Perception on the Influence of Training and Development Programmes on their Performance	115
17	Senior Staff's Responses on Factors which Hinder Transfer of Training	119
18	Senior Staff's Perception on how Training and Development Programmes can be Improved?	121
19	ANOVA Results on the Extent of Relevance of Training and Development Programmes to the Needs of Staff by Senior Staff Categories	126
20	Post Hoc Results on Difference in Relevance of Training and Development Programmes among Categories of Staff	126
21	ANOVA Results of the Difference in Appropriateness Training Procedures by Senior Categories	128
22	Post Hoc Results of the Difference in Level of Appropriateness of Training Procedures among Categories of Staff	128
23	ANOVA Results of the Differences on the Influence of Training Programmes on Performance by Categories of Senior Staff Categories	129
24	Post Hoc Results on Differences of the Influence of Training Programmes on Performance among Categories of Staff	130

25	ANOVA Results on the Differences on Relevance of Training and Development Programmes by Type of Programmes Attended	131
26	Post Hoc Results on Difference in Relevance of Training and Development Programmes by Type of Programmes Attended	132
27	ANOVA Results of the Difference in Appropriateness Training Procedures by Type of Programmes Attended	133
28	Post Hoc Results on the Differences in Level of Appropriateness of Training Procedures by Type of Programmes Attended	134
29	ANOVA Results of the Differences on the Influence of Training Programmes on Performance by Type of Programmes Attended	135
30	Post Hoc Results on Differences of the Influence of Training Programmes on Performance by Type of Programmes Attended	135



## **CHAPTER ONE**

### **INTRODUCTION**

#### **Background to the Study**

University of Cape Coast (UCC) was established in December 1962 as a University College and in 1967, it was incorporated by the University College of Cape Coast NLC Decree 1967, effective October 1966. It became a full University under the University of Cape Coast Act 1971 (Act 390), thus obtaining the power to confer its own degrees (Antwi, 1992). According to Antwi (1992, p. 145), “the primary purpose for the establishment of the University was “to produce graduate teachers in arts and science subjects for the secondary schools, teacher training colleges, polytechnics and technical institutions in Ghana”. Antwi again explained that the aims of the University include the provision of higher education, research, knowledge dissemination and to foster relations with other bodies.

For the University to be able to provide these services, it requires material, capital and human resources. These resources are referred to as factors of production. Of these factors, human resources are the most crucial. It is believed that in spite of her rich deposit of natural resources, Africa is poor because she lacks the right calibre of human resources to turn the material resources into forms useful to humanity.

Harbison (1973) explained that human resources constitute the ultimate basis for the wealth of nations. He describes capital and material resources as passive agents and human resources as active agents of production. Harbison concluded his emphasis on the importance of human resources with the assertion that any country which is unable to develop the skills and knowledge of its people would be unable to develop as expected. Carnevale (1990, p. 28) supported this notion with the statements that "Learning systems in the workplace are the first line of defence against economic and technical changes. The ability of the nation's employers to respond expeditiously to these changes determines in large part, the nation's adaptability and competitiveness". Thus, one could deduce that organisations or institutions can grow and satisfy their consumers only when they train and develop their human resources. According to Noe, Hollenbeck, Gerhart and Wright (2004, p.3), "the concept of human resource management implies that employees are resources of the employer". They described it as human capital and explain that through training, experience, judgment, intelligence and insight, the employee adds economic value to the organisation.

Fricker (1994) described training and development of employees as "an investment into tomorrow" and reported that organisations are thus seeking ways to ensure that money spent on training and development eventually make employees more productive. The purposes of training and development in institutions or organisations are varied. Carrell, Elbert and Hatfield (2000, p.255) identified them to include

1. Improving performance,
2. Updating employees' skills,
3. Avoiding managerial obsolescence,
4. Solving organisational problems, orient and socialise new employees,
5. Preparing for promotion and managerial succession and
6. Satisfying personal growth needs of employees.

Even though there are various reasons for training and development of staff in organisations, efforts should be made to ensure that the purpose of each training and development activity is achieved.

In higher education, the need for training and development of staff becomes even more crucial. This is because of the rapid changes taking place in these institutions such as increasing student enrollments, changes in technology and the introduction of various fees such as academic facility user fees and residential facility user fees. Thus, students now demand accountability from authorities as well as improvement in the quality of services provided by staff. Also, tertiary institutions must now compete among themselves to be able to attract more qualified applicants.

A survey by the Commonwealth Higher Education Management Services [CHEMS] (1999) revealed that as a result of the challenges mentioned, higher education institutions are under pressure not only to maintain, but actually to improve the quality of the services that they deliver to their various stakeholders. The report also observed that the immediate impact of this pressure falls on the staff. The need for staff training and development in higher



institutions therefore becomes critical and management of the universities have acknowledged this. In 1996, a Conference of Rectors, Vice Chancellors and Presidents of universities (COREVIP) in Africa recommended that management skills of all those involved in the running of universities should be enhanced through appropriate tailor-made training programmes (CHEMS, 1999).

In spite of its importance, very few organisations actually provide training and development programmes for their employees. Such organisations are usually those who have large number of employees. This is because of the cost involved in training and developing employees. Anthony, Perrewe and Kacmar (1999) asserted that even in the United States, it is only larger companies like IBM and Procter and Gamble which are able to provide training and development programmes for their employees. Smaller organisations such as Parker Foods and Apple Computer rather hire experienced staff from other organisations and thus avoid the cost involved in staff training.

This means that the cost of training and developing employees in organisations could be very huge. Even though there is no consensus on the amount spent annually, the Trainings Magazine Annual Industry Report (as cited in CHEMS, 1999) asserted that approximately \$58.6 billion was spent on formal training and development of staff in the United States in 1997. This amount, it is believed, represented an increment of over \$6 billion over the two previous years, thus signifying an increasing trend in expenditure on training and development of staff. Even though critics do not agree whether this amount is enough or not, what is obvious is the fact that this amount was spent by very few organisations. Stone

(1991) estimated that more than half of the amount spent on training and development of staff annually, is provided by merely 0.5 percent of all employers.

Another issue worth examining is the category of staff who receive training in organisations. According to Mullins (2007, p. 489) “Training is necessary to ensure adequate supply of staff who are technically and socially competent, and capable of career advancement into specialist departments or management positions”. This implies training, especially for middle level staff, will ensure that organisations, including the universities, have adequate supply of the right calibre of staff to take up top management positions in the near future. However, many organisations, even if they provide training and development programmes, rather concentrate on top management. Anthony et al. (1999, p. 326) noted, “Further, some firms spend nothing on training while others concentrate the training they do provide on managers, technical employees and professionals”.

Considering the critical position senior staff occupy in the Universities, the need to provide adequate training and development programmes for them cannot be overemphasised. This was however not the case sometime past. In the late 1990s in the United Kingdom, it was observed that although management development for Higher Education Institutions staff had improved since the mid-1980s, evidence of professional development for mid career staff as part of succession planning was still lacking (CHEMS, 1999).

Again, a study by CHEMS in 1996 for United Nations Education, Science and Cultural Organisation [UNESCO] as cited in CHEMS (1999) on strengthening middle level management skills in universities revealed that in

many developing country universities, the increasing enrollment and decline in resources had led to poor managerial and administrative effectiveness. The report attributed the decline in quality in part to a lack of trained middle level staff to occupy effectively, senior positions when they are vacated by experienced administrative staff. Amewudah (2002) also revealed that until 1998, University of Cape Coast concentrated on providing training and development programmes only for the teaching staff. One could therefore say that higher education institutions have not done well in terms of training and developing middle level staff for succession purposes.

In recent times, however, universities in Africa seem to be making appreciable strides. Thus, within their limited resources, most of these universities are providing avenues for their staff, including junior and middle level, to be able to develop themselves. For instance, Antwi and Nwali (1990) and Asiagodo (1989) have identified the following avenues as being used for developing library staff in the Abubakar Tafawa Belewa University, Nigeria and University of Ghana, Legon.

1. Introduction/orientation on first appointment
2. In-service training/on the training
3. Study visits
4. Staff meetings
5. Informal discussions with colleagues
6. Seminars/workshops/conferences
7. Job rotation

8. Participations in activities of professional associations
9. Study leave/sabbatical/leave of absence
10. Consultancy
11. In-house journals and
12. Organised departmental research/individual research

University of Cape Coast established a staff Training and Development Unit within the Alumni Relations Section in 1982. Its main concentration was on the training and development of academic staff. In 1997, the Committee of Vice Chancellors and Principals (CVCP) at a meeting recommended the separation of Training and Development from Alumni Relations. The CVCP also recommended the inclusion of all categories of staff in training and development programmes. In 1999, University of Cape Coast implemented the recommendations of the C.V.C.P. and established a separate Training and Development section under the Division of Human Resources. A policy document was drawn in 2002 to regulate and guide the activities of this section. (University of Cape Coast [UCC], 2002, Training Policy for Senior and Junior Staff).

The Training and Development Section, now headed by a Senior Assistant Registrar, is responsible for the training and development needs of all categories of staff in the University. Its specific functions include:

1. Initiating and advising on staff training and development policies,
2. Assessing staff training needs of the University,
3. Designing, implementing and evaluating staff development programmes,

4. Developing and carrying out induction, orientation and re-orientation programmes for all categories of staff,
5. Liaising with other training institutions and organisations,
6. Liaising with the Scholarship Secretariat and other agencies on training and study leave awards to staff,
7. Handling study/sabbatical leave matters of staff,
8. Employee counselling and services and career development and
9. Placement of outsiders on attachment/practical training at University of Cape Coast (UCC, 2002).

Staff in the Universities in Ghana are categorised into three main groups. These are junior staff, senior staff and senior members Collard (as cited in Effah, 1998). Senior Staff employees of University of Cape Coast are put into different categories depending on the nature of task they perform. They occupy ranks which can conveniently be described as middle level management positions. These include Administrative Assistants to Chief Administrative Assistants; Research Assistants to Chief Research Assistants; Library Assistants to Chief Library Assistants, Technician Assistants to Chief Technicians as well as teachers and some ranks among health workers. They are concerned with the implementation of decisions taken by top management and supervision of junior staff. They also engage in planning and decision making at a micro level as well as training of junior staff.

Training and development programmes should not only be targeted at increasing output of organisations but also for the personal development of

employees. Training provides intrinsic satisfaction to employees and makes them feel secured at their work places. Mullins (2007, p.489) again wrote “many unions are recognising the importance of training in relevant skills to sustaining the security of their members”.

Considering the importance of training and development as well as the cost involved, organisations must endeavour to make training and development programmes relevant to the needs of both the organisation and the employees concerned. Anthony et al. (1999, p. 337) opined that “the goal of training and development programmes of all organisations should be to maintain and improve the performance of individuals and in so doing, that of the organisation”. Thus, training programmes should target satisfying employees’ needs so as to improve productivity in the organisation. According to CHEMS (1999), an Australian article on staff development in higher institutions for instance, commented on the need for a growing understanding of the important link between individual development and the strategic development of the Universities. Management should therefore assess the training needs of both the institutions and their staff to ensure that they provide the kind of training programmes that are relevant to the organisation and will be able to improve on the knowledge, skills, and attitudes of beneficiaries and thus enhance their performance.

Also, to make training and development programmes successful in the universities, the types and methods used in transmitting the required skills, knowledge and attitudes are very important if beneficiaries are to transfer what they learn on to their jobs. Again, according to Leimbach and Baldwin (1997 p.

34), “research suggests that failure of learned skills to transfer to the work place is because of failure of systems to support the transfer of learning”. Management will thus have to put in place mechanisms to promote transfer of what ever is learnt during training and development programmes to the job.

In addition, there is the need to ensure that costs incurred on training and development programmes correspond to benefits derived. This can be achieved through proper evaluation of training and development programmes offered by organisations. Kunder (1998) explained that many analysts observe that money spent on training and development programmes is not being well spent. Kunder explained further that this is because most organisations do not assess the training and development needs of their staff nor evaluate the benefits of training programmes to their organisations. Thus, evaluation to find out whether training and development programmes have actually advanced the objectives of the organisation to increase productivity and improve upon individual performance is not often done.

Considering the fact that the cost of training and development could be huge for the organisation and also that training may not necessarily lead to the objective of improving performance, care should be taken before any training programme is provided to staff. Heneman III, Schwab, Fossum and Dyer (2000) proposed that management should ensure that training is not only a potential solution but rather the preferred solution to a performance problem. They opine that training becomes a potential solution to performance problems when (a) the discrepancy is caused by a lack of ability rather than a lack of motivation to

perform (b) the individuals involved have the aptitude and motivation needed to learn how to do the job better and (c) supervisors and peers are supportive of the desired behaviours. They also explain that training becomes the preferred solution only when it is a relatively cost-effective means of correcting an important performance discrepancy.

From the foregoing, it is obvious that training and development, though very important for all organisations including the University of Cape Coast, may not necessarily result in improved performance by staff. The crux of the study therefore, is to find out the perception of senior staff employees on how the training and development programmes offered by the University of Cape Coast influence their performance.

### **Statement of the Problem**

One great criticism leveled against training and development programmes in organisations is that participants most often fail to transfer what they learn during the programmes to their jobs. Harris (2000 p. 358) wrote “one of the biggest problems associated with training programmes is the lack of transfer of training”.

Training costs money; therefore, it must add value to the organisation by developing people in the most effective way (Nfila, 2005). University of Cape Coast spent GH¢125,807.89 on training and development of staff in 2007 (UCC, Directorate of Finance, 2008). This amount excludes salaries paid to staff on study leave. A substantial portion of this amount is spent on training senior staff. However, in University of Cape Coast, it is common to find some senior staff



undergoing the same training and development programmes even though it is clear that their job functions are completely different. For instance, Senior Administrative Assistants and Senior Research Assistants undergo particular programmes in M. Phil. (Educational Administration) and M. B. A. (Human Resource). There are questions as to how these training programmes have influenced the performance of such staff: What factors determine the selection of staff to undergo these programmes? Are the training and development programmes offered to Senior Staff in response to the actual needs of the institution and the staff concerned? Do they lead to improvement in the performance of staff? Some of the answers to these questions are anecdotal hence the need to investigate whether the training and development programmes offered by the University respond to the needs of both Senior Staff and the University and also if they influence their performance.

### **Purpose of the Study**

The main purpose of this study is to find out whether the training and development programmes provided for senior staff of the University of Cape Coast influence their performance. Specifically, it will seek to find:

1. How often staff participate in training and development programmes and the kind of programmes provided.
2. How senior staff are selected to participate in training and development programmes
3. Whether these programmes are relevant to the actual needs of the University and senior staff employees. That is whether a thorough training needs assessment

is done before training and development programmes are provided for senior staff.

4. It will also examine how training and development programmes influence the performance of senior staff who undergo such exercises.

5. It will again find out if there are any differences in the perception of senior staff on the training and development programmes according to categories of staff and also by type of programmes attended.

6. Again, it will find out if there are any factors inhibiting training transfer.

7. Finally, it will determine the perception of senior staff on how to improve the training and development programmes offered.

### **Research Questions.**

To be able to achieve the stated objectives, the study is designed to answer the following questions:

1. What kind of training and development programmes are provided for senior staff employees of University of Cape Coast?

2. What factors determine the selection of senior staff to undergo training and development programmes in the University?

3. How relevant are the training and development programmes to the actual needs of Senior Staff and the University?

4. How appropriate are the training procedures to promote learning and transfer of learning?

5. What is the perception of senior staff on how training and development programmes influence their performance?
6. What work place factors hinder senior staff's ability to transfer what is learned onto their jobs?
7. What is the perception of senior staff on how training and development programmes can be improved?

### **Hypotheses**

In addition, the following hypotheses will be tested:

1. Responses of Senior Staff do not differ significantly in respect of relevance of programmes, appropriateness of training procedures and influence of the programmes on performance when compared by categories.
2. Responses of Senior Staff do not differ significantly in respect of relevance of programmes, appropriateness of training procedures and influence of the programmes on performance when compared by type of programme attended.

### **Significance of the Study**

The study provided information on the training and development programmes offered to senior staff in University of Cape Coast. This information could help the University management to determine the expectations of senior staff as they undergo training and development programmes. Secondly, it could provide feedback to trainers so as to adapt their training and development programmes to suit the actual needs of both employees and the University. Again,

it could serve as guide for the evaluation of the training and development programmes provided for senior staff. Finally, it would serve as a source of reference for further studies in related areas.

### **Delimitations**

Although University of Cape Coast faces many administrative challenges, this study was confined to finding out the perception of senior staff on how training and development programmes provided by the University of Cape Coast influence their performance. It does not consider the influence of other training programmes attended privately by staff.

### **Limitations**

As with every research, a number of problems were envisaged to be encountered but some were beyond expectation. The main limitation observed is that even though respondents were expected to respond to all training and development programmes participated in, some of the respondents who had attended more than one programme were influenced by particular programmes they had attended to the neglect of others. Their responses could therefore be biased towards such particular programmes. Also, even though the research was on all senior staff of the University who had undergone training and development programmes, the number was so large that sampling had to be made. Conclusions could therefore be subject to sampling errors. However, efforts were made to ensure that the sample chosen was representative of the population. Again, as with

all surveys, the researcher had no control over extraneous factors which could affect the results.

### **Definition of Terms**

**Training and Development** – Any activity (excluding orientation and induction) provided for staff by the University for the purpose of improving their skills so as to enhance on the job performance or to prepare them for higher responsibilities in the future.

**Performance:** Action, thought or activity which is related to the job of the individual and which ultimately results in a positive contribution to the realisation of the goals of the institution.

**Senior Staff:** Middle level staff of the University of Cape Coast, who support top level management, academic and technical staff (Senior Members) in their various fields of operation.

**Performance Gap:** The difference between actual level of performance by employees and the level of performance desired by management.

**Motivation to Transfer:** The intended effort towards utilising the skills and knowledge learned in a training context to the trainee's job.

**Transfer of Training:** The degree to which trainees apply the knowledge, skills and attitudes acquired from training and development programmes on their work schedule and maintain such practices over time.

**Short Term Programmes:** Training and development programmes provided by the University to senior staff which lasts less than one year.

**Long Term Programmes:** Training and development programmes provided by the University to senior staff which lasts one year or more.

**Training Procedures:** The methods, duration, mode of examination, personnel, materials and all other factors which affect the training and development process.

**KSTDS:** Key staff at the Training and Development Section of University of Cape Coast who responded to the interview.

### **Organisation of the Study**

The study is systematically arranged. Chapter One covers the background to the study, the research problem, research questions and hypotheses, purpose and significance of the study; delimitations and limitations as well as operational definitions of some key words and terms. Chapter Two reviews relevant and related literature on the topic. The review falls under related sub headings. In Chapter Three, the research design used, methods used in gathering data as well as how the data was analysed are provided. Chapter Four has been devoted to a description and analysis of the research findings as well as their interpretation. In Chapter Five, a summary of the entire work and the major findings are presented. In addition, suggestions for improving training and development programmes in future have been offered and recommendations for further research in areas which were identified in the course of the study were made.

## **CHAPTER TWO**

### **REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE**

This chapter reviews relevant literature related to training and development of staff in various organisations. Books, Journals, articles, and other published and unpublished materials were consulted.

#### **Training and Development**

Training and development of staff play a crucial role in the success or failure of every organisation. Different authors have given different definitions to training and development. According to Mathis and Jackson (2002, p. 75) “Training is a learning process whereby people acquire skills or knowledge to aid in the achievement of goals”. They explained further that “in a limited sense, training provides employees with specific identifiable knowledge and skills for use on their present jobs” (p. 75). Training as a process as described by Mathis and Jackson implies it is always on-going. For Anthony et al. (1999, p. 337) “Training refers to providing instructions to develop skills that can be used immediately on the job”. To these authors, training has a narrow focus and should provide skills that will benefit the organisation rather quickly. They therefore believe that training prepares one to perform acts which are immediately required by the organisation. Training does not occur by accident in the

organisation. It is a deliberate activity which is geared towards specific goals. This is clear in the definition by Noe (2005, p. 3) that “training refers to a planned effort by a company to facilitate employees’ learning of job related competencies”. He identified these competencies to include knowledge, skills and behaviours that are critical for successful job performance. The notion that training is a planned activity is also supported in the following definitions by DeNisi and Griffin (2001, p. 266) that “employee training is a planned attempt by an organisation to facilitate employee learning of job-related knowledge, skills and behaviours” and also by Cascio (1992, p. 232) that “training consists of planned programmes designed to improve performance at the individual, group and/or organisational levels”. Cascio went further to say that “improved performance, in turn, implies that there have been measurable changes in knowledge, skills, attitudes and/or social behavior” (p. 232). Thus, training can be described as complete only when it leads to observable and measurable changes in the performance of beneficiaries.

Development on the other hand “involves providing employees with knowledge that may be used today or sometime in the future” (Anthony et al. 1999, p. 337). They added that it may not be focused on either the present or future job but more on meeting the organisation’s general long term needs. Noe (2005, p. 266) also gave a similar definition when he wrote “Development refers to formal education, job experiences, relationships and assessments of personality and abilities that help employees perform effectively in their current and future job and company”. Because development is future oriented, it involves learning



that is not necessarily related to the employees' current job. These two sources thus agree that development is for both current and future purposes. They also agreed that the content of development programmes may not directly be related to known job schedules of employees. Development thus provides employees with a deeper appreciation and understanding of the vision and mission of the organisation and equips them to face challenges that are likely to occur. Development is also seen to be provided for senior or managerial staff in the organisation. DeNisi and Griffin (2001, p. 266) wrote "development refers to teaching managers and professionals the skills needed for both present and future jobs".

Mathis and Jackson (2002) explained that development is concerned with improving the intellectual or emotional capabilities of employees at all levels of the organisation. To them, human resource development is therefore a broader, less tangible concept than merely training. They identify the following as the aims of staff development in organisations:

1. Changing attitudes about involvement of employees in decision making.
2. Improving abilities to communicate.
3. Using better judgment on innovative decisions.

Some authors attempt to differentiate between staff training and development. For instance, Noe (2005) wrote, "it is important to note that although training and development are similar, there are important differences between them" (p. 266). He identified the following differences:

1. While training is focused on helping employees to improve performance on their current jobs, development helps prepare them for other jobs in the company and increases their ability to move into jobs that may not yet exist.
2. Also, because training programmes often focus on improving employees' performances on their current jobs, participation may be made compulsory by management. Development programmes may only be made compulsory to employees who might have been identified to possess management or special potential. Thus, in most cases, employees must take the initiative to undergo development programmes.

Other writers are however of the view that the distinction between training and development is in practice too difficult and unnecessary. One such writer is Cascio (1992, p. 232) as he wrote "traditionally, lower level employees were "trained" while higher level employees were 'developed'. This distinction has however become too blurry in practice to be useful". He therefore opined that the two terms could be used interchangeably. This view is shared by Werther and Keith (1996 p. 282) when they wrote "although training helps employees do their current jobs, the benefits of training may extend through out a person's career and help develop that person for future responsibilities". They also described the distinction between training (now) and development (future) as blurred and primarily one of intent.

From the foregoing, one could conclude that training is geared towards equipping employees with knowledge, skills and attitudes which are of immediate importance to their present job schedules. Development on the other hand is

provided with the intention of preparing staff for both immediate and future purposes. It therefore considers the organisation's long term plans. However, both training and development are concerned with performance of tasks in the organisation and thus aim at improving organisational effectiveness. Also, training programmes could eventually equip staff for future tasks. The distinction between the two is therefore thin and both could be used alternatively.

### **Reasons and Benefits of Training and Development**

The behaviours and talents of human resource have a direct or indirect influence on all other resources of the organisation (Holbrook Jnr, 2002). Management must therefore ensure that every action or inaction of staff in the organisation in the long run contributes positively to the progress of the organisation. Dolliver (1993) asserted that every employee's performance can be improved and Beckman (2007) also observed that one of the ways that an employee's performance can be improved is through training. There is therefore the need to continuously train and develop staff so as to ensure improvement in all aspects of the organisation. Staff training can thus be likened to maintenance of equipments of the organisation. Training and development can also be described as the framework for helping employees to develop their personal and organisational skills and knowledge. There are various reasons why organisations undertake training and development of employees. Adiele (2009) identified some as follows:

1. When needs arise as a result of findings from the outcome of performance appraisal.
2. As part of staff development plan of the organisation.
3. As part of succession planning to help an employee be eligible for a planned change in role in the organisation.
4. To imbibe and inculcate into staff a new technology in the system.
5. Because of the dynamic nature of the business world and changing technologies.

When training coincides with an organisations goals and strategic planning, one of the most important benefits that the employer is looking for is higher employee productivity (Lee & Nelson, 2006). Some other general benefits of employee training are:

1. Increased job satisfaction and morale among employees.
2. Better inter personal relationship and customer satisfaction.
3. Increased employee motivation.
4. Increased efficiencies in processes, resulting in improved financial gain.
5. Increased capacity to adopt new technologies and methods.
6. Increased innovation in strategies and products.
7. Reduced employee turnover.
8. Enhanced company image.
9. Better Risk management and staff safety consciousness.
10. Increase in productivity. (McNamara, n.d.)

## **Responsibility for Training**

Training and development of staff in every organisation is a shared responsibility (Anthony et al., 1999). All stakeholders are therefore required to take part in the training and development of staff in the organisation. These include top management, the human resource department, the immediate supervisor and the employees.

1. Top Management – The commitment of the Chief Executive Officer and top management of every organisation is critical if training and development programmes are to be effective. Their role include providing the general policies and procedures, provision of administrative controls to ensure compliance by management and employees, and setting the proper culture to encourage training and development.

2. The Human Resource Department – This section should provide staff support functions. This includes assisting line managers by providing expertise and resources as well as sponsoring conferences and workshops.

3. The immediate supervisor – Supervisors have the direct responsibility to ensure that training and development occurs. They should not only encourage employees to develop themselves but also provide time for this to occur. They should also ensure that the right atmosphere and adequate resources are provided for training and development.

4. The employees – They have the responsibility of demonstrating interest in personal career development relative to the goals of the organisation. The primary responsibility for training and development therefore lies on employees. They

should also encourage their colleagues to take advantage of the various development opportunities available in the organisation (Anthony et al., 1999).

Megginson and Gibb (2001) also identified three main stakeholders of staff training and development. These are (a) individuals, to identify their own potentials and show enthusiasm for self development; (b) employers, to identify training needs, liaise with suitable institutions and provide on the job training and (c) Government, to provide legal regulations and other support services.

In his study of “The training and development of academic librarians in Ghana”, Effah (1998) opined that the responsibility for staff training can be put into two broad areas. These are:

1. The responsibility of the staff: This includes making an honest self assessment of his training needs, looking for appropriate courses, taking initiative to pursue training, applying for sponsorship and taking part in managing career interests.
2. The superior officer: This has to do with the head of department who is responsible for describing what is expected for effective performance, identifying areas where improved skills will enhance performance and providing access to the best ways of developing these skills.

Effah (1998) concluded with an emphasis that neither the responsibility of the individual staff nor that of the superior officer should be left in the hands of the personnel department or the training officers. He opined that the duty of the personnel department should be to assist or facilitate the development and implementation of overall training policies. Heneman III et al. (2000) also

supported the division of roles in the training of staff. They however opined that there should be close cooperation between line managers and the human resource department. They suggested that while line managers should be actively involved in determining which employees need training and the type of training required, the human resource department should be responsible for developing general policies regarding training and development as well as working with line managers to recommend appropriate budget levels among others.

Training and development of staff in an organisation requires a concerted effort of all stakeholders in order to be successful. While management or superiors should identify training needs and provide all the necessary logistics, staff and employee unions should also strive to identify more training opportunities available, avail themselves for training and learn to acquire the necessary knowledge and skills to ensure training transfer.

### **Training Process**

The training process can be described as the various stages or levels which must be followed to ensure that training and development programmes provided by the organisation achieve the targeted results. According to Noe (2005 p. 5), “the training design process refers to a systematic approach for developing training programmes”. Noe presented seven steps in the training process. These are:

1. Conducting needs assessment – this is necessary to identify if training is needed. It involves organisational analysis, person analysis and task/job analysis.

2. Ensuring employees' readiness for training – this is to make sure that staff have the motivation and basic skills necessary to master training content. Thus, employees must be ready both psychologically and physiologically before training programmes are provided for them if learning is to take place.
3. Creating a learning environment – involves providing a learning environment that has the features necessary to facilitate learning. This includes setting clear learning objectives, providing meaningful learning materials, opportunity for practice and feedback.
4. Ensuring Transfer of Learning – is to ensure that trainees apply what they learn to their jobs. It involves having the trainee understand how to manage skill improvement. Thus, self management, peer and manager support are required.
5. Developing an Evaluation Plan - this includes identification of expected learning outcomes, choosing an evaluation design that can help determine the influence of training on outcomes and planning how to justify the cost incurred on training.
6. Selecting Training Methods – an appropriate training method depends on learning objectives and learning environment. It could be “on-the-job” or “off-the-job”. A variety of training methods exist.
7. Monitoring and Evaluating the Programme – this is to find out whether or not the training programme has been successful. It may mean changing the entire programme or revisiting any of the earlier steps in the process to improve upon it so as to ensure that learning objectives are attained.



Anthony et al. (1999) on the other hand, divided the training process into three stages. These are the assessment stage, the training stage and the evaluation stage.

1. The Assessment Stage: Before any training can be done, the need for it must be analysed. This is referred to as the assessment stage. At this stage, the training needs of the organisation, the job as well as the individuals are examined. Management uses different methods to gather different information relevant for the assessment. At the assessment stage, the objectives of training and the criteria for evaluating the training programme are also determined. The assessment stage therefore involves (a) assessing the needs of the organisation, (b) assessing the needs of the job/tasks to be performed, (c) assessing the needs of the employees/individuals, (d) developing training objectives and (e) developing criteria for evaluating training programmes.

2. Training Stage: This is the stage where the training or development programmes is implemented. It involves the design and selection of the appropriate types and methods of training to achieve results. According to Anthony et al. (1999), training procedures fall into two broad categories: “on-the-job” training and “off-the-job” training and any comprehensive training system in an organisation utilises both types.

3. Evaluation Stage: This stage attempts to determine the success or otherwise of a training programme. A variety of approaches are available for evaluating training and development programmes. According to Anthony et al. (1999), one most widely accepted and used evaluation approach is that developed by Donald

Kirkpatrick. This identified four different levels for evaluating programmes. These are reactions, learning, behaviour and results.

Schermerhorn (1984, p. 272) on the other hand identified five steps which should be addressed by any training programme. He wrote “A good training and development programme should address five steps. These are: needs assessment, setting objectives, selecting methods, implementation and evaluation of the programme”.

From the discussions, it is obvious that training should always be approached in a methodical manner if management wants to derive expected benefits from this activity. Even though writers differ on the stages or steps involved in the training process, the content involved is similar. Training will be successful if providers undertake a needs analysis, ensure staff readiness, choose the appropriate training methods or designs, plan how to evaluate the programmes and also evaluate the programmes after they have been implemented.

If training is to be systematic, then one of the first things to do is to determine if there is a difference between the performance level of staff and the level expected by management. This is done through a measurement process called appraisal which is considered in the ensuing subheading.

### **Performance Appraisal**

Organisations hire the services of employees for the purpose of increasing and improving productivity. Even though efforts are made during the recruitment process to ensure that people with the right knowledge and skills are employed,

those who get appointment will most often possess some skills which may not be readily useful for the organisation and also some skills which fall short of what is required to perform. Also, changes in the organisation, which may be as a result of factors such as changes in technology, increase in output, change in consumer taste or expansion usually result in employee performances which differ from what is expected from management. The need to appraise the performance of staff while on the job therefore becomes necessary.

Performance appraisal goes by many terminologies. These include performance evaluation, performance review, employee evaluation, and merit evaluation (Sangweni, 2003) and progress rating, merit rating, and performance evaluation (Dawra, 2001).

Noe (2004 p. 239) defined performance appraisal as “the measurement of specified areas of an employee’s performance”. This implies that the various criteria which serve as indicators of performance by an employee should be considered and assessed during appraisal. Performance appraisal is a purposeful activity. This means that it is carried out with an objective in mind. Again, the purpose of each appraisal activity could vary from another. Bratton and Gold (1999) for instance saw performance appraisal as the collection and analysis of data on the overall capabilities and potentials of individual workers in an attempt to make decision in tune with a purpose while Dawra (2001 p. 332) also wrote “In simple words, performance appraisal is the systematic evaluation of the individual, with respect to his performance on the job and his potential for development”. Dawra explained further that appraisal also considers the

personality of the employee and observed that it is usually performed by his supervisor. These two definitions imply appraisal is for the purpose of staff development. Thus, during performance appraisal, management should not only concern itself with measuring staff performances but also look out for potentials in staff which should be developed for the benefit of the organisation. It considers not only what the employee does on the job but also the innate qualities which are necessary for the performance of his tasks. In supporting the view that appraisal is also for developmental purposes, Beach (1980) explained performance appraisal as a systematic evaluation of the individual with respect to his performance on the job and his potential for development.

It is important to note that appraisals are carried out for the benefit of the organisation and not for its own sake. This is the view of Agyenim-Boateng (2006) that appraisal is about measuring, monitoring and enhancing the performance of employees as a contributor to the overall organisational performance. Again, Martinez and Martineau (2001, p. 1) supported this in the statement that “it is not a stand alone process but an approach to creating a shared vision of the purposes and aims of the organisation, helping each individual employee to understand and share the workload to achieve those aims”.

Another issue worth mentioning is that appraisal in organisations is a process and not a “one shot activity”. Thus, performance appraisal should be a continuous activity in the work place so that any conclusion that is arrived at about the individual will be a fair description and representation of that employee. This notion is supported by Gobbler (as cited in Agyenim-Boateng, 2006) who

explained performance appraisal as an ongoing process of evaluation and management of both the behaviours and outcomes of employees in the work place. Appraisals are aids to creating and maintaining a satisfactory level of performance by employees on their present jobs. When the actual evaluation process is followed up with each employee, it may contribute towards more effective or improved performance on the part of many individuals.

Performance appraisal is very important to the training and development process because it is a means to identify the strengths and weaknesses of the employee. Cowling and Lundy (1996, p. 287) wrote “The assessment of employee performance interface with training and development and with the organisation’s employee reward system”. Thus, the weaknesses and strengths of the employee identified by an appraisal process become the basis for future training and development. They explained further that the results of appraisal are used for taking important decisions like training, transfer and promotion. Performance appraisal could therefore be described as the bedrock for developing an appropriate training and development programme. It is therefore important that before any training and development programme is carried out, management should first appraise staff to determine their level of performance and what knowledge, skills and attitudes fall short and should be imparted.

### **Methods of Appraisal**

Different methods are used to appraise the performance of employees. Methods of performance appraisal can be grouped into two main categories. These are the informal and formal performance appraisal (Cole, 2004). Informal

appraisal is adhoc in nature and involves the day-to-day assessment of an employee by his superior in the ordinary course of work. Formal appraisal is a planned event which is usually discussed between the superior and subordinate with definite terms of reference or work context and content. The two types should be used for the purpose of identifying training needs.

In addition to the above, performance appraisal can take a variety of methods depending on what is being measured, who is doing the measurement, how the measurement is being done and the purpose of the measurement. Some of the methods with their advantages and disadvantages are as follows:

1. Work Standards Approach: This is mostly used for production employees. According to Byars and Rue (2004, p. 253), “it involves setting a standard or an expected level of output and then comparing each employee’s performance to the standard”. Marks may be awarded, depending on level of performance and efforts are made to remedy poor performances. The advantage of this is that performance review is based on highly objective factors. However, it has its weakness as lack of comparability of standards for different jobs.

2. Goal Setting or Management by Objectives (MBO): This method is ideal with professional and high calibre employees. It involves the participation of all employees in determining what should be done and how it should be done. Noe et al. (2004, p. 253) defined MBO as “a system in which people at each level of the organisation set goals in a process that flows from top to bottom, so employees at all levels are contributing to the organisations’ overall goals; these goals become the standards for evaluating each employees performance. It is worth

mentioning that for MBO to be successful, the objectives set should be clear, concise and unambiguous. Also, they should be measurable, attainable and challenging. Finally, both the employee and manager should regularly discuss and review the objectives and action plan as and when the need arises.

3. The Essay Appraisal Method: In this method, the manager provides a written narration of the performance of the employee. Byars and Rue (2004) explained that it is a method in which the rater prepares a written statement describing an individual's strengths, weaknesses and past performance. In most cases, instructions are provided on which specific areas to cover such as quantity and quality of work, job knowledge, ability to get along with others etc. This has the advantage of touching on most important issues in an objective manner since there is minimum restriction. However, it is subject to the raters' writing abilities and skills.

4. Rating Attributes: Certain traits or attributes are necessary for the performance of certain jobs. Management could therefore identify these traits and use them as the basis for appraisal. Thus, employees who exhibit higher levels of such attributes could be adjudged as performing well on the job. Rating attributes has become a very popular method of performance appraisal because it is easy to develop and can be applied to a wide variety of jobs and organizations. Its main disadvantage is that ratings of attributes such as judgment and creativity are at the manager's discretion. Reliability is therefore questionable. (Noe et al., 2004).

5. Total Quality Management (T. Q. M): This method of appraisal assesses both individual employee performance and the system within which he works (Noe et

al., 2004). It enables the employer, employee and customers to work together to set standards and measure performance, all in an effort to achieve the overall goals of the organization through customer satisfaction. Total quality management combines both measurement of results and measurement of attributes. Thus, the employee is assessed on subjective feed back from managers and peers on issues like initiative and intelligence as well as objective issues like work process.

### **Potential Errors in Performance Appraisal**

Performance appraisal as a human activity is subject to some potential errors which if not checked, could affect the reliability and validity of the results obtained. There is therefore the need to train all staff to understand and appreciate the essence of the appraisal process so as to help limit the errors that may be committed. This is evidenced in the findings of Agyenim-Boateng (2006) that “the data showed that respondents (both supervisors and employees) lacked knowledge of the objectives of the performance appraisal system” (p. 138) and again “both the employees and their supervisors had not been given enough training to ensure the effective management of the performance appraisal process” (p. 140). The notion that staff, especially supervisors, lack knowledge of the appraisal process is supported in the statement of Bohlander, Snell and Sherman (2001, p. 330) that “a weakness of many performance appraisal programmes is that managers and supervisors are not adequately trained for the appraisal task and provide little meaningful feedback to subordinates”. In addition to lack of training, Byars and Rue (2004) identified the following as likely sources of errors:



1. Leniency – the grouping of ratings at the positive end instead of spreading them.
2. Central Tendency – tendency of a manager to rate most employees near the middle of the scale.
3. Recency – tendency of a manager to rate employees on work done recently. i.e. recent performance instead of for the whole period.
4. Halo Effect – occurs when a rater allows a single prominent characteristic/performance to influence his judgment on separate items on the appraisal sheet.

Bohlander et al. (2001) on the other hand classified these possible errors into (a) error of central tendency, (b) leniency or strictness error, (c) recency error, contrast error and (d) similar-to-me error.

### **How to Overcome the Errors**

Byars and Rue (2004) suggested that to limit these errors, managers should;

1. Make refinement in the designs to make them more applicable and relevant.
2. Improve the skills of raters through training in performance appraisal methods.

Naming (2005) studied performance appraisal of Administrative Staff in tertiary institutions. The aim of the study was to determine the purpose of performance appraisal systems used at the Auckland University of Technology and also to investigate the perception and understanding of administrative staff of the appraisal system. The sample size consisted 543 staff members with a 20 percent return rate of the staff survey. Data was gathered via audio taped

interviews and questionnaire in an attempt to gauge what people were thinking. The interview was semi-structured and a set of 10 respondents who volunteered were interviewed. The rest responded to two sets of questionnaires, one to obtain information on administrative decisions (pay and promotion) and the other to obtain developmental information (training and development). The results revealed that appraisal was beneficial in helping with career development. The main purposes for performance appraisal were stated as to assist in administrative (pay increase and promotion), and developmental (training) decisions.

Agyenim-Boateng (2000) also conducted a study on performance appraisal in University of Cape Coast. The main purpose was to evaluate the system of appraisal for senior and junior staff of the University and to recommend any improvements if necessary or to develop a new system for consideration by the University authorities. His review of related literature revealed that there are two main purposes of appraisal which appear to be at extreme ends to each other. While one school of thought opined that appraisal should be used mainly for staff development purposes, (e.g. Gilley & Egglund, 1993), another school (e.g. Bannister & Balkin, 1990) believed that it should rather be used for reward outcomes. The study revealed that performance appraisal system used in University of Cape Coast is purposely to determine who should earn a salary increment or be promoted. He wrote “It does not aim at assessing the past performance, identifying training needs of employees, identifying career development opportunities, establishing a more effective communication system nor performance goals for employees, etc” (Agyenim-Boateng, 2000, p. 137). The

writer therefore proposed Peter Drucker's Management By Objective (MBO) system of appraisal for adoption by the management of the University. His findings revealed that the need for staff appraisal for the purpose of training and development is crucial if the University wants to make its training and development programmes more effective.

From the above, performance appraisal can be explained as the processes adopted by an organisation to identify the strengths and weaknesses of its employees and also to measure their performances. In addition to remuneration or promotion purposes, appraisal plays a crucial role in the training and development process. However, the appraisal system in some organisations including University of Cape Coast is not used for developmental purposes. Appraisal is a continuous process and different methods are available for use to appraise staff performance. The nature of the job, capabilities of appraisers as well as the objective of the appraisal system influence the method to choose. Also, appraisal is prone to some problems and care should be taken to avoid them since they could make appraisal results unreliable. For organisations to be able to provide training and development programmes which are relevant to the job schedules of the staff and cost effective to the organisation, it is prudent to first appraise staff performance. This will enable the organisation to determine the shortfalls in performance and the causes of such shortfall. Unfortunately, some managers are not themselves knowledgeable in the appraisal process. They are therefore unable to do proper appraisal, thus making appraisal results not very reliable for training and development purposes.

When appraisal results reveal that actual performance fall short of expectation, the need to find out whether the cause of the performance problem could be solved through training arises. This is done through training needs assessment which follows next.

### **Training Needs Assessment**

Organisations can justify their expenditure on training only on the basis of the needs of the organisation (Cole, 1997). Organisations must therefore find means to make sure that training and development money is well spent, that training and development activities further the organisations' goals and that the cost of training is "an investment into tomorrow". Bartram and Gibson (2000) opined that trainers must be able to match all training activities directly to the needs of the organisation. They argue on that, by analysing current capabilities of employees, it is much easier to predict and overcome potential barriers to achieving the company's new goals. It is therefore important that every organisation makes efforts to assess its training needs. Anthony et al. (1999) supported this notion by expressing the view that before any training activity can be done, the need for it must first be analysed. They emphasize that it is at the assessment stage that training needs are discovered.

Harris (2000, p. 342) defined training needs analysis as "an assessment by the organisation of its employees' training needs". This definition is people centred because it appears that training needs analysis focuses only employees' needs. Nfila, (2005), on the other hand explained training needs assessment to

mean a process that focuses on the identification and prioritisation of training needs. This means that an organisation does not only identify its training needs but should also define which ones are crucial and must be promptly attended to.

According to Landale (1994), a training need exists in an organisation when there is a gap between the present skills and knowledge of the employees and the skills and knowledge required for effective performance. Landale identified three reasons why organisations should embark on training needs assessment. These include:

1. When a person's job changes e.g. through promotion and transfer.
2. When a person changes e.g. where the person changes job either by choice or by necessity, or preparing for future changes in job and
3. When there are performance deficiencies.

There is therefore the need to distinguish between training needs of the organisation and those of the individual. Thus, management should endeavour to reconcile corporate and personal needs. This is necessary because in most cases, employees seek to develop transferable skills, which are seen as valuable by other employers while local management is interested in skills which improve performance on employees' present job leading to improvement in quality and quantity. For instance, Price (2004, p. 594) wrote "Employees seek training which will make them more marketable whereas organisations prefer training which makes employees more productive". Nowack (1991) agreed to this notion and further distinguished between the two as:

1. Training Needs: tasks and behaviours which are necessary for the organisation and which employees' proficiency is inadequate.
2. Training Wants: tasks and behaviours in which employees are not proficient and the organisation does not regard as necessary.

Nowack (1991) observed that the first purpose of training needs analysis is to weed out training wants. Anthony et al. (1999) and Carrell et al. (2000) therefore suggested that training needs analysis should be done at three major levels, namely organisational, task/operation and employee/person.

Analysing organisational needs involves the examination of the proposed training projects with respect to the organisation's goals, objectives and strategies (Anthony et al., 1999). It determines the existing problems in the organisation e.g. accidents, low productivity and inferior quality for the training programme to deal with (Carrell et al., 2000). It also considers how the proposed programme will affect other sections or activities of the organisation. For instance, will staff be able to combine work with the training and development programme being offered? Efforts should also be made to ensure that the programme fits into the long term plans of the organisation. Cole (2004) explained that for the organisation, sources of training needs are the demands of the job and the demands for organisational change.

Task or Operations needs assessment is to isolate the specific requirements of the job in question. The purpose is to determine what jobs are done, how they are to be performed and the desired level of performance (Carrell, et al. 2000). This helps trainers to focus on the correct methods and procedures of performing

a job. Also, providers of training are able to determine the right personnel to provide training and what methods and materials would be appropriate.

Person needs analysis is performed for two main reasons; to determine who currently requires training and development programme and also the kind of skills, attitudes and abilities required to be provided or strengthened (Carrell et al. 2000). Thus, it identifies the present performance level of the employee and compares them with the expected or desired level by the organisation so that training efforts would be geared at settling the difference. Carrel et al (2000, p. 258) summed this in the following statement “Person analysis is important to ensure that employees who need training are the ones who actually receive it and that programmes are designed to fill the gap between actual and desired performance, called the performance gap”.

### **Methods of Needs Assessment**

Different methods are used to gather different kinds of information from various sources to identify training needs so as to make training and development programmes beneficial. The content for a needs assessment can thus be obtained through the use of a couple of different processes. These include developing a curriculum (DACUM), interviewing, focus groups or research questionnaires and surveys (Lee & Nelson, 2006). The DACUM process consists of a map or chart that identifies the competencies and tasks required to perform a job. The competencies and tasks are identified by individuals who either perform or supervise the job. Thus, these experts prepare a chart of the formal procedures involved in the performance of the job and then compare it with how an employee

goes about his normal duties. The deviations observed become the source for training. Interviewing comprises a couple of different methods including face to face, telephone or filling out of a questionnaire. Interviews can be highly structured, moderately structured or unstructured. Highly structured interviews involve the use of specific predetermined questions which the interviewer must follow strictly. Moderately structured or semi-structured interviews contain specific questions but are done in a conversational manner and thus the interviewer must not necessarily adhere to the predetermined pattern and content. Unstructured interviews contain no specific questions, but just a topic.

In focus groups interviews, usually staff of similar level and job characteristics are brought together to talk about how they perform their jobs and the difficulties they face. It allows for information to be gathered in a fast and inexpensive manner and can consist of any number of people. They are lead by a mediator and often participants are surprised by how much they have in common. Focus groups interviews allow for people to inform each other and also share their feelings. Research questionnaires and surveys consist of a series of questions used for the purpose of gathering information. Questionnaires and surveys are relatively inexpensive and do not normally require significant resources or efforts to create (Lee & Nelson, 2006).

Another method of assessing training needs is the use of the needs assessment matrix. The "Needs Assessment Matrix" is a simple tool that suggests different ways of gathering information regarding audiences, tasks, and content ([www.ceismc.gatech.edu/mm\\_tools/analysis.html](http://www.ceismc.gatech.edu/mm_tools/analysis.html). Retrieved 18th June, 2009).



This procedure "triangulates" the information you need by collecting it via two or more ways. These ways include observation, interviews and documentation review.

1. Observations are sometimes considered the most direct method of collecting needs assessment data, although in many cases, a great deal of inference is involved in interpreting observations. It involves directly or indirectly looking at how the employee performs his or her tasks and taking note of the deviations or difficulties faced.

2. Interviews are considered the easiest way of collecting needs assessment data. Questionnaires and focus groups may also be relatively effective and efficient methods. However, what people tell you and what they really do may differ. It is sometimes important to verify the results of interviews with observations and document analysis.

3. Documentation review, e.g., looking at employee personnel records, can provide useful needs assessment data. These records include appraisal results, previous works, previous training programmes attended and other personal files of employees. It should be noted however, that in some situations, it may be difficult or impossible to obtain desired documents. ([www.ceismc.gatech.edu/mm\\_tools/analysis.html](http://www.ceismc.gatech.edu/mm_tools/analysis.html). Retrieved 18th June, 2009).

Effah (1998) categorised performance needs analysis methods into two types. These are (a) Manager centred methods such as observations, tests and samples and analysis of records and (b) Staff centred methods such as questionnaires and interviews.

## **Theories/Models of Needs Assessment**

Different authors have come out with a number of different needs assessment models that can be used to guide trainers through the training process.

Gupta (1999) identified six needs assessment models. These are:

- i) Human competency model
- ii) Front-end analysis
- iii) Organisational elements model
- iv) Analysing performance problems
- v) Training needs assessment and
- vi) Performance improvement by managing the white space.

The human competency model was created by Thomas Gilbert. It considers six principles or factors which are believed to affect human performance. These factors are information, resources, incentives, knowledge, capacity, and motives. The Front-end analysis model was developed by Joe Harless. This model is based on the theory that training is not an end to all solution, but through this analysis core problems can be revealed. The Organisational elements model was made by Roger Kaufman. It is made up of five elements which are inputs, processes, products, outputs, and outcomes.

The Analysing performance problems model developed by Robert Mager represents a flow chart that covers five main areas. These areas are used to ask systematic probing questions. The five main areas are: describe the problem, explore fast fixes, check consequences, enhance competence, and develop

solutions. The Training needs assessment model created by Allison Rossell is a purpose-based model. In this model five types of information are gathered: optimal performance or knowledge, actual or current performance or knowledge, feelings of trainees and significant others, causes of the problem from many perspectives, and solutions to the problem from many perspectives. These five types of information are used to find a gap between an optimal and actual situation.

The Performance improvement by managing the white space model was developed by Geary Rummler. It is based on an examination of three levels of performance. This model is made up of five phases and uses fourteen steps to diagnose and develop a plan for implementing interventions for performance improvement.

There are several other models that are available to assist in the process of needs assessments.

### **Importance of Needs Assessment**

Needs assessments play a variety of roles in the training and development of staff in an organisation. They are often used to identify the value that training or an education programme will have on fixing a performance problem. The following functions were identified as being performed in a needs assessment exercise (Lee & Nelson, 2006).

1. Gathers data on perceived needs
2. Identifies knowledge, skills, and behavior discrepancies
3. Assists trainers, human resource development personnel, administrators, and instructors in developing relevant curriculum materials

4. Gathers information that brings beneficial change to an organisation or community
5. Assesses organisational needs
6. Promotes buy-in by participants

According to Effah (1998), needs analysis helps management to identify the unique developmental requirement of staff at various levels in the organisation thereby making sure that their training needs are appropriately met. Thus, training needs analysis helps both the organisation and the staff to reduce waste of resources in the form of time, energy, money and materials by providing the right training to the right people at the right time.

It should be noted, however, that training and development programmes do not necessarily solve all performance related problems in the organisation. Some performance problems are caused by other factors either than lack of knowledge and skills on the part of employees to perform them. For instance, Lee & Nelson (2006) observed that, contrary to many beliefs, training can't fix everything, and unfortunately training is sometimes done just for the sake of training. (McClelland, 2002, p. 9) also wrote "training is not always the answer and when it is, it has to be the right training". Needs assessments are critical, they identified the potential causes of problems, determine whether the problem can or cannot be solved by training and if it can be solved by training, whether it will be significant in determining the training objectives.

This does not mean that needs assessment is not without a weakness. According to Gupta (1999), the main drawback of training needs assessment

approach is that it lacks the rigor of a strategic needs assessment, competency assessment or job and task analysis.

Nfila (2005) carried out a study on “Training Needs Analysis for Bachibanga Company Limited in Botswana” (a fictitious name). The purpose of the study was to discuss the importance of conducting systematic needs assessment to differentiate training solvable needs from other organisational needs within the company. Out of a population of 300, she selected a sample size of 50 employees working at different levels, divisions and locations of the company. The researcher used a survey instrument derived in part from her literature review. Items in the instrument were to determine whether employees know or do not know the tasks required by their jobs. If they cannot perform the required tasks because they do not know them, then it means they require training. The study revealed that 16.7% of the staff actually required training. It was observed that training cannot solve all problems in an organisation which are related to performance improvement. Again, for training to be effective, performance problems must be identified and analysed. Then needs assessment must be conducted to determine if training is the best way to solve the problem. Finally, training programmes should be evaluated to find whether learning took place and if learned skills are actually being applied to the job.

It is now clear that needs assessment plays a crucial role in the training and development of staff. It ensures that training and development programmes satisfy both the immediate and future needs of the organisation and individuals concerned. It also ensures that the right type and methods of training are provided

for the right kind of staff. This is done by first determining who requires training and what kind of training is actually required. It is therefore a way of making sure that training and development budget is judiciously spent. Thus, scarce resources of the organisation in the form of time, personnel and money are not spent on people who do not require training. Again, it acknowledges that different reasons necessitate training and development in an organisation and these include performance deficiencies and changes in the organisation. Finally, trainers should note that training and development programmes do not necessarily solve all performance related problems in organisations.

After training needs have been assessed and the need for training is justified, there is the need to determine the type and method which will be appropriate for the intended objective. The various types and methods of training are therefore considered in the proceeding subheading.

### **Types and Methods of Training**

Noe et al. (2004, p. 2000) noted that “an effective training programme teaches what it is designed to teach, and it teaches skills and behaviours that will help the organisation achieve its goals”. They explained further that to achieve this, trainers must approach training through instructional design. They also observed however, that this is not always the case. This means that some organisations provide training to staff without following any appropriate procedure. This could hamper the achievement of the goals of such training programmes.

According to Anthony et al. (1999), training procedures fall into two main categories. These are “on-the-job” training and “off-the-job” training. They observe that any comprehensive training system in an organisation uses both types. Byars and Rue (2004, p. 192) defined on-the-job training as “training that shows the employee how to perform a job and allows him or her to do it under the trainer’s supervision”. Thus, the employee undergoes the training programme at his work place and therefore learns new skills or ideas while performing his normal schedules. The notion that training types could be put into two main categories is supported by Harris (2000) who wrote, “...it is helpful to divide training techniques into two broad categories: on-the-job and off-the-job approaches” (p. 349). Harris explained that on-the-job training is provided at the worksite while off-the-job training is provided away from the worksite. Thus, while on-the-job training is provided to the trainees alongside normal working schedules, off-the-job training is provided to the employee outside his normal job schedules. It may take place outside the premises of the organisation or within the organisation but not while the employee is working.

Training methods refer to the means or techniques by which trainers communicate information, ideas, skills, attitudes and feelings to trainees (Cole, 1997). To ensure that training programmes achieve desired results, trainers must ensure that the right training method is used for the right training objective. For this reason, Cole explains that methods are a crucial element to the trainer’s success. Silliman (2004) supported this view when he explained that the training programme is as important as the training content. Trainers should therefore

attach equal importance to training methods or designs as they do for training content.

Again, training design should be able to meet the individual needs of trainees so as to sustain their interest through out the training programme. It should be motivating enough and also be able to link content to real situations on the job. Whaley (2006, p. 23) wrote, “Good training designs dictate that training must fit the learning styles of multiple learners and be designed in such a way as to encourage learners to find things within the training programme that are beneficial to them”. This is to ensure transfer of training. Different writers have identified various methods of training under on-the-job and off-the-job training. These include Anthony et al. (1999) who have; job enlargement, job rotation, staff development meetings, mentoring and problem solving conferences for “on-the-job” training and outside short courses and seminars, college or university degree and certificate programmes, advanced management programmes and outside meetings and conferences for “off-the-job” training. Anthony et al. go further to explain that instructional techniques such as lecture, multimedia presentations, job coaching, computer-assisted instruction, case analysis and gaming/role playing could be used either for on-the-job or off-the-job training programmes.

Harris (2000) on the other hand identified coaching, job rotation, “one-on-one” instruction, and apprenticeship and internship as methods of on-the-job training while classroom/lecture, videotape, distance learning and equipment simulators as methods of off-the-job training.



From the foregoing, there are disagreements among authors on the classifications of the methods of training as well as instructional techniques. Some of the methods of training are described below.

1. Job Rotation – also called cross training. It involves placing an individual on several different jobs in a work unit to perform each job for a specified time period (Byars & Rue, 2004).

2. Coaching – is where a manager or supervisor achieves objectives by setting goals, providing assistance in reaching the goals and giving timely and constructive performance feedback. It works well when there is a rapport between the trainer and trainee (Carrell et al., 2000).

3. Mentoring: - is where a learner is assigned to an experienced supervisor to be provided with support and guidance. It could be formal or informal (Carrell et al., 2000).

4. Apprenticeship – a formal programme that involves a combination of classroom instruction and hands on practice and training.

5. Lecture - where an expert or trainer imparts uniform information to a group of trainees. It involves delivering ideas or knowledge in a timely manner to a group of people.

6. Vestibule/Simulation – a training area is created to resemble employees' actual work area. The instructor demonstrates processes and procedures on the same kind of machines and similar situations as can be found in the real work place.

7. Case Study – a written description of an organisation's problem is given to trainees. They are required to identify and analyse specific problems, develop

alternative courses of action and recommend the best alternative. It is ideal for developing problem solving skills in employees (Carrell et al., 2000).

According to Byars and Rue (2004), advantages of on-the-job training include that no new equipment are required since the same job equipment are used in the training process. Also, the employee does productive work while learning. Therefore, time and resources are maximised. Again, it is cheaper as the organisation does not incur further cost in hiring personnel to do the training. The main disadvantage is that the pressure of work may cause disruptions in the training process. DeNisi and Griffin (2001) also added that on-the-job training may make employees learn a relatively narrow approach to performing a task.

### **Approaches to Staff Training and Development**

Different organisations use various approaches for staff development programmes. Bittel (1985) identified four of such approaches. They are:

1. Hit-or-miss: This refers to situations where management may suddenly decide to offer some development or training programme to equip its staff with new skills or competencies necessary for their job. Since this is unplanned, it may or may not be successful.
2. Trial and error: Here, the organisation does not take time to analyse situations to know what the actual needs of staff are. They just offer training and where the problem persists, they keep changing training programmes until the problem is solved.
- 3) Sink-or-swim: Refers to a situation where an organisation will do well or badly with some few adhoc training programmes.

4) Structured and systematic type: This is based on a careful analysis of the needs of staff. Instruction is orderly presented to staff by experts or professionals who use the most appropriate training techniques to ensure success.

From the discussion, the method adopted by trainers in the training and development process is very crucial to the success of the training programme. This is because the right approach will not only sustain learner interest throughout the training process but will also promote better understanding of what is taught and thereby ensure transfer of training. There are different types and techniques of training and the objective of the training programme plays a crucial role in determining the most appropriate technique. Types of training can be put into two main categories which are on-the-job and off-the-job training. There are different methods under the two broad categories even though writers do not agree on the classification. What is important is that trainers should analyse the merits and demerits of each method in relation to the objective of the training programme before making a choice. Again, various approaches to training exist in organisations. However, some are more appropriate and are therefore recommended.

The main reason for using various methods and techniques to train staff is to facilitate learning and later transfer of training. This will be achieved when trainers understand what learning is and have an appreciation of the theories and principles which guide learning. This is considered in the next section.

## **Learning and Learning Principles**

Any training and development programme can become beneficial only when trainees acquire the skills and knowledge imparted for application on their jobs. Megginson, Banfield and Joy-Mathews (1999) observed that learning is at the heart of training and development. They wrote “learning is the essential pre-condition for any change in performance at work” (p. 53). This means that without learning, the objective of training programmes to bring about improved performance cannot be realised. Trainers must therefore ensure that learning takes places during training programmes. Understanding of learning theories and processes is therefore beneficial to trainers. Cole (1997) explained that some influential theories of learning have affected the ways managers approach training and development programmes.

Learning can be defined as “a complex process of acquiring knowledge, understanding, skills and values in order to be able to adapt to the environment in which we live” (Cole, 1997, p. 254). He explained further that such adaptation must result in observable change in behaviour. This also means that learning precludes any change in behaviour which is as a result of biological factors such as maturation. Factors which influence learning include intelligence of the learner, skills of the trainer and the learning environment. Cole wrote “the effectiveness of the learning will be tempered by the conditions under which it takes place, for example, amount of stress present and learning aids utilised” (p. 254).

Some learning theories such as those by Plato and Aristotle emphasised mental faculties, that is, reason, memory and willpower. They are therefore

referred to as “trained minds” or “thinking people” (Cole, 1997). Cole explained further that such theories suggest that learning should be structured, teaching methods should be didactic; great importance should be attached to subject matter and also memorising and rote-learning considered as crucial. An example of this could be seen in long term staff development programmes which are academic in nature such as M. Phil., M.B.A. and other degrees which are academic oriented.

Another learning theory is the behaviourist theory by Thorndike and Skinner referred to as “Behaving People” (Cole, 1997). He explained that this theory puts emphasis on the behaviour of people, especially as a response to a stimulus. The most popular law of learning from this theory is the “Law of Effect”. Thorndike (as cited in Cole, 1997 p. 257) stated a general principle that “when a response is followed by a reward or feeling of satisfaction, that response is more likely to be repeated in similar circumstances”. Thus, when trainees are awarded with certificates and promotion after a training programme or when staff who apply training ideas on their jobs for improved performance are rewarded with a form of remuneration, they are more likely to be encouraged to repeat such actions.

For these theories to be applicable for the benefit of training and development programmes, certain principles must be adhered to. Harris, (2000) suggests the following principles:

1. Provide for Active Practice – trainees must be given the opportunity to practice what they are being taught either in the course of the training programme or immediately after.

2. Choose between Massed versus Distributed Learning Sessions: - This has to do with the duration of the programme. Depending on the nature, managers must choose between making the programme compact to be completed within a short period and spreading it over a longer period with short training sessions a day.

3. Provide Feedback to Trainees – Trainers must use an appropriate means of informing trainees about their performance as a result of the training programme. Feedback should not be seen as a criticism else they discourage trainees. Feedback would help to make learning interesting, make trainees correct their mistakes and encourage them to set goals for improving performance.

4. Maximise Application of Training to the Job – this is to ensure that what is learnt on training and development programmes is actually transferred to the job situation. This does not usually happen because there may be lack of support from management or the work situation; trainees may be uncomfortable with using new competencies or trainees may perceive the training programme as irrelevant or impractical.

In addition to these principles, Harris (2000) suggested that to ensure that training and development programmes become successful, stakeholders of a training programme should ensure the following:

1. Participants should be actively involved in planning the training programme.
2. Develop a written contract between trainees and their supervisors so that supervisors will know what to expect from trainees and what trainees will also need from them.

3. Use realistic work situations as illustrations to make the programme more relevant to trainees.
4. Facilitate trainee participation in the programme to promote better learning and understanding.
5. Arrange refresher sessions to remind trainees of what was learnt and also help them with difficulties they may be experiencing.
6. Support training by helping to discuss and address concerns that arise after the programme.

Thus, for training programmes to be beneficial, trainers must observe that learning is very critical. This is because trainees can only apply what is taught at training session when they are able to learn. Providers of training should therefore make efforts to promote learning during training programmes. There are different theories of learning which can be applied. The choice of a theory should depend on factors such as the type of knowledge or skills being imparted, the caliber of trainees and the objective of the training programme.

Training and development programmes are effective when participants are able to transfer what they learn to their job schedules. Learning is thus crucial to transfer. For instance, Holton, Bates & Rouna (2000) observed that two critical outcomes of effective training are learning and transfer of training. Transfer of training is considered in the following review.

## **Factors that Influence Transfer of Training**

If learning takes place during training programmes, the general expectation is that trainees would apply what they have learnt on to their jobs. This is referred to as transfer of training. According to Lee (2007, p. 23), “transfer of training can be considered as the purpose of training and an organisation’s expectations for its employees who go through training”. Baldwin and Ford (1988) defined transfer of training as “the degree to which trainees effectively apply the knowledge, skills and attitudes gained in a training context to the job and maintained overtime”. This means that transfer of training can be said to have occurred only when acquired knowledge and skills from training programmes are practised overtime in the work situation. Haskell (1998) noted that transfer of training is a way of thinking, perceiving and processing information and that without the ability to transfer, people could not engage in everyday thinking and reasoning. Thus, transfer of training is simply the ability to process information acquired from training and therefore apply it to solve work related problems.

However, it is not always the case that transfer of training follows learning. According to Broad (2000, p. 9), “it is estimated that the extent to which learning typically is transferred into performance range from 5 to 20 percent”. This is because a multiplicity of factors influences trainees’ ability to transfer what they acquire during training programmes. According to Cheng and Ho (2001), transfer is seen as a function of three sets of factors. These are:

1. Trainee characteristics i.e. ability, personality and motivation.



2. Training design i.e. training content, sequencing, principle of learning and methods.
3. The work environment i.e. support, opportunity to practice and available equipments.

Several research works support Cheng and Ho (2001) that transfer of training is complex and is influenced by several factors. These include the works of Noe and Schmitt (1986), Holton and Baldwin (2003), and Rouiller and Goldstein (1993).

Among the factors that influence transfer of training is transfer climate. Transfer climate is explained as those situational cues and consequences that either inhibit or help to facilitate the transfer of what has been learned from training into the job situation (Rouiller & Goldstein, 1993). The transfer climate, according to these writers, is not the work environment per se but rather the interpretation through which the work environment affects job behaviours and attitudes. This means that transfer climate is much more about the perception of individuals. Again, transfer climate, according to Schneider and Rentsch (as cited in Handy, 2008) can be described as a “sense of imperatives” that arises from a person’s perceptions of the work environment, and that influences the extent to which a person applies learned skills to the job. Holton et al. concluded that transfer climate has a significant effect on the individual’s ability and motivation to transfer learning to the job. Again, the influence of work environment on transfer of training is supported by Tannenbaum and Yukl (1992) who opine that individuals may be motivated to transfer learned knowledge, skills and attitudes

back to the job, but may be discouraged, inhibited or prevented from doing so by circumstances in their work environment.

Noe (1986) explained further that environmental favourability comprised both situational or task constraints (lack of resources) and social support (people). Like Noe, other writers including Lim and Morris (2006) who supported that work environment affect transfer of training, also categorised the factors into two i.e. factors related to the work system (situational or task) and people related factors (social support). Some of the variables under the two categories are;

1. Situational/Task (Work System) Constraints: These include (a) job related information, (b) tools and equipments (c) materials and supplies, (d) budgetary support, (e) require services and help from others, (f) task preparation, (g) time availability and (h) work environment i.e. noise, temperature and lighting. (Peters & O'Connor, as cited in Handy, 2008)
2. Social Support: These include (a) subordinate, (b) peer, (c) supervisor and (d) Top management (Facteau et al., as cited in Handy, 2008).

The role of supervisors and top managers in supporting employees to be able to transfer what they learn at training to their jobs can not be underestimated. Some writers are even of the opinion that managers should be trained in how they could offer such support. One such author is Rosner (1999, p. 43) in the following statement “The most effective programmes train workers in new behaviours and then train managers to support employees as they apply learning daily”.

It is now obvious that the work environment plays an important role in transfer of training. Whaley (2006) was more emphatic on the importance of the work environment on performance in the following statement “a supportive environment does as much to encourage training transfer as much as an environment devoid of support does to sabotage training transfer” (p. 42). Managers must therefore provide working environments which support transfer of training so as to make training programmes useful to both the organisation and beneficiaries. The importance of work environment as one major variable that affects transfer climate is also supported by Noe (1986). He argued that a favourable environment is an important variable impacting subsequent transfer of training.

Handy (2008) observed that although the work environment variables have been emphasised by research as important to the transfer of training, it is surprising that little research has addressed the issue of the employees’ perception of the work environment variables and if they perceive these work environment variables as being significant in their ability to transfer their knowledge and skills gained from training back to the job. She conducted a study on “The Importance of Work Environment Variables on the Transfer of Training”. The study was in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the award of Doctor of Education Degree. The purpose of the study was to examine a proposed model of training transfer which relates the employee’s perceived importance of the work environment variables to transfer of training within an organisational work setting. She used 115 service engineers from two separate companies who had

just completed a particular training programme. Using questionnaire as the only instrument, the researcher administered the first set to the respondents immediately after they had completed the training programme. This was to measure the existence of the work environment variables and motivation to transfer training. The second questionnaire was sent to the same participants 60 days after the training programme and this measured the importance of the work environment variables and the transfer achieved. A Pearson's correlation and multiple regressions were conducted and five variables were removed due to low reliability.

The study revealed a positive relationship and a moderate correlation between motivation to transfer and perceived transfer achieved. The correlation was statistically significant. Work environment variables were also seen to be important for transfer of training as it accounted for 11.1% of the variance in motivation to transfer. Peer support and feedback were also seen to be important as they were significantly related to motivation to transfer.

From the foregoing, it is clear that after learning has taken place, the ability of the learner to transfer the acquired knowledge and skills to his job is influenced by a multiplicity of factors which can be described as organisational climate or work environment. These factors which constitute work environment can be categorised into two, namely; situational or task constraints and social support factors. Thus, beneficiaries of training and development programmes may be willing and able to apply the knowledge and skills acquired in their work but the work environment may hinder their ability to transfer. Managers should

therefore ensure that at all times, positive transfer climate prevails within their organisations. They should strive to provide favourable work environment variables so as to facilitate transfer of learning and thus make the cost of training programmes justifiable.

If transfer of training occurs, it is most likely to result into enhanced performance. This could be ascertained when the overall training programme is evaluated. Evaluation and performance measurement are therefore considered in the next subheading.

### **Evaluation of Training Programmes and Performance**

The expenditure on training and development programmes can be justified only when it translates into benefits to the employees and the organisation in the form of improved performances. Thus, while the organisation enjoys increases in productivity and improved quality, the employees enjoy promotions which lead to enhanced remunerations. This can be ascertained after the programme has been evaluated. Hamblin as in Cole (1997, p. 307) contributed a well known definition for evaluation in training context when he wrote “It is any attempt to obtain information (feedback) on the effects of a training programme, and to assess the value of the training in the light of that information”. Thus, evaluation has to do with obtaining feedback as to whether a training programme has been successful or not and also, an attempt to compare the value to the cost to see if the investment was beneficial. It also implies a training programme should be

evaluated not only in terms of performance or outcomes but also cost effectiveness to find out whether the investment has been worthwhile.

The importance of evaluating a training and development programme cannot be overemphasised. It helps management to identify more effective training programmes and implement them for the benefits of the organisation and employees. Byars and Rue (2004) explained that evaluation helps trainers to identify and withdraw less effective programmes to save time, effort and cost. Also, weaknesses identified within some programmes can be remedied. Harris (2000) identified the importance of evaluation to include:

1. To be able to justify the expenditure on training
2. To help make decisions about future programmes
3. To be able to make decisions about individual trainees and
4. To help reduce professional liabilities by ensuring that injuries and accidents that may occur can be defended against legal charges.

Since the success or otherwise of a training and development programme is determined through evaluation, management must ensure that a systematic and comprehensive approach is adopted to evaluate training programmes. Byars and Rue (2004) and Carrell et al. (2000) suggested that evaluation of training and development programmes should be done on four different levels. These are:

1. Reaction: How did participants react? This provides information on the opinion of trainees on a wide range of issues including the content, approach, equipments used and relevancy. A questionnaire could be used to gather this data. The major

disadvantage of this is that enthusiasm of trainees cannot be taken to mean improved performance is assured.

2. Learning: What did participants learn? This involves evaluating learning concerns, trying to find out how well the trainees understood and absorbed the theory, principles, facts and skills which were taught. This can be done through tests or allowing participants to demonstrate or role play. However, this is hardly done because it is seen to be “adult unfriendly”.

3. Behaviour: How did participants’ behaviour change? This concerns a positive change in attitude and perception towards the job. Although it is very difficult to measure, it can be observed in the form of how punctual the trainee becomes, the enthusiasm with which he works, how he relates at work place and the quality of his output. The most ideal method of evaluation is to compare pre-training and post training behaviours.

4. Results: What organisational goals were affected? This is much more with the impact on the organisation. It assesses to what extent the training and development programmes have brought about changes in organisational variables such as reduced staff turnover, improved quality and quantity of production, reduced accidents and reduced cost of production. Evaluation can also be done through comparing pre-training and post-training performances.

### **Criteria for Performance Evaluation**

Different organisations and writers have adopted different indicators or criteria to measure performance after training programmes. In the opinion of Burrow and Berardinelli (2003, p. 4) “the most meaningful factor in evaluating

the effectiveness of training is the trainee's work performance and therefore, a better performance indicator maybe in the knowledge and skills employees transfer from the training back to the work environment".

The criterion for evaluation should be determined at the planning stage of the training process. Heneman III et al. (2000. p. 444) wrote "actually, the choice of evaluation criteria occurs before training when instructional objectives are set because the two concepts are synonymous". This means that the criteria for evaluation are influenced by the objectives of any training and development activity. For example, the East Tennessee State University considered several criteria including:

1. Knowledge of work - How well does the employee know his or her job? This measures the extent to which the employee demonstrates improved understanding of his job as a result of undergoing the training programmes.
2. Quantity of Work – Has the employee's rate of production increased? It also considers the ability of the person to complete tasks within limited time. It compares the present quantity or level of production to the level before training.
3. Quality of Work - Does the employee make frequent mistakes? It compares the quality of job produced by the employee in terms of accuracy.
4. Initiative - Does employee volunteer for new assignments and responsibilities? Does the employee require a great deal of supervisory guidance regarding initiative? This considers the ability of the staff to do what is expected of them without being prompted. Thus, it is concerned with how independent staff have become after undergoing training programmes.



5. Dependability/ Responsibility - Does employee consistently fulfill responsibilities? How much follow-up is required? It relates to the extent to which management can put its trust in staff to perform their jobs.

6. Quality of Interpersonal Relationships - Does employee create resentment in fellow employees? How tactful is employee when communicating with fellow employees and customers? It also measures the extent to which beneficiaries are able to function effectively in team work as well as how they able to cooperate with superiors, peers and subordinates.

7. Attendance - How often is employee absent or late? Does the employee notify his/her supervisor promptly when absence or tardiness occurs? It measures employees' present attendance to what prevailed before training. Punctuality can also be considered here.

8. Supervisory Ability - Does employee exert a positive influence on others? The leadership skills exhibited by staff especially with regards to how fair they treat staff and ability to make sound judgments are considered. (<http://www.etsu.edu/humanres/guide.htm>. Retrieved 26<sup>th</sup> October, 2009)

Hakala (2008) also identified 16 ways to measure performance in organisations. Among them include:

1. Quantity: The number of units produced, processed or sold is a good objective indicator of performance. He advises that care should however be taken not to place too much emphasis on quantity since this could affect quality.

2. Quality: The quality of work performed can be measured by several means. This includes the percentage of work output that must be redone or is rejected.

Thus the rate of errors committed is a measure of quality.

3. Timeliness: How fast work is performed is another performance indicator that should be used with caution. This also affects quantity of work. A worker's ability to complete tasks within schedule is an indicator of good performance.

4. Cost-Effectiveness: The cost of work performed should be used as a measure of performance only if the employee has some degree of control over costs. This concerns how efficient an employee is. Thus, staff who undergo training programmes should be able to perform their job using minimum resources.

5. Absenteeism/Tardiness: An employee is obviously not performing when he or she is not at work. Other employees' performance may be adversely impacted by his absences, too. Training should be able to influence attitude of staff to desist from avoidable absenteeism.

6. Creativity: It can be difficult to quantify creativity as a performance indicator, but in many white-collar jobs, it is vitally important. Supervisors and employees should keep track of creative work examples and attempt to quantify them. This includes employees' ability to initiate tasks on their own or introduce innovative ways of doing things.

7. Adherence to Policy: This may seem to be the opposite of creativity, but it is merely a boundary on creativity. Deviations from policy indicate an employee whose performance goals are not well aligned with those of the company. Staff should be trained to work towards the attainment of organisational goals and this is easier when they adhere to the policies and norms of the organisation.

Amewudah (2002) evaluated training and development programmes in University of Cape Coast and how they can be improved to meet current and future requirements of the University. The main objectives for carrying out the research were to find out how training and development of staff could be explored through its strategic role and again to examine what role evaluation plays in the training and development functions of the University. He chose a sample size of 41 comprising Teaching and Non-Teaching Senior Members, Senior and Junior Staff and Heads of Departments of the staff concerned. His study was for the period between 1987 and 1997 because, according to him, training and development for other categories of staff other than academic was intensified after 1987. Three types of questionnaire were developed, one each for Senior Members, Senior and Junior Staff and Heads of Departments with the aim of providing respondents the opportunity to offer self report on the programmes they underwent and to illicit the opinions of their heads on the impact of these programmes on their performance.

The researcher analysed his study under the following headings (a) suitability of programmes; comparability of programmes with University's strategic goal, (b) impact of programmes on personal developments of participants, (c) impact on job performance, (d) impact on work output, (e) contribution to the development of the University and (f) future training needs envisaged. The study revealed that the training and development programmes provided by the University were relevant to the needs of both the University and the beneficiaries. They also impacted positively on the work output and

performance of staff. He also observed that while academic staff would want further training programmes which were academic related and longer in duration such as Ph. D. and Post Doctoral courses, non-academic staff would prefer shorter professional courses after acquiring a Masters degree.

From the above, it is obvious that evaluation is indispensable in the training and development process and that the cost of training and development programmes can be justified only when it translates into improved performances on the part of beneficiaries. Thus, the dual role of evaluation is to find out the impact on staff performance and cost effectiveness of training programmes. Evaluation can be explained as the attempt adopted by management to determine whether the objectives of providing a particular training programme has been achieved. It provides information to management as to whether or not to invest in such programmes in future and also what changes might be necessary to bring improvement. There are different indicators or traits that managers can use to determine performance. The nature of a person's job will however influence which indicators are reliable. Also, evaluation can be done at different levels. For reliability of results, it is recommended that management tries to evaluate programmes on all or at least more one of the levels.

### **Summary**

Staff training and development is an important area in which every organization must endeavour to invest. The need to train and develop staff could

be compared with the need to maintain equipments and other facilities in an organization. Training should thus be viewed as an investment into the future.

Some organisations, including University of Cape Coast, invest huge sums of money in training and development programmes. To ensure that such investments eventually satisfy both the employees and the organisation by improving on performance and job satisfaction, organizations must be methodical in implementing training programmes.

To make training and development programmes successful, organizations should first appraise the performance of their staff and use the results to conduct a needs assessment for the entire organisation. After the needs of the organization and staff have been identified and analysed, a training programme can be planned and implemented. However, in University of Cape Coast, the appraisal system only concentrates on promotion purposes to the neglect of staff developmental aspects (Agyenim-Boateng, 2000). Again, training should consider the various theories of learning as well as methods of training and depending on the needs or objectives of the training programme, an appropriate method should be selected. Training does not necessarily solve all performance related problems in an organization. All training and development programmes must be evaluated on various areas or levels so that weaknesses identified could be remedied and also ensure that it is worth the investment. Studies reveal that the training and development programmes provided by University of Cape Coast for the various categories of staff some years ago yielded positive results to both the University and the individual beneficiaries.

## **CHAPTER THREE**

### **METHODOLOGY**

This chapter presents the methods adopted by the researcher for the study. It discusses the research design, population, sample size and the sampling techniques used. In addition, the research instruments used, how the instruments were developed and pilot tested, procedures used in gathering data and how data were analysed are discussed.

#### **Research Design**

According to Trochim (2000, p. 183), “a research design provides the glue that holds the research together”. He explains that the design is used to structure the research, thereby showing how all the major parts of the research work together to address the central research question. Nwadinigwe (2005, p. 33) also emphasised the importance of design to research in the following statement, “basically, research design as an important aspect of research, must be the most appropriate to appropriately measure what is being measured and obtain the data that will validly lead to a conclusion that is also valid”. The design used for the study is a case study design. “A case study is an empirical enquiry that investigates a contemporary phenomenon within its real-life context when the boundary between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident” Yin (as cited

in Sarantakos, 2005, p. 211). According to Broomley (1986), a case study is not a method of data collection but a research model, and employs a number of methods of data collection and analysis in a variety of contexts.

Some of the characteristics of case study are: it is suitable for pursuing in-depth analysis, it studies whole units and not parts (Sarantakos, 2005) and also it is conducted within a localized boundary of space and time, it is conducted mainly in its natural context (Bassey, 2007). This design is ideal because the study is conducted mainly in its natural setting and employs various methods in collecting data. Thus, in the words of Cohen et al. (2005, p. 181), “it provides a unique example of real people in real situations, enabling readers to understand ideas more clearly than by presenting them with abstract theories and principles”. Another reason which is also supported by Hitchcock and Hughes (1995) is because the researcher has little control over the events.

This does not mean that case study designs are not without shortfalls. Marczyk, DeMatteo and Festinger (2005) observe that case study designs, like all non-experimental designs, merely tell us what occurred but cannot tell us why it happened. Also, they are most likely to contain a great deal of experimenter bias. However, efforts were made to minimize this limitation by reporting only what was obtained.

### **Population**

Population refers to “all individuals of interest to the researcher” Marczyk et al. (2005 p. 33). Agyedu, Donkor and Obeng (1999) also explained

population as a set of individual (objects, subjects, events) which have common observable characteristics for which a researcher is interested. According to Fink (1995), the criteria for the inclusion of a unit in a survey are based on characteristics of respondents who are eligible for the participation in the survey. For this reason, the target population for the study is all senior staff of University of Cape Coast who have undergone any kind of training and development programme provided by the University of Cape Coast in the last five years. It also included all Heads of Departments/Units/Sections who have such staff working under them as well as KSTDS. Since some of these people could be on further training and development programmes outside campus or on annual, maternity or casual leave at the time of collecting data, the accessible population, which comprised all Staff at post at the time of gathering data was used.

### **Sample and Sampling Procedure**

The study has three main categories of respondents. Senior staff who have undergone training programmes provided by University of Cape Coast, Heads of Departments/Units/Sections who have such senior staff working under them and KSTDS. Breakwell, Hammond, Fife-Shaw and Smith (2006) explained that populations are often extremely large or infinite, thus making it either impossible or too costly to study. They therefore opine that a sample be drawn from the population. Breakwell et al. noted “in addition to the cost savings this entails, we are usually able to make more-and-more detailed observations of each sample element” (p. 107). Thus, to reduce cost and also ensure a more detailed study of



the elements involved, a sample size of 151 senior staff was selected from the population of 240. The sample size was chosen using the table for determining sample size from a given population provided by Krejcie and Morgan (1970) which shows that for a population of 240, a sample size of 151 is adequate. Again, five Heads of Departments/Units and one KSTDS were purposively selected for the study.

Stratified sampling procedure was used to select the senior staff respondents. Nsowah-Nuamah (2005) explained that stratified sampling is used when individual members within a stratum are similar in characteristics and the different strata exhibit different characteristics among themselves. This thus becomes appropriate because senior staff in University of Cape Coast fall into different categories of unique functions and their responses to training and development programmes are most likely to be different. These include staff in research, administration, health, teachers, finance/audit and technicians.

According to Ary, Jacobs and Razavieh (2002), the major advantages of using stratified random sampling are that it guarantees representation of defined groups in the population and again enables the researcher to study the differences that might exist between various subgroups in the population. Also, Borg and Gall (1983) explained that stratified sampling ensures a proportional representation of the various categories of the strata. Thus, to ensure proportional representation of the various strata, the proportional stratified sampling method (Ary et al., 2002) or proportional stratified random sampling method (Nsowah-Nuamah, 2005) was

used. This means that categories with larger numbers of senior staff in the population had a proportionally larger representation in the sample size.

The population and the sample size selected from each category of senior staff as well as the return rate of the questionnaire is shown in Table 1.

Table 1

**Population, Sample Size Selected and Return Rate of Instrument**

Staff Category	Population	Sample Size	No. Retrieved	Percentage (%)
Administration	75	47	40	85.1
Research	72	45	41	91.1
Finance/Audit	30	19	16	84.2
Technicians	21	13	13	100.0
Teachers	26	17	17	100.0
Health	16	10	10	100.0
Total	240	151	137	90.1

**Source:** (Field Data, 2009).

Table 1 shows the population and the number of senior staff sampled for the survey as well as the return rate. In all, a total of 151 questionnaires were administered and 137 were retrieved, representing a 90.1% return rate. This was deemed adequate for the study. The returned questionnaires were scrutinised and all were found to have been properly completed. Technicians, teachers and health staff had the highest return rate of 100.0% each while Finance/Audit staff had the least rate of 84.2%.

In addition to the questionnaires responded to by senior staff, five Heads of Departments/Units were purposively selected for interviews. According to Cohen, Manion and Morrison (2008 p. 114), in purposive sampling, “researchers handpick the cases to be included in the sample on the basis of their judgment of their typicality or possession of the particular characteristics being sought”. For this reason, Sarantakos (2005) referred to it as judgmental sampling. Thus, these Heads were selected because they had been Heads before and after the senior staff in their departments underwent the various training programmes. The researcher thus believed that they would be able to provide the information required since the staff worked directly under them. Again, KSTDS was purposively selected because the researcher believed he would have considerable knowledge about the training and development issues in the University. This opinion is supported by Ball (1990) when he explained that purposive sampling is used in order to access “knowledgeable people”. That is, people who by virtue of their professional role, power, access to networks, expertise or experience, have obtained an in-depth knowledge about a particular issue or subject.

Purposive sampling, however, has a weakness. Trochim (2000 p. 64) wrote “with purposive sampling, you are likely to get the opinions of your target population, but you are also likely to overweight subgroups in your population that are more readily available”. Care was therefore taken to ensure that all interest groups were represented. For instance, the five Heads were made up of two from academic and one each from technical, health and administrative sections.

## **Research Instruments**

The instruments used in gathering data were the questionnaire, interview guides and documentary studies. Some of the items in the questionnaire were developed by the researcher while others were adopted from the research works of Handy (2008) and Whaley (2006). Those adopted from related research works were adapted to make them more suitable for the study. This was done under the guidance of my supervisors. Items in the questionnaire were mostly “closed-ended” with a few “open-ended” ones. According to Twumasi (2001), “closed-ended” items are very easy to code, thus making analysis easy. However, they are quite difficult to construct and also, there is the likelihood that individual respondents may have other responses either than the options provided. “Open-ended” items on the other hand are easier to construct. Also, respondents have the opportunity to provide their original responses. The problem with them is that it is difficult to code and analyse responses. The researcher considered the merits and demerits of both items and used them appropriately to ensure that adequate data are collected.

The questionnaire (copy attached as Appendix A), which was responded to by the senior staff contained 50 items and was divided into seven parts. The first part solicited information on the personal data of respondents. Information required included: gender, age of respondents; working experience, rank or job category (administrative, research etc) and educational qualification. There were five items, all of which were close ended.

The second part comprised six sections. The first section sought to find out the nature of training and development programmes provided to senior staff. The items concerned; how often programmes are attended, type of programmes provided and the duration of these programmes. The second section solicited responses on factors which influenced the participation of staff in these programmes. There were six items in this section. The next section measured the relevance of the kind of programmes offered to both the University and the staff. It determined how the programmes are related to the present and future needs of the beneficiaries and whether they provided useful skills and knowledge to the staff concerned. The fourth section was concerned with the training procedures. It considered the personnel involved in the training processes, the training methods adopted during training programmes, the training materials used and examinations. The fifth section measured staff's perception of how these programmes influenced their performance. It identified different indicators of employees' performance which might have been influenced by the training programmes. These included increase in output, errors committed, motivation to work, personal initiative and improvement in human relations.

Respondents were required to assess all these areas on a five point Likert's scale format ranging from "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree" with scores of "five" to "one" respectively. A second part of the fifth section provided items on factors which could prevent beneficiary staff from transferring what they learn from training programmes on to their jobs. Respondents were provided with a three point Likert's scale format ranging from: "to a greater extent", "to a little

extent” and “to no extent”. The scores here ranged from “three” to “one” respectively. The last section solicited respondents’ opinion on how training programmes could be improved so as to make them beneficial to both the University and the beneficiaries.

In addition, two separate interview guides were developed. One for the Heads of Departments/Units and another for KSTDS. All items in the interview guides were developed by me under the guidance of my supervisors (Copies of the interview guides are attached as Appendices B and C respectively). The interview took a semi-structured form. Amedahe (2002) explained that semi-structured interviews are more flexible and allows the interviewer to probe into issues and in some cases follow the order dictated by the situation. This type of interview was more appropriate because it offered the researcher the flexibility to illicit more relevant information. The interviews enabled me to obtain other vital information which served as checks and balances on the responses provided by senior staff on the questionnaire. It also provided me with vital information about training and development programmes which is not available to senior staff. Interviews however have some weaknesses. Borg and Gall (1983) identified these to include that they are not appropriate for quantitative data and also allow possible bias from both interviewee and interviewer. Care was therefore taken to avoid these problems. These include analyzing results qualitatively and also giving respondents the opportunity to confirm what was written by the interviewer.

Finally, some documents pertaining to training and development of senior staff in the University were obtained and studied. This was to lend support to some claims made and also to show evidence of some activities performed. As explained by Prior ((2003), documents are useful in rendering more visible the phenomena under study, however, they should be studied in conjunction with a whole range of other factors occurring at the same time. It is therefore a supplementary activity. Bailey (1994) also identified the merits of documentary studies to include their ability to catch the dynamic situation at the time of writing and ability to reveal some personal and detailed information that would otherwise not surface. The demerits, according to Bailey, include that they may be interpretations rather than objective accounts of what the real situation is and also they may come in so many different forms that make standard analysis very difficult.

The documents that were considered in this study include training schedules or calendars for the present and previous years, appraisal reports on some senior staff, evaluation reports on staff after training programmes as well as some formal communications concerning the training and development of senior staff.

### **Pilot-testing of Instruments**

For the purpose of ascertaining the validity and reliability of the instruments, both the questionnaire and the interview guides were pilot tested at the University of Education, Winneba. This University was chosen because apart

from being in the same region, it was once affiliated to the University of Cape Coast. Management practices, including staff training and development, are therefore similar. According to Bell (1999), all data gathering instruments should be piloted to test how long it takes respondents to complete them and to ensure that all questions and instructions are clear so as to enable the researcher delete any items which do not yield useable data. Ary et al. (2002) also opined that “field-test” of the instrument will help to identify ambiguities, misunderstandings and all other inadequacies so that they can be corrected before the actual study is done.

The items were subjected to total item analysis and it revealed that respondents were not comfortable with one item which required them to indicate their section/unit of work. This is because it affected anonymity. Also, some items were found to be unclear to respondents. The final instrument was therefore revised to take care of these weaknesses. Thus, while the item on “section/unit of work” was deleted, additional explanations were provided in brackets to make the items which more clear. This agrees with Opoku (2002) that even when using an existing questionnaire, there is the need for pilot test to ensure that all the items are culturally relevant.

Using Cronbach Alpha reliability coefficient, the reliability of the questionnaire was computed after the pilot study and the results obtained were generally good. This description is obtained from the view of Sproull (1988) that a reliability of 7.0 is ideal for an instrument to be used. The results for the various sections are represented in Table 2.



Table 2

**Reliability Coefficients after Pilot Study**

Section	Coefficients	Interpretation
Nature of training programmes	.697	Questionable
Factors influencing participation	<b>.773</b>	Acceptable
Training procedures	.856	Good
Influence on Performance	.726	Acceptable
Obstacles to transfer	.880	Good
Suggestions for improvement	.721	Acceptable

Source: (Field Data, 2009)

The interpretations provided are in agreement with the rule of thumb for determining the Cronbach’s Alpha results provided by George and Mallery (2003 p. 231) as follows: “ $\geq .9$  - Excellent;  $\geq .8$  - Good;  $\geq .7$  - Acceptable;  $\geq .6$  - questionable;  $\geq .5$  - Poor and  $\leq .5$  – Unacceptable”.

**Data Collection Procedure**

I obtained a letter of introduction from the Director of the Institute for Educational Planning and Administration (IEPA) of the University of Cape Coast (Copy attached as appendix D). This helped me to obtain the needed cooperation from the departments/ sections/units where data were collected.

Preliminary visits were made to departments, sections and units for familiarisation reasons and also to explain the purpose of the exercise to the Head of Department or Administrator. I later visited each department/section/unit and

with the help of the Administrator, identified senior staff who had been sampled for the exercise. I then established the necessary rapport with the respondents and after explaining the purpose of the exercise, distributed the questionnaire to them. Guidelines for filling the questionnaires were explained to respondents and they were also given the opportunity to ask questions for clarification of doubts. While some were able to complete and return theirs immediately, those who could not were requested to leave completed questionnaires with the Administrator for collection at a later date.

Data collection started in mid December, 2009. This coincided with the University's first semester vacation. It therefore affected retrieval of the questionnaire because some staff were not regular at post. Also, staff in the schools were preparing for examinations and were too busy. As a result, administration and collection of the questionnaire continued into the following year and were completed in the first week of February 2010, thus lasting longer than I anticipated. To conduct the interviews, I wrote a letter addressed to the interviewees, seeking permission to interview them and also indicating the issues on which the interviews were expected to cover (copy attached as appendix E). This was attached to the introductory letter obtained from the department. I followed up later and approval was obtained. The interviews were conducted between the first and fourth week of February, 2009. This was because some of the appointments with respondents were rescheduled for respondents were busy.

## **Data Analysis**

The main statistical tool used in analysing the data was Software Package for Services and Solutions (SPSS). This provides a full range of contemporary statistical methods. In addition to its ability to produce output in both reports and table formats, it has a good editing and labeling facilities and is also able to handle missing data with ease.

The SPSS was used to analyse frequency distributions of the data for clearer understanding. To determine the different responses provided by respondents, percentages of these frequencies and mean values of responses were also provided. Again, to show the differences in responses as per staff categories and types of training programmes attended by staff, the means of the responses were computed and ANOVA was used to determine the level of significance in the different mean values. A post hoc analysis, using Tamhane T2 test was then used to determine where the differences occurred.

Interview responses from Heads of Departments/Sections were analysed thematically while the responses from KSTDS were analysed holistically. According to Breakwell et al. (2006), thematic analysis considers issues which repeatedly run through responses and which are quite complex and elaborated statements which are not easily open to conversion into simple elements or categories. Thus, responses which were common among respondents were observed and analysed while divergent or contradictory responses were also discussed. Holistic analysis on the other hand “seeks to summarise in a coherent way the overall content, meaning and implications of the interviewee’s responses”

(Breakwell, p. 251). Thus, it attempts to describe the entirety of the responses obtained from the respondent. This approach is used because apart from the fact that this respondent is unique in status from the Heads of departments/units, his position also provides him with the opportunity to possess an in-depth knowledge and detailed information on the topic which are critical to this study.

In conclusion, the chapter provided a detailed description of the methodology adopted in conducting the study. It identified the design used by the researcher, the target population for the study and how respondents were sampled. Again, the instruments used in collecting data and how these instruments were developed have been discussed. Also, the various procedures in which data were methodically collected, the scoring procedure, presentation of data and how they have been analysed have been described.

The next chapter presents a detailed analysis and discussion of the results obtained from the study by research questions. It identifies the differences in responses to the various research items and interprets the findings in respect to literature consulted. It also reveals the similarities and differences in responses of the various respondents.

## **CHAPTER FOUR**

### **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

This chapter deals with the analyses and discussions of data obtained from respondents in the study. It begins with an analysis of the bio data of respondents and then follows with the analysis of responses to the research questions and hypotheses.

The study uses frequencies, percentages and means to interpret and report findings of the study. It also uses ANOVA to analyse and compare mean values of the various categories of senior staff and the types of programmes attended. Again, it follows up with a post hoc test using Tamhane T2 to determine where the differences occurred.

In all, a total of 151 questionnaires were administered and 137 were retrieved, representing a 90.10% return rate. In addition to the questionnaires responded to by senior staff, five Heads of Departments/Supervisors and one KSTDS responded to interviews.

#### **Biodata of Respondents**

The first section of the questionnaire sought to obtain demographic information about the respondents. This was to enable the researcher make

comparisons among the respondents. Information obtained included gender, age, working experience, category of work and educational qualification.

Respondents were asked to indicate their sex and the responses obtained are indicated in Table 3.

Table 3

**Gender Distribution of Respondents**

	No	Percentage (%)
Male	101	73.7
Female	36	26.3
Total	137	100.0

Source: (Field Data, 2009)

From Table 3, the total number of male respondents was 101 (73.7%) while that of female respondents was 36 (26.3%). It is thus obvious that males outnumber females by a large margin in the category of senior staff who have undergone training and development programmes provided by the University. It would be appropriate for management to devise an appropriate strategy to bridge the gender gap.

Beginning from below 30 and using a range of 10, participants were asked to indicate the range in which their ages fell. Table 4 represents their responses.

Table 4

**Age Composition of Respondents**

Age Range (Years)	No	Percentage (%)
Below 30	35	25.547
30 – 39	76	55.474
40 – 49	18	13.138
50 – 59	8	5.839
60 and Above	-	-
Total	137	100.0

Source: (Field Data, 2009)

Table 4 reveals that 35 (25.5%) respondents were below 30 years and 76 (55.5%) were between 30 and 39 years. 18 (13.1%) respondents were between 40 and 49 years while eight (5.8%) were between 50 and 59 years. No respondent was 60 years and above. Thus, 84% of the staff were below 40 years. The University can thus be said to have the advantage of a youthful senior staff population who are likely to work for a long period for the University. This advantage will be of enjoyed if management is able to implement policies which make this category of staff satisfied with their conditions of service and thus retain them.

Participants were also asked to indicate how long they had been working in the University by choosing from ranges of five years. Their responses are represented in Table 5.

Table 5

**Working Experience of Respondents**

Period of Service	No	%
1 – 5 yrs	89	65.0
6 – 10 yrs	31	22.6
11 – 15 yrs	6	4.4
16 – 20 yrs	2	1.5
21 – 25 yrs	3	2.2
26 – 30 yrs	5	3.6
31 – 35 yrs	1	0.7
Total	137	100.0

Source: (Field Data, 2009)

Table 5 shows that 89 (65%) of senior staff had worked in the University of Cape Coast for between one and five years and 31 (22.6%) had worked for between six and 10 years. Thus, a total of 87.6% had 10 years working experience or less while a total of 17 or 12.4% had worked between 11 and 35 years. This means that the University provides training and development programmes to fresh appointees in the senior staff category. Also, contrary to the findings of CHEMS (2001) of what pertained in the United Kingdom in the late 1990s, the University of Cape Coast provides training for its mid career staff. Management's decision to train them is a sure way of ensuring adequate supply of qualified manpower in the near future.



Table 6 represents responses on the category or nature of work performed by respondents.

Table 6

**Staff Categories of Respondents**

Category	No	%
Administration	40	29.2
Research	41	29.9
Finance/Audit	16	11.7
Technical	13	9.5
Teachers	17	12.4
Health	10	7.3
Total	137	100.0

Source: (Field Data, 2009)

From Table 6, 40 (29.2%) of the respondents were in administration and 41 (29.9%) were in research/academic. Finance/Audit had 16 (11.7%) respondents while Technicians were 13 (9.5%). Also Teachers were 17 (12.4%) while Health workers were 10 (7.3%). Senior staff in administration and research formed about half or 49.1% of total senior staff population. This indicates that much of the tasks of the University, especially at the middle level, are concentrated in administration and academics. It also reveals that management is preparing adequate staff to take up leadership positions in administration and academic.

Respondents were again requested to indicate their highest educational qualifications and their responses are represented in Table 7.

Table 7

**Educational Qualification of Respondents**

Qualification	No	%
Second Degree	20	14.598
First Degree	81	59.124
University Dip/H. N. D.	21	15.328
Others	15	10.948
Total	137	100.0

Source: (Field Data, 2009)

From Table 7, 20 (14.6%) of the staff had second degree and 81 (59.1%) had first degree. Staff with University Diploma or Higher National Diploma were 21 (15.3%) while those with other qualifications such as G. C. E. “O” and “A” levels, R. S. A. II and III, etc were 15 (10.9%). The minimum academic qualification for appointment as senior staff is first degree (Scheme of service for senior and junior staff of universities in Ghana, 2006). It is therefore clear that majority of the staff, that is, 73.7% have first degree or higher qualification. Thus, senior staff of the University could be described as having adequate academic qualifications suitable for the performance of the duties for which they have been engaged. This therefore agrees with the view of KSTDS who stated that “the University of Cape Coast has a cohort of senior staff who have the requisite academic qualifications and therefore, management will need to concentrate more

on on-the-job training programmes which are more directly related to the tasks of staff of the University”.

**Research Question One: What kind of training and development programmes are provided for senior staff employees of University of Cape Coast?**

This question aimed at finding out the various types and nature of training and development programmes which the University provided for senior staff. It concentrated on the forms of training and development programmes, how often these programmes were provided and the duration of these programmes.

To answer this question, three items in the questionnaire were provided. Also, there were questions in the interview guide for Heads of Departments/Sections as well as the interview guide for KSTDS.

Respondents were asked to indicate the number of training and development programmes they had attended and their responses are represented in Table 8.

Table 8

**Number of Training and Development Programmes Attended by Respondents**

No. of Programmes	No. of Staff	%
Once	50	36.5
Twice	44	32.1
Thrice	16	11.7
Four times	10	7.3
Five times	6	4.4
Six times	3	2.2
Seven times	2	1.5
Eight times	-	-
Nine times	2	1.5
Ten times	1	0.7
Eleven times	1	0.7
Twelve times	2	1.5
Total	137	100.0

Source: (Field Data, 2009).

Table 8 shows that 50 (36.5%) of respondents had attended one training and development programme in the last five years and 44 or 32.1% had attended two training and development programmes. This means that more than half of the senior staff, 68.6% had attended one or two programmes within the last five years. Thus, only 43 (31.4%) had attended between three and 12 training and

development programmes in the last five years. This appears quite low. The low numbers of programmes attended by staff were also corroborated by responses from heads in the academic departments.

The interview results from KSTDS indicated that the frequency of training and development programmes was seriously affected by human resource constraints at the Training and Development Section. At the time of data collection, there was only one Human Resource professional who was in charge of training and development activities for all staff of the University. Thus, this has affected the ability of the Training and Development Section to organise adequate number of training activities for all staff including senior staff (A copy of the training schedule for 2009 is attached as Appendix F).

The responses on number of programmes attended by staff were also grouped by the categories of respondents. This is presented in Table 9.

Table 9

**Number of Training and Development Programmes Attended by Categories of Respondents**

	Once (%)	Twice (%)	Thrice (%)	Four (%)	Five (%)	Six (%)	Seven (%)	Eight (%)	Nine (%)	Ten (%)	Eleven (%)	Twelve (%)
Administration	11 (27.5)	20 (50)	6 (15)	1 (2.5)	1 (2.5)	0	1 (2.5)	-	-	-	-	-
Research	27 (65.9)	6 (14.6)	3 (7.3)	2 (4.9)	1 (2.4)	1 (2.4)	1 (2.4)	1 (2.4)	-	-	-	-
Finance/Audit	2 (12.5)	8 (50.0)	4 (25.0)	1 (6.2)	1 (6.2)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Technical	6 (46.2)	4 (30.8)	-	3 (23.1)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Teachers	4 (23.5)	3 (17.6)	1 (5.9)	2 (11.8)	1 (5.9)	1 (5.9)	-	-	2 (11.8)	-	1 (5.9)	2 (11.8)
Health	-	3 (30.0)	2 (20)	1 (10)	2 (20)	1 (10)	-	-	1 (10)	-	-	-

Source: (Field Data, 2009)

Considering the number of programmes attended by category of senior staff as indicated in Table 9, the low number of attendances, that is, one or two programmes, reflected in some categories but not in others. These are Administrative staff (57.5%), Research staff (80.5%), Finance/Audit (62.5%) and Technicians (77.0%). The trend was however different for Teachers and Health workers who had 59.0% and 70% respectively attending three or more programmes. Teachers and Health workers therefore received more training programmes than their colleagues in other categories. This is because, as indicated by interview responses, the Heads of these units organised additional programmes to supplement what was provided by the Training and Development Section. This agrees with Anthony et al. (1999) and Effah (1998) that to be effective, training and development of staff should be a shared responsibility involving all stake holders including top management and line supervisors.

Responses were also grouped according to type (by duration) of programmes attended. All programmes which lasted less than one year were considered short term type and programmes which lasted one year or more were considered as long term type. It was observed that most of the short term programmes were provided on the job while the long term programmes were provided off the job. The responses obtained are presented in Table 10.

Table 10

**Number of Training and Development Programmes Attended by Duration of Programmes**

Type	No.	%
Short Term Type Only	52	37.956
Long Term Type Only	32	23.357
Both Short & Long Term Types	53	38.686
Total	137	100

Source: (Field Data, 2009)

Table 10 shows that 52 (38%) of senior staff had attended short term programmes only while 32 (23.4%) had attended long term programmes only. Those who had attended both long term and short term were 53 (38.7%). There was thus a fair balance of the types of training provided for senior staff. This conforms to the opinion of Anthony et al. (1999) that any comprehensive training programme in an organisation uses both on-the-job (short term) and off-the-the job (long term) types of training.



Table 11

**Number of Training and Development Programmes Attended by Categories of Senior Staff and Duration of Programmes**

	ADM		RES		FIN		TECH		TEA		HLTH	
	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
Short Term Only	18	45	1	2.4	10	62.5	4	30.8	12	70.6	7	70
Long Term Only	4	10	23	56.1	-	-	4	30.8	-	-	1	10
Both Short & Long Term	18	45	17	41.5	6	37.5	5	38.5	5	29.4	2	20
Total	40	100	41	100	16	100	13	100	17	100	10	100

Source: (Field Data, 2009).

Table 11 however shows a slightly different picture. Staff in research who had undergone “long term programmes only” totaled 23 (56.1%) and thus outnumber those who had undergone either “short term programmes only” or both “short and long term” programmes put together who totaled 18 (43.9%). For all other categories, staff who had attended long term programmes only were less than the number of those who had attended short term only and both short and long term put together. It is therefore clear that staff in the research category received more long term programmes which were academic oriented in nature than the other categories of staff. This could be as a result of the objective of the University to prepare research staff for teaching positions.

The next question was to determine the kind/nature of programmes provided for senior staff. A column was also provided for respondents to indicate the venues where the programmes were provided. The responses are presented in Table 12.

Table 12

**Types of Programmes Attended by Respondents**

	No. of Staff	%
Workshops	61	45.525
Seminars	21	15.328
Conferences	4	2.919
Schooling (Formal Education) e.g. Diploma and Degree Programmes	32	23.357
Others e.g. coaching, apprenticeship, short term courses	19	13.868
<b>Total</b>	<b>137</b>	<b>100</b>

Source: (Field Data, 2009).

Table 12 reveals that the programmes provided took the form of workshops, seminars, conferences, schooling and others such as apprenticeship and coaching. Workshops were the most used form of training with 45% followed by Schooling with 23%. Conferences formed the least with 3%. The venues provided by respondents revealed that most of the short term programmes were provided on the job. A few were however provided off the job and took the form

of short term courses. The long term courses were all provided off the job and were all academic related programmes such as diploma, first and second degree programmes.

Responses from the heads/supervisors confirmed the responses of the senior staff. While four heads observed that senior staff participated in both “on-the-job” and “off-the-job” programmes, the other one (academic) explained that his staff participated in only off-the-job or academic oriented programmes which were long term in duration. The four also agreed that the on-the-job programmes took the form of seminars, workshops and conferences that lasted between one day and two weeks. One of the heads also observed that some of his staff attended short term courses which lasted between one and three months. These courses were provided off-the-job. KSTDS responded that

the duration of programmes differed depending on the nature and objective of the programme. For example, some off-the-job programmes lasted between three and six months while those intended to provide current skills lasted about three days. Long term programmes which involved study leaves lasted between two and four years.

**Research Question Two: What factors determine the selection of senior staff to undergo training and development programmes in the University?**

This question sought to investigate the reasons why senior staff underwent training and development programmes and also the factors which the University management considered in selecting senior staff for training and development

programmes. Items numbered 10 – 18 on the questionnaire provided answers to these questions. Respondents indicated in a continuum from “Strongly Agree” to “Strongly Disagree” to statements which influenced their participation into training and development programmes. These factors include encouragements from friends, encouragements from superiors, to enable me gain promotion, to help me improve upon my work performance and to prepare me for future tasks. Table 13 represents the responses of senior staff.

Table 13

**Factors Determining the Selection of Senior Staff to Participate in Training and Development Programmes**

	SA		A		N		D		SD	
	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
Encouragements from friends	30	21.9	51	37.2	18	13.1	21	15.3	17	12.4
Recommendations from superiors	23	16.8	58	42.3	22	16.1	18	13.1	16	11.7
For Promotion	52	38.0	54	39.4	13	9.5	14	10.2	4	2.9
To improve my Performance	72	52.6	64	46.7	1	0.7	-	-	-	-
For further qualifications	54	39.4	50	36.5	11	8.0	17	12.4	5	3.6
For future tasks	71	51.8	62	45.3	3	2.2	1	0.7	-	-
Gain recognition	19	13.9	46	33.6	34	24.8	29	21.2	9	6.6
Compulsory	6	4.4	33	24.1	26	19.0	35	25.5	37	27.0
Institutional needs	14	10.2	32	23.4	21	15.3	30	21.9	40	29.2
Total	137	100	137	100	137	100	137	100	137	100

Source: (Field Data, 2009).

From Table 13, it can be seen that 30 (21.9%) of staff “strongly agreed” that they were encouraged by friends/peers to undertake training programmes while 51 or 37.2 also “agreed” to this statement. Thus, a total of 59.1% were encouraged by friends to undertake training programmes. This agrees with Anthony et al. (1999) that employees should also encourage their colleagues to take advantage of various training opportunities available. It could also be an indication of the desire of staff to sustain their job security as observed by Mullins (2007, p. 489) that “many unions are recognising the importance of training in relevant skills to sustaining the security of their members”. The Table also reveals that 23 (16.8%) of respondents “strongly agreed” that they were recommended by their superiors while 58 (42.3%) “agreed” to the statement. Thus, a total of 59.1% were recommended by their superiors. Immediate heads or superiors can therefore be said to be fulfilling their responsibility of recommending training programmes for their staff. This also conforms to the view of Anthony et al. (1999) that supervisors have the direct responsibility to ensure that training and development of staff occurs in the organisation.

Also, the Table shows that 52 (30.0%) “strongly agreed” that the quest for promotion influenced their decision to undergo training and development programmes while 54 (39.4%) also “agreed” to the promotion factor. This means that a total of 77.4% of staff are influenced by promotion to undergo training programmes. A total of 22.6% were either undecided or not influenced by promotion. Promotion of staff is therefore a major factor which influences senior staff to undergo training and development programmes. This agrees with Carrel et

al. (2000) who identify among others, promotion as a purpose for embarking on training and development in organisations. Again, it is seen from Table 12 that 72 (52.6%) of staff “strongly agreed” that they wanted to improve on their performance while 64 (46.7%) “agreed” to the statement. This gives a total of 99.3% of staff who attended training programmes for the purpose of improving their performance. It should be noted that only one person or 0.7% was undecided while no respondent disagreed with this reason. Thus, the quest for improved performance is a strong factor which influences senior staff in the University of Cape Coast to undergo training and development programmes. This agrees with Anthony et al. (1999) “that the goal of training and development programmes of all organisations should be to maintain and improve performance of individuals and in so doing, that of the organisation” (p. 337).

Another reason for which staff participated in training and development programmes worthy of consideration was that of preparing themselves for future tasks. From the table, 71 (51.8%) of the respondents “strongly agreed” that they participated in training and development programmes to prepare them for future tasks and 62 (45.3%) agree to this reason. Thus a total of 97.1% agreed that training was to prepare them for future tasks. Only one person or 0.7% disagreed that participating in training and development programmes was to prepare him for future tasks. This suggests that most senior staff foresee changes in their present jobs and are being proactive in preparing themselves for such changes. These changes could be as a result of promotions, transfers or changes in technology as opined by Landale (1994).

Reasons which did not have much influence on why senior staff participated in training and development programmes included (a) because they were compulsory, 28.5%; and (b) in response to identified institutional needs; 33.4%.

In addition, responses from Heads of Departments/Sections as well as KSTDS were sought through interviews. From the interviews conducted with the Heads/supervisors, three respondents indicated that their departments/units did recommend senior staff for training programmes. One head reiterated “There was nobody to operate one particular machine so we had to encourage two of our staff to undergo a training programme in Accra for four months, both of them have come and are doing very well. I believe they are also happy because they have been promoted” (Health). Other reasons for such recommendations include correcting identified errors, to enable staff adapt to changes, they were mandatory for staff to be able to perform, and to introduce staff to new ideas.

However, two Heads/Supervisors indicated that they did not formally recommend staff for training programmes. They however admitted that they sometimes encouraged senior staff in their Departments/Units to further their education but this was usually on personal basis. These two were incidentally academic heads.

On whether the University recommended staff for training programmes, one respondent (20%) indicated that the University did recommend staff for programmes. He observed that this happened when management realised that an advertised programmed could be useful to staff of the unit. This was from a

technical head. The remaining four (80%) of the respondents indicated that the University did not expressly recommend senior staff for training programmes. They however believed that the fact that the University sent letters round at the end of every year to advertise available programmes and conditions that staff must fulfill to qualify for sponsorship was an indirect way of recommending staff for training and development programmes (copy attached as appendix G).

On whether senior staff requested for training programmes, all five respondents 100% agreed that senior staff requested to undergo training programmes but observed that these were mostly long term and academic programmes. All of them also indicated that staff did not give formal reasons for their requests. Respondents were of the opinion that the requests were mainly for self development and promotion purposes.

Response from KSTDS indicated that the University sometimes recommended senior staff for “off-the-job” programmes. Also, most of the “on-the-job” training programmes are recommended by the University. He indicated that these programmes are offered to equip staff with the requisite knowledge and skills to perform their official schedules. The respondent also had a similar response as the Heads/Supervisors regarding requests from senior staff. He also agreed that the requests had always been for long term or academic programmes which did not have immediate impact on performance. This agrees with Noe (2005) that while management may make training programmes mandatory because they have immediate impact on performance, staff may have to make



personal initiatives to benefit from development programmes which do not have immediate impact on organisation.

**Research Question Three: How relevant are the training and development programmes to the actual needs of senior staff and the University?**

The purpose of this question was to investigate the procedures that were followed when determining the type and content of training and development programmes for senior staff. It examined the relationship between the present and future jobs of staff and the content of training programmes that were provided. The main objective was to find out whether training programmes provided were based on appraisal and needs assessment results of senior staff. Items numbered 19 to 23 on the questionnaire sought to answer this question. Respondents were to indicate their responses in a continuum of “Strongly Agree” to “Strongly Disagree” to the statements provided. Again, Heads of Departments/Supervisors and KSTDS responded to interview questions on the issue. Table 14 represents the responses of senior staff.

Table 14

**Responses of Senior Staff on the Relevance of Training and Development Programmes to their Needs**

	SA		A		N		D		SD	
	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
Programmes were directly related to my job	58	42.3	54	39.4	5	3.6	18	13.1	2	1.5
I have acquired skills for my present job	42	30.7	69	50.4	4	2.9	20	14.6	2	1.5
I have acquired skills for my future job needs	67	48.9	47	34.3	1	0.7	6	4.4	16	11.7
I have obtained a better understanding of my job	34	24.8	76	55.5	6	4.4	14	10.2	7	5.1
Programmes' objectives matched my expectation	26	19.0	80	58.4	8	5.8	11	8.0	12	8.8

Source: (Field Data, 2009).

Table 14 shows that between 70% and 90% of respondents strongly agreed or agreed to all the five statements relating to the relevance of programmes to their individual jobs. The mean value of for the responses of all staff was 3.924 which correspond to the scores for “agree” on the questionnaire. This means that senior staff considered the training and development programmes offered to them as being relevant to the present and future demands of their jobs. This could be an indication that the procedures adopted by the Training and Development Section to conduct training needs assessment are appropriate.

Again, all five heads/supervisors (100%) who responded to interviews indicated that the programmes offered to their staff were relevant to their jobs. They observed that the programmes provided staff with knowledge and skills which were related to both the present and future needs of their jobs. For their present needs, one head (Technical) indicated that since the unit uses peculiar software, the on-the-job (short-term) programmes are the only means by which staff are able to perform in the unit. Another head (Health) also observed that practices in their job keep changing and the regular training programmes had kept staff abreast with current demands. The rate of errors committed had also reduced as a result of training programmes attended by staff. For future needs, respondents observed that the programmes provided staff with knowledge that make them independent and have prepared them to take up higher responsibilities.

Also, KSTDS observed that the programmes offered were relevant to both the immediate and future needs of senior staff. He however, intimated that a few staff had undergone programmes which were not relevant to their jobs and explained that such staff intended to change their job schedules in the near future. Asked how the section determined relevant programmes, he said

at the beginning of every year, the section sends requests to Deans and Heads of Departments/Sections/Units to assess the training needs of their staff including senior staff (a copy attached as appendix H). In addition, the Section conducts interviews and surveys with senior staff to determine their training needs and together with appraisal results from the

heads, the training and development needs of senior staff are determined.

The respondent also explained that some of the requests from the departments were to prepare staff for tasks for which personnel were lacking or new areas or tasks which such departments intended to venture into. Thus, in all cases, the needs of the University had been considered. He however conceded that the way and manner most heads conducted appraisal of senior staff revealed some weaknesses and is an indication that the heads would require some training in order to make staff appraisal more effective and reliable. This conforms to the findings of Agyenim-Boateng (2006, p. 140) on problems associated with the management of performance appraisal in Ghanaian public universities that “both the employees and their supervisors had not been given enough training to ensure the effective management of the performance appraisal process”.

**Research Question Four: How appropriate are the training procedures to promote learning and transfer of learning?**

This question sought to determine the appropriateness of the methods of training and the other circumstances which affected training and development process. It considered the perception of participants about the competency of training staff, the materials used in delivery of lessons, the duration of the programmes and examinations where applicable. It also considered the teaching methods used, benefits received from the programmes as a way of motivation and the overall assessment of the quality of the training and development

programmes. Respondents indicated the extent to which they agreed or disagreed to each statement in a continuum of “strongly agree” to “strongly disagree”. Table 15 represents the responses received from participants.

Table 15

**Senior Staff’s Perception of the Appropriateness of Training Procedures**

	SA		A		N		D		SD	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Competency of personnel	30	21.9	79	57.7	19	13.9	9	6.6	-	-
Quality of training programme	18	13.1	88	64.2	10	7.3	20	14.6	1	0.7
Training materials	12	8.8	64	46.7	28	20.4	32	23.4	1	0.7
Coverage of materials	14	10.2	75	54.7	15	10.9	22	16.1	11	8.0
How exams were conducted	12	8.8	60	43.8	26	19.0	20	14.6	19	13.9
Feedback from exams	17	12.4	56	40.9	22	16.1	21	15.3	21	15.3
Programmes’ duration	21	15.3	69	50.4	9	6.6	32	23.4	6	4.4
Methods used in teaching	14	10.2	82	59.9	19	13.9	21	15.3	1	0.7
Benefits received	5	3.6	34	24.8	18	13.1	47	34.3	33	24.1

Source: (Field Data 2009).

Table 15 represents responses from all senior staff involved in the study. On the competency level of trainers involved in the training and development

programmes, 30 (21.9%) indicated strongly agreed while 79 (57.7%) indicated agreed. Thus a total of 79.6% agreed that facilitators or personnel who provided the training programmes were competent. It also means that a total of 20.4% of respondents were either undecided or disagreed that such personnel were competent. A similar trend was observed on staff's perception of quality of the overall training programmes and methods used. A total of 77.3% of respondents indicated that they strongly agreed or agreed that the overall level of organisation of training programmes were of a high quality while 22.7% were either undecided or disagreed that the overall level of organisation of the programmes was of high quality.

On the materials used for training, 8.8% strongly agreed that they were of high quality and quantity while 46.7% agreed to the statement that they were satisfied with the quality and quantity of training materials used. This gives a total of 55.5%. Thus 44.5% were either undecided or disagreed that that they were satisfied with the quality and quantity of training materials used. Also, a total of 64.9% agreed that the training materials provided covered adequate content while 35.1% were either undecided or disagreed.

Responses on examination after the programmes could be described as average. A total of 52.6% agreed that they were satisfied with how examinations were conducted while 47.4% were either undecided or dissatisfied. Again, a total of 53.3% indicated that they were satisfied with feedback received from their examinations while 46.7% were not satisfied. Feedback from examination in this context refers to how early results were released, the medium through which

results were obtained by participants and how fair staff perceived the results as reflecting their performances.

As to the benefits received after training, five respondents (3.6%) indicated strongly agreed and 34 (24.8%) indicated agreed. Thus a total of 28.4% agreed that they received immediate direct benefits from the training programmes they attended. This means that a total of 71.6% were either undecided or did not receive any immediate direct benefits from their training programmes. Direct benefits in this context include promotions, certificates and other material rewards. One could therefore conclude that the university does not provide enough immediate direct benefits to senior staff trainees. The mean score of all responses on the level of appropriateness of training procedures is 3.391. This corresponds to the score for “Neither” on the questionnaire. It could therefore be said that staff were not satisfied with the level of appropriateness of training procedures used.

**Research Question Five: What is the perception of senior staff on how training and development programmes influence their performance?**

This question aimed at finding out the perception of senior staff on the extent to which they had transferred the knowledge, skills and attitudes acquired from the training and development programmes they participated in onto their jobs. This is determined in two ways. Firstly, the study identifies different indicators or variables which contribute to overall employee performance. Respondents were required to indicate the extent to which they agreed or

disagreed to the statements that the training and development programmes have brought improvement in these performance variables.

Secondly, the study sought to find out whether work climate is contributing to the failure of senior staff to transfer acquired skills and knowledge. This was done by identifying work place variables or factors which were likely to hinder senior staff's ability to apply what they learn from training programmes. Respondents were required to indicate the extent to which each factor prevented them from applying learned skills and knowledge onto their jobs. Senior staff's responses on how training programmes influenced their performance are presented in Table 16.

Table 16

**Senior Staff's Perception on the Influence of Training and Development Programmes on Performance**

	SA		A		N		D		SD	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
New initiatives	38	27.7	74	54.0	3	2.2	13	9.5	9	6.6
Increase in quantity	30	21.9	71	51.8	8	5.8	25	18.2	3	2.2
Improved quality	47	34.3	57	41.6	9	6.6	15	10.9	9	6.6
Timeliness	21	15.3	82	59.9	9	6.6	10	7.3	15	10.9
Better motivation	29	21.2	67	48.9	11	8.0	24	17.5	6	4.4
Improved competence	43	31.4	70	51.1	5	3.6	13	9.5	6	4.4
Human relations	57	41.6	54	39.4	18	13.1	8	5.8	-	-
Prestige/Respect	16	11.7	60	43.8	32	23.4	14	10.2	15	10.9

Source: (Field Data, 2009).



From Table 16, senior staff of University of Cape Coast perceived training and development programmes to have a positive influence on their performance. All the performance variables or indicators measured, except prestige, had a total of 70% or more of the respondents indicating that they strongly agreed or agreed that the training and development programmes they attended had resulted in improvement in their performances in those areas. A total of 76 respondents (55.5%) also strongly agreed or agreed that they had earned respect as a result of the programmes they had attended. This number was also above average. The variable with the highest score was “improvement in competence” which had a total of 82.5% of staff responding strongly agreed or agreed that the programmes had resulted in improvement in their competence to perform. The mean score for responses of all staff was 3.774 which correspond to the score for “Agree” on the questionnaire. Thus, staff perceive that the training and development programmes are resulting into improvement in their performance.

The view of staff that the programmes have positive influence on their performance agrees with the responses of the interviews with the Heads/supervisors. Four out of the five Heads/Supervisors observed that the training programmes had helped staff to improve upon the quality and quantity of output. One head (Health) for instance said, “There has been a significant reduction in dispensing errors due to the regular programmes”. Again, they agreed that the need for close supervision was no longer necessary after the programmes. They also observed that some of staff began performing some tasks even before they are asked to start. An academic head for instance intimated, “sometimes after

some few guidelines, they finish marking quiz scripts before you even know and there is nothing to even correct”.

One Head/Supervisor (technical) however, explained that not much improvement could be observed in staff who had participated long term training programmes. He was of the opinion that the problem could be attributed to the individual staff concerned and not the programmes. He believed that the staff had their own personal interests for undergoing those programmes which were different from the objective of improving their performance on the job. This corresponds to the findings of Nfila (2005) that training does not solve all performance related problems and also by Price (2004, p. 594) that employees seek training which make them more marketable.

The observations of the four Heads/Supervisors were also corroborated by KSTDS. On quantity and quality of job performed, he cited an instance where two staff he had personally monitored were now able to perform tasks which they were unable to perform before their training programmes. He also explained that staff had demonstrated better understanding of their jobs and had become more independent after undergoing training programmes. He read evaluation reports from Heads of Departments (copy attached as appendix K) which supported that senior staff had become more effective and efficient on their jobs after undergoing training and development programmes. The respondent however agreed that not much improvement had been observed in the performance of staff who underwent programmes which were not related to their present jobs. He also acknowledged that some senior staff faced few challenges at their places of work which could

affect their ability to fully transfer knowledge and skills they acquired on to their jobs. One could therefore say that the findings of Amewudah (2002) that the training and development programmes offered by the University had positive impact on staff still applies to senior staff of the University.

The responses of senior staff on human relations and motivation however contradicted the observations by their Heads as well as KSTDS. Thus even though the senior staff responses indicated a total of 70.1% and 81.0% for improvement in motivation and human relations respectively, their heads rather observed that not much had been achieved in these variables/indicators. While two heads attributed this to the fact that the programmes did not specifically target these variables, the other three opined that it was because these variables were difficult to measure.

KSTDS agreed with the second opinion. He explained that one cannot be specific since various factors could influence these variables. He however agreed that the training programmes could have played a part since efforts were made at all training sessions to make participants feel recognised and appreciated.

**Research Question Six: What work place factors hinder senior staff's ability to transfer what is learned onto their jobs?**

This question sought to determine the extent to which certain work place factors prevented senior staff from transferring acquired knowledge and skills onto their jobs. Some work place factors were provided and respondents were to indicate the extent to which such factors hindered their preparedness to transfer

knowledge and skills acquired from training programmes onto their jobs. Table 17 represents the responses obtained.

Table 17

**Senior Staff’s Responses on Factors which Hinder Transfer of Training**

	To A Greater Extent		A little Extent		To No Extent		Mean
	N	%	N	%	N	%	
Inadequate materials	49	35.8	65	47.4	23	16.8	2.19
Lack of support from superiors	33	24.1	81	59.1	23	16.8	2.07
Lack of cooperation from colleagues	7	5.1	57	41.6	73	53.3	1.52
Lack of cooperation from subordinates	24	17.5	49	35.8	64	46.7	1.71
Administrative procedures	73	53.3	50	36.5	14	10.2	2.43
Lack of opportunities	49	35.8	64	46.7	24	17.5	2.18
Lack of motivation	33	24.1	7.4	54.0	30	21.9	2.02

Source: (Field Data, 2009).

Table 17 considers factors prevailing at the work places which hindered beneficiaries of training and development programmes from transferring what they learnt during training programmes onto their jobs. Respondents were to indicate in a continuum of from “A Greater Extent” to “No Extent”, the level at which some identified work place variables affected their ability to transfer learned skills and knowledge onto their job. From the Table, Administrative procedures constituted the greatest obstacle with 73 (53.3%) respondents indicating that this affected them to a greater extent while 50 (36.5%) indicated

that it affected them to a little extent and 14 (10.2%) indicated to no extent. This gives it a mean of 2.43. Administrative procedures in this study refers to the level of bureaucracy, channel of communication and the number of officers one had to contact or go through before a particular task was completed.

The next major obstacle is inadequate materials and equipments which had a mean of 2.19 while the least of the obstacles was “lack of cooperation from colleagues”, with a mean of 1.52. With an overall mean of 2.01 which corresponds to the score of “To a little extent”, these factors can be said to have contributed to a little extent, senior staff’s inability to transfer learned skills onto their jobs.

**Research Question Seven: What is the perception of senior staff on how training and development programmes can be improved?**

This question was aimed at finding out from respondents, their perception of how training and development programmes for senior staff could be improved in the University of Cape Coast so as to make them more beneficial to both staff and management. To determine this, different ways of improving training and development programmes were provided by the researcher and respondents were expected to respond by indicating the extent to which they agreed or disagreed to each suggestion. Also, respondents were encouraged to provide their own suggestions on ways they perceived training and development programmes could be improved.

Again, the Heads of Departments/Supervisors and KSTDS were asked of their opinions in which training programmes for senior staff could be improved as well as the challenges they face in the training and development of senior staff. Table 18 represents the frequencies of the responses of the senior staff.

Table 18

**Senior Staff's Perception on how Training and Development Programmes can be improved**

	SA		A		N		D		SD	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Senior staff should be part of needs determination	99	72.3	35	25.5	3	2.2	-	-	-	-
There should be more Training & Development programmes	109	79.6	26	19.0	2	1.5	-	-	-	-
Training and Development programmes should be considered in the promotions of senior staff	97	56.2	51	37.2	5	3.6	3	2.2	1	0.7
Participants should be awarded with certificates	75	54.7	59	43.1	3	2.2	-	-	-	-

Source: (Field Data, 2009).

From Table 18, a total of 134 respondents representing 98.8% either strongly agreed or agreed that senior staff should be part of determining their training and development needs while three (2.2%) were undecided. This means that no respondent disagreed with this suggestion. This confirms the stand of Harris (2000) that participants of training programmes should be actively involved in planning training programmes. Again, 135 (98.5%) of respondents perceived that senior staff should be provided with more training and

development programmes. This means that the average of two programmes in five years as revealed by the first research question of this study was perceived by staff as inadequate. Again, the quest for more training programmes agrees with the stand of Mullins (2007) that more employees are recognising the importance of training in relevant skills to sustain the security of their jobs. Management should however be careful to ensure that they differentiate between training needs and training wants and provide the former as suggested by Nowack (1991).

As to whether participation in training and development programmes should be considered in the promotions of staff, a total of 128 (93.4%) respondents strongly agreed or agreed. Five respondents (3.6%) were undecided while a total of four (2.9%) either disagreed or strongly disagreed. Again, a total of 134 (97.8%) either strongly agreed or agreed that participants should be awarded with certificates after each training programme. Three respondents (2.2%) were undecided while nobody disagreed. This means that respondents strongly support that participation in training and development programmes should count towards promotion and also earn certificates. On other suggestions, many respondents wrote nothing while some suggestions only reemphasised what they had responded to in the given options. A few strange suggestions included; that snacks and transport allowance be provided at training sessions, 3.6%; qualification for development programmes should be equally accessible to all staff, 2.2% and staff who qualify for study leave should be given automatic admission by the University, 2.2%.

Responses of the Heads/Supervisors were quite varied. One academic head suggested that short term programmes such as seminars and workshops should be provided for Research Assistants to compliment the long term programmes they undergo while the other suggested that all senior staff be given equal opportunities to pursue training and development programmes. The technical head suggested that Heads/Supervisors should be directly involved in the determination of who to train and what training and development programme was appropriate. Another head (Health) had observed that although senior staff preferred development programmes, the short term programmes were more beneficial. He therefore suggested that management should make short term programmes more attractive by linking them to promotions and remunerations. The administrative head suggested that management should regularly redesign jobs for senior staff through job enlargement and job enrichment so as to make their jobs more challenging. Again, managers should provide leadership training and do succession planning for senior staff to aspire to higher positions. This, he believes, would make their training and development programmes more relevant and beneficial.

KSTDS was of the opinion that to be able to improve training and development programmes for senior staff, the Training and Development Section should be well resourced, especially with human resource and equipments. He explained that the section, which is responsible for the training of all staff of the University, presently had only one qualified person who was supported by a few clerks. He went on to say that



training and development of staff is not only about mounting of programmes but also developing relevant programmes based on the needs of the organisation and evaluating these programmes to determine their impact on staff and organisation. These entail a lot of intellectual work including proposal and report writing but all these for now are done by only one person

The office would also need equipments like photocopier and other communication tools to facilitate its operations.

In addition, he was hopeful that recent decisions which were being implemented, when fully adopted, will help improve training for senior staff and all other categories of staff in the University. These include:

1. The establishment of a monitoring unit whose functions will be to monitor the daily activities of staff and to conduct needs assessment.
2. The University to concentrate more on “on-the-job training” since that had been observed to provide more impact on staff performance.
3. Heads of Departments/Sections to be trained to conduct needs assessment and performance appraisal so as to make their reports more reliable.
4. Collaborate more with the departments on the training of staff, thus making the role of the Training and Development Section more of coordination.
6. The section should become a research centre working to coordinate the training and development activities of various departments and offer professional advice.

Thus, training and development programmes should be in the hands of departmental heads who were better positioned to determine their training needs. This conforms to the stand of Effah (1998) when he emphasises that the responsibility of staff training and development in the universities should be that of the individual staff and their Heads of Departments and that the personnel department or training officers' role should be to assist or facilitate the development and implementation of the overall training policies.

**Hypothesis One: Responses of Senior Staff do not differ significantly in respect of relevance of programmes, appropriateness of training procedures and influence of the programmes on performance when compared by categories.**

To test hypothesis one, a one way between groups analysis of variance was conducted to explore the responses of the various categories of staff on the dependant variables namely; relevance of programmes to the needs of staff, appropriateness of training procedures in ensuring transfer of training and influence of training and development programmes on performance. Respondents were grouped according to their categories, that is, Administrative, Research, Finance/Audit, Technicians, Teachers and Health staff. There was a statistically significant difference at  $p < .05$  for all the variables.

Table 19 shows the ANOVA results for staff categories on the extent to which training and development programmes were relevant to the needs of staff.

Table 19

**ANOVA Results on Differences in the Extent of Relevance of Training Programmes to the Needs of Senior Staff by Categories**

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	43.381	5	8.676	11.599	.001
Within Groups	97.990	131	.748		
Total	141.371	136			

Source: (Field Data, 2009).

From Table 19, there was a significant difference in the levels at which the various categories of senior staff perceived training and development programmes as relevant to their needs [ $F(5, 131) = 11.566, p < .001$ ].

To determine where the difference occurred, a post hoc pairwise comparison analysis was conducted. Table 20 represents the results obtained.

Table 20

**A Post Hoc Results on Difference in Relevance of Training and Development Programmes among Categories of Staff**

	Mean	SD	Level of Significance					
			ADM	RES	FIN	TECH	TEA	HLTH
ADM	3.1000	1.28901	-	.001*	.419	.001*	.001*	.001*
RES	4.3268	.58439	.001*	-	.379	1.000	1.000	.999
FIN	3.7625	.90397	.419	.379	-	.399	.296	.166
TECH	4.3846	.51937	.001*	1.000	.399	-	1.000	1.000
TEA	4.3647	.38881	.001*	1.000	.349	1.000	-	1.000
HLTH	4.4800	.42374	.001*	.999	.166	1.000	1.000	-

\* = where figures indicate significant differences in means

From Table 20, a post hoc comparisons using Tamhane T2 test indicated that the mean score for the Administrative Staff ( $M = 3.100$ ,  $SD = 1.289$ ) was significantly different from all the categories except Finance/Audit. The means of the other categories did not differ significantly from each other. The extent to which the programmes were perceived to be relevant was therefore in favour of the other categories as against Administrative staff.

The reason for this deviation could be attributed to the fact that administrative staff work under heads of all the different departments, units and sections of the University. These heads are mostly knowledgeable in issues relating to tasks under their departments/or units and not probably in administration. Needs assessment conducted by these departments might therefore not be very favourable to the tasks of administrative staff. The recent letter from the Training and Development Section of the University to the various Departments/Units/Sections (copy attached as Appendix J), which makes the Central Administration responsible for the training needs of all administrative staff in the other departments could be an indication of the realisation of this problem by the University management.

Again, differences in the responses of staff on the level of appropriateness of training procedures were also investigated. Table 21 shows the ANOVA results of the level of significance in the differences obtained.

Table 21

**ANOVA Results of the Differences in Appropriateness of Training Procedure by Categories of Senior Staff**

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	17.447	5	3.489	6.266	.000
Within Groups	72.950	131	.557		
Total	90.397	136			

Source: (Field Data, 2009).

From Table 21, there was a significant difference in responses of the various categories of senior staff on how they perceived training and development procedures as appropriate in ensuring transfer of training [ $F(5, 131) = 6.266, p < .001$ ].

To determine where the difference occurred, a post hoc pairwise comparison analysis was conducted. Table 22 represents the results obtained.

Table 22

**A Post Hoc Results on Difference in Level of Appropriateness of Training Procedures among Categories of Staff**

	Mean	SD	Level of Significance					
			ADM	RES	FIN	TECH	TEA	HLTH
ADM	2.858	.9848	-	.001*	.539	.001*	.013*	.001
RES	3.664	.6204	.001*	-	.986	1.000	1.000	1.00
FIN/AUD	3.389	.8374	.539	.986	-	.877	1.000	.999
TECH	3.786	.5201	.001*	1.00	.877	-	.947	1.00
TEA	3.550	.4914	.013*	1.00	1.00	.947	-	1.00
HLTH	3.633	.4831	.001*	1.00	.999	1.000	1.000	-

\* = where figures indicate significant differences in means

From Table 22, a post hoc comparison using Tamhane T2 test indicated that the mean score for the Administrative (M = 2.858, SD = .98484) was significantly different from all the categories except Finance/Audit. The mean values of the other categories did not differ significantly from each other. This means that the training procedures favoured the other categories more than the administrative staff.

Finally, differences in the responses of staff on the influence of training and development programmes on their performance were also studied. Table 23 shows the ANOVA results obtained.

Table 23

**ANOVA Results of the Differences on the Influence of Training Programmes on Performance by Categories of Senior Staff**

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	29.600	5	5.920	8.514	.000
Within Groups	91.082	131	.695		
Total	120.682	136			

Source: (Field Data, 2009)

From Table 23, the level at which the various categories of senior staff perceived training and development programmes as having influenced their performance on the job was significant [ $F(5,131) = 8.514, p < .001$ ].

To determine where the difference occurred, a post hoc pairwise comparison was conducted. Table 24 represents the results obtained.

Table 24

**A Post Hoc Results on Differences on the Influence of Training and Programmes on Performance among Categories of Staff**

	Mean	SD	Level of Significance					
			ADM	RES	FIN	TECH	TEA	HLTH
ADM	3.0750	1.27249	-	.001*	.289	.001*	.001*	.001*
RES	4.1280	.57179	.001*	-	.839	1.000	1.000	1.000
FIN/AUD	3.7578	.82579	.289	.839	-	.986	.759	.763
TECH	4.0288	.35412	.001*	1.000	.986	-	.998	.998
TEA	4.1544	.34666	.001*	1.000	.763	.998	-	1.000
HLTH	4.1750	.36420	.001*	1.000	.763	.998	1.000	-

Source: (Field Data, 2009).

\* = where figures indicate significant differences in means

From Table 24, a post hoc comparisons using Tamhane T2 test indicated that the mean score for the Administrative (M = 3.075, SD = 1.272) was significantly different from all the categories except Finance/Audit. The means of the other categories did not differ significantly from each other. Thus, training and development programmes influenced the performance of the other categories more than the administrative staff.

**Hypothesis Two: Responses of Senior Staff do not differ significantly in respect of relevance of programmes, appropriateness of training procedures and influence of the programmes on performance when compared by type of programmes attended.**

To test hypothesis two, a one way between groups analysis of variance was conducted to explore the influence of the different types of programmes attended by staff on the dependant variables, that is, relevance of programmes to the needs of staff, appropriateness of training procedures and influence on performance. Respondents were grouped according to the type of programmes they attended, that is, short term programmes only, long term programmes only and both short and long term programmes. There was a statistically significant difference at  $p < .05$  for all the variables.

Table 25 shows the ANOVA results for type of programmes on the extent to which training and development programmes were relevant to the needs of staff.

Table 25

**ANOVA Results of the Differences on the Relevance of Training Programmes by Type of Programmes Attended**

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	44.009	2	22.004	30.285	.001
Within Groups	97.362	134	.727		
Total	141.371	136			

Source: (Field Data, 2009).



From Table 25, the level at which staff who attended the different types of training and development programmes perceived the programmes as being relevant to their needs differed significantly [ $F(2, 134) = 30.285, p < .001$ ].

To determine where the difference occurred, a post hoc pairwise comparison was conducted. Table 26 represents the results obtained.

Table 26

**A Post Hoc Results on Difference in Relevance of Training and Development Programmes to Staff by Type of Programmes Attended**

	Mean	SD	Level of Significance		
			STP	LTP	L&STP
STP	3.2000	1.28947	-	.001*	.001*
LTP	4.3312	.38558	.001*	-	.883
L&STP	4.3887	.39108	.001*	.883	-

Source: (Field Data, 2009).

\* = where figures indicate significant differences in means

From Table 26, a post hoc comparisons using Tamhane T2 test indicated that the mean score for responses of staff who attended the short term programmes only (M = 3.200, SD = 1.289) was significantly different from that of those who attended long term programmes only (M = 4.331, SD = .386) and those who attended both short and long term programmes (M = 4.389, SD = .391). Responses from staff who attended long term programmes only did not differ significantly from those who attended both short and long term programmes. The significant difference in the perception of relevance of training

and development programmes is thus in favour of long term and both long and short term programmes.

This contradicts the statement by KSTDS that management should concentrate on short term on-the-job programmes which were more related to the jobs of senior staff.

Also, the differences in responses on the level of appropriateness of training procedure were also studied. Table 27 shows the ANOVA results obtained on the significance level among the various types.

Table 27

**ANOVA Results of the Differences on the Relevance of Training Programmes by Type of Programmes Attended**

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	29.600	2	13.800	29.447	.001
Within Groups	62.797	134	.469		
Total	90.397	136			

Source: (Field Data, 2009)

From Table 27, the extent to which the various categories of senior staff perceived training and development procedures as being appropriate to ensure transfer of training differed significantly [ $F(2, 134) = 29.447, p < .001$ ].

To determine where the difference occurred, a post hoc pairwise comparison was conducted. Table 28 represents the results obtained.

Table 28

**A Post Hoc Results on Difference in Level of Appropriateness of Training Procedures by Type of Programmes Attended**

	Mean	SD	Level of Significance		
			STP	LTP	L&STP
STP	2.8184	.89730	-	.001*	.001*
LTP	3.7118	.43343	.001*	-	.957
L&STP	3.7610	.55316	.001*	.957	-

Source: (Field Data, 2009).

\* = where figures indicate significant differences in means

From Table 28, a post hoc comparisons using Tamhane's T2 test indicated that the mean score for responses of staff who attended the short term programmes only (M = 2.818, SD = .897) was significantly different from that of those who attended long term programmes only (M = 3.712, SD = .433) and those who attended both short and long term programmes (M = 3.761, SD = .553). Mean responses from staff who attended long term programmes only did not differ significantly from those who attended both short and long term programmes. The significant difference in the level at which senior staff perceive the training procedures as appropriate is therefore in favour of long term and both long and short term programmes.

Again, studies were conducted on the differences in the responses of staff on the influence of training and development programmes on their performance. Table 29 indicates the ANOVA results obtained.

Table 29

**ANOVA Results of the Differences of the Influence of Training Programmes on Performance by Type of Programmes Attended**

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	36.967	2	18.484	29.586	.001
Within Groups	83715	134	.625		
Total	120.682	136			

Source: (Field Data, 2009).

From Table 29, the level at which the various categories of senior staff perceived training and development programmes as having influenced their performance on the job differed significantly [ $F(2, 134) = 29.586, p < .001$ ].

To determine where the difference occurred, a post hoc pairwise comparison was conducted. Table 30 represents the results obtained.

Table 30

**A Post Hoc Results on Difference on the Influence of Training and Development Programmes on Performance by Type of Programmes Attended**

	Mean	SD	Level of Significance		
			STP	LTP	L&STP
STP	3.2206	1.16307	-	.001*	.001*
LTP	4.1680	.42787	.001*	-	.995
L&STP	4.1887	.41720	.001*	.995	-

Source: (Field Data, 2009).

\* = where figures indicate significant differences in means

From Table 31, a post hoc comparisons using Tamhane's T2 test indicated that the mean score for responses of staff who attended the short term programmes only ( $M = 3.220$ ,  $SD = 1.163$ ) was significantly different from that of those who attended long term programmes only ( $M = 4.168$ ,  $SD = .428$ ) and those who attended both short and long term programmes ( $M = 4.187$ ,  $SD = .417$ ). Mean responses from staff who attended long term programmes only did not differ significantly from those who attended both short and long term programmes. The significant difference in the perception of staff on the influence of training and development programmes on performance is thus in favour of long term only and both short and long term programmes.

This perception of senior staff that the long term programmes had a more positive influence on their performance than the short term programmes contradicts the observations by their Heads of Departments and KSTDS. For example, all the respondents interviewed observed that the short term (on-the-job) programmes had more positive influence on performance than the long term (off-the-job) programmes which were mostly requested by senior staff.

From the foregoing, the University provides different kinds of training programmes to senior staff. The number of programmes however depends on the category of staff and their units/section as some units provide additional programmes to what is provided by the Training Section. Senior staff see the training and development programmes provided by the University as being relevant to their needs and also having a positive influence on their

performance. However, they were not satisfied with the procedures used in training. The study also revealed significant differences when responses were compared by categories of staff and by type of programmes attended. The programmes favoured the other categories more than administrative staff. Also, senior staff perceived long term only and both short and long term programmes as being more beneficial. This contradicted the views of their Heads and that of KSTDS. Work place factors can also be said to contribute to a little extent, the inability of staff to transfer skills acquired from training on to their jobs. Finally, to be able to improve on the training programmes for senior staff, the Training and Development should be adequately resourced with qualified staff. Again, staff training should be made the responsibility of the departments/units. Senior staff should among others be more actively involved in determining their training needs.

The next chapter presents a summary of the study and draws conclusions from the findings. It also makes recommendations based on the findings to appropriate bodies.

## **CHAPTER FIVE**

### **SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

This chapter provides a summary of the study and draws conclusions from the findings. It also makes recommendations based on the conclusions for the purpose of improving training and development programmes provided for senior staff by the University of Cape Coast. Again, suggestions for further research in areas related to the study are provided.

#### **Summary of the Study**

Many authors acknowledge the importance of human resource to the success of all organisations. Some have described human resource as the biggest asset an organisation can have. However, this asset, if not given the appropriate training, can also become a liability to the organisation. The need for staff training and development is therefore crucial if an organisation is to derive the expected benefits from its employees.

For training to become beneficial to an organisation, management must approach it methodically, bearing in mind some principles and theories which affect its success. Thus, in addition to adhering to the training process, management should conduct performance appraisal, needs assessment, apply theories of learning and appropriate methods of training and development as well

as ensure comprehensive evaluation of programmes provided. This study aimed at finding the perception of senior staff of the University of Cape Coast on how the training and development programmes provided for them influence their performance. Specifically, it tried to find out the types of training and development programmes provided, the factors which influence senior staff to participate in these programmes, how relevant these programmes are to the jobs of beneficiary staff and how staff perceive the appropriateness of the training procedure used for these programmes. Also, the study sought the perception of staff on how these programmes can be improved. Again, it determined if there are any differences in their responses according to the categories of staff and also according to the type of programmes attended.

The case study design was used for the study. This is because the study sought to provide an in-depth analysis of contemporary phenomenon in its real life context. The target population for the study was all senior staff who had attended any training and development programme provided by the university in the last five years. The total number was 240. To ensure that all categories of senior staff are fairly represented, the stratified sampling method was used to select a sample size of 151. Again, five heads of departments/units who had been heads before and after the senior staff participated in training and development programmes as well as a key staff at the training and development section of the University were purposively selected. The total sample size for the study was therefore 161.



Instruments used in collecting data were questionnaire for senior staff and interview guides for the Heads of Departments/Units and the staff of the Training and Development Section. These instruments were developed by the researcher with the guide of his supervisors. Some items in the questionnaire were however adopted from previous studies elsewhere and adapted to suit this study. Also, some documents relating to the training and development of senior staff in the University were consulted.

### **Summary of Findings**

The study revealed some issues which are crucial to training and development of senior staff of the University of Cape Coast. These are:

1. An analysis of the bio data shows that 73.7% of senior staff have either first or second degree. This means that they have adequate academic qualification considering the fact that the required academic qualification for all senior staff positions is a first degree (Conditions of Service for Senior and Junior Staff of Public Universities, 2002).
2. The number of training and development programmes provided for senior staff varied from one category to another. However, more than half i.e. 68.6% of staff have attended one or two programmes in the last five years. Again, some units/sections such as the hospital and schools provided additional training programmes to what is provided by the Training and Development Section. Staff in these sections therefore participated in more training programmes. The

University generally provided a fair balance of “on-the-job” and “off-the-job” training programmes to senior staff.

3. Senior staff are motivated by a multiplicity of factors to undergo training and development programmes. Key among them are “to improve their performance” (99.3%), “to prepare them for future task” (97.1%), “for further qualification” (95.9%) and “for promotion” (77.4%). The least motivating factor was “because they were compulsory” (28.5%). Also, senior staff regularly request to undergo training programmes but these are most often off-the-job and academic oriented in nature.

4. The Training and Development Section follows an elaborate procedure in determining the training and development needs of senior staff and. This has made the type of programmes provided for senior staff relevant to the immediate and future needs of both staff and the University.

5. Senior staff were generally not satisfied with the appropriateness of procedures used in the training and development programmes. They were “undecided” as to whether or not these procedures were appropriate in promoting learning and ensuring transfer of training.

6. The general perception of senior staff is that the training and development programmes provided by the university have positive influence on their performance and this is corroborated by their Heads as well as KSTDS.

7. Work environment factors in the form of task/situational constraints and social support, affect “to a little extent” the ability of senior staff to transfer knowledge and skills acquired from training programmes onto their jobs. Of these factors,

administrative procedures and inadequate materials contributed the highest constraints with a mean of 2.43 and 2.19 respectively. Also, technicians and administrative staff were the categories who were most affected by the work environment.

8. Senior staff observed that for management to make training and development programmes more beneficial to both the university and employees, staff should be involved in determining their training needs, more training programmes should be provided for staff, participation in training programmes should be considered for promotions and participants should receive immediate benefits from participation in training programmes including award of certificates.

9. Training of all senior staff is largely the responsibility of the Training and Development Section. The role of heads of departments/units is minimal. Most of the heads are not well informed in the various tasks/processes for providing appropriate training programmes for senior staff. The Training and Development Section is in itself faced with some challenges, key among them is inadequate number of qualified personnel.

10. A comparison of the responses by categories of senior staff revealed significant differences in extent to which programmes were relevant, appropriateness of training procedures and influence on performance. Further analyses indicated that the differences occurred in the Administrative category. Thus, the responses favoured the other categories compared to Administrative staff.

11. Again, a comparison of the responses by type of training attended by staff revealed significant differences in the extent to which programmes were relevant, appropriateness of procedures used and influence on performance. The difference was observed to occur in the short term (on-the-job) programmes. Thus, staff responses favoured the other programmes compared to short term programmes. This however contradicts the responses from the Heads of Departments and KSTDS that the short term programmes were more relevant and had more influence on performance of senior staff than the long term (academic) programmes.

### **Conclusions**

From the findings of this study, a number of conclusions can be drawn.

The University provides an appreciable blend of both “on the job” and “off the job” training programmes for senior staff. However, the number of programmes provided differed by unit/section since some sections provided additional training programmes. Senior staff preferred long term “off-the-job” programmes while management preferred short term “on-the-job” programmes because they satisfied organisational needs.

The appropriateness of the procedures used in the training and development of senior staff was questionable. This was especially so for administrative. Training and development programmes provided had a positive influence on the performance of staff. They resulted in remarkable improvement in the quantity and quality of work as well as an appreciable level in human

relations and staff's motivation to work. Responses of staff differed significantly the extent on the relevance of programmes, appropriateness of training procedures and influence of programmes on performance when compared by categories. Work environment factors also affected "to a little extent" the ability of staff to transfer what they learn from training sessions.

The Training and Development Section is faced with inadequate qualified personnel even though training and development of all staff of the University in the primary responsibility of the section.

### **Recommendations**

Based on the findings of the study, the following recommendations are made:

1. The training and development section should encourage the departments/units to provide additional training programmes for their senior staff so as to ensure that staff receive adequate training programmes.
2. The training and development section should provide training for heads of departments/units to be able to conduct performance appraisal and needs assessments for their staff.
3. The division of human resource should make short term on-the-job training programmes attractive to senior staff by making them count towards promotion and providing incentives such as certificates so as to reduce the requests for long term academic oriented programmes

4. The training and development section should evaluate training programmes for administrative staff and review them where necessary to ensure that they provide maximum benefits. Also, the training procedures adopted for the various training and development programmes should be evaluated.

5. The division of human resource should appoint more qualified staff to the training and development section and equip them to be able to carry out its mandate more effectively and efficiently

6. The university administration should take steps to eventually make the departments/units directly responsible for the training of their staff and thus make the role of the training and development section that of coordination and provision of expert support.

#### **Suggestions for Future Research**

1. That a comparative study of “on-the-job” and “off-the-job” training programmes be conducted.

2. A detailed study of the influence of work environment on transfer of training by senior staff of the university.

## REFERENCES

- Adiele, N. (2009). *Importance of training and development in a firm*. Retrieved April 6, 2010, from <http://ezinearticles.com/?Importance-Of-Training-And-Development-In-A-Firm&id=1885451>
- Agyedu, G. O., Donkor, F., & Obeng, S. (1999). *Research methods*. Kumasi: University of Education.
- Agyenim-Boateng, E. O. (2000). Towards the development of performance appraisal system for UCC senior and junior staff. *Journal of Educational Management*, 3, 128 – 141.
- Agyenim-Boateng, E. O. (2006). Problems associated with the management of performance appraisal in universities: The case study of Ghanaian public sector universities. *Journal of Educational Management*, 5, 134-152.
- Amedahe, F. K. (2002). *Notes on educational research*. (Unpublished).
- Amewudah, N. D. K. (2002). An evaluation of staff training and development activities at the University of Cape Coast. *Journal of Educational Management*, 4, 164 - 177.
- Anthony, W. P., Perrewe, P. L., & Kacmar M. K. (1999). *Human resource management* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). Orlando: Dryden Press.
- Antwi, M. K. (1992). *Education, society and development in Ghana*. Accra: Unimax Publishers Limited.
- Antwi, I. K., & Nwali, L. O. (1990). Staff development of librarians: The case of Abubakar Tafawa Balewa University Library, Nigeria (Electronic version). *Library Management*, 11, (6) 30-34.
- Ary, D., Jacobs, L. C., & Razavieh, A. (2002). *Introduction to research in education* (6<sup>th</sup> ed.). Belmont, CA.: Thomason Learning Co.
- Asiagodo, G. D. (1989). Staff development for the professional staff of a university library: The case of the Balme Library, University of Ghana (Electronic version). *Ghana Library Journal*, 7, 17-21.
- Baldwin, T. T., & Ford, K. J. (1988). Transfer of training: A review of directions for future research. *Personnel Psychology*, 41, 63 – 105.
- Baldwin, T. T., Magjuka, R. J., & Loher, B. T. (1991). The perils of participation: Effects of choice of training on trainee motivation and learning. *Personnel Psychology*, 44, 51-65.

- Ball, S. J. (1990). *Politics and policy-making in education*. London: Routledge.
- Bailey, K. D. (1994). *Methods of social research* (4<sup>th</sup> ed.). New York: The Free Press.
- Bartram, S., & Gibson, B. (2000). *The training needs analysis* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Amherst, MA: HRD Press Inc.
- Briggs, A. R. J. & Coleman, M. (Eds.). (2007). *Research methods in educational leadership and management*. London: SAGE Publications.
- Beach, S. D. (1980). *Personnel: The management of people at work* (4<sup>th</sup> ed.). New York: Collier Macmillan Publishers.
- Beckman, M. (2007). *Training needs assessment for warehouse employees*. Unpublished masters research paper. University of Wisconsin – Stout.
- Bell, J. (1999). *Doing your research project: A guide for first time researchers in education and social sciences* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bittel, L. R. (1985). *What every supervisor should know. The basis of supervising management* (5<sup>th</sup> ed.). New York: McGraw Hill.
- Bohlander, G., Snell, S., & Sherman, A. (2001). *Managing human resources* (12<sup>th</sup> ed.). New York: South-Western College Publishing.
- Borg, W. R., & Gall, M. D. (1983). *Educational research: An introduction* (4<sup>th</sup> ed.). New York: Longman Inc.
- Broad, M. L. (2003). *Ensuring transfer of learning to the job*. In ASTD Handbook of Training Design and Delivery. New York, NY: McGraw Hill.
- Breakwell, G. M., Hammond, S., Fife-Shaw, C., & Smith, J. A. (Eds.). (2006). *Research methods in psychology* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). London: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Bratton, J., & Gold, J. (1999). *Human resource management theory and practice* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Avon: Bath Press.
- Broomley, D. B. (1986). *The case study method in psychology and related disciplines*. Chichester: John Wiley.
- Burrow, J., & Berardinelli, P. (2003). Systematic performance improvement – Refining the space between learning and results. *Journal of Workplace Learning*, 15(1), 6 – 13.



- Byars, L. L., & Rue, L. W. (2004). *Human resource management* (7<sup>th</sup> ed.). New York: McGraw Hill/Irwin.
- Carnevale, A. P. (1990). *Training in America: The organization and strategic role of training*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass/Pfeiffer.
- Carrell, M. R, Elbert, N. F., & Hatfield, R. D. (2000). *Human resource management: Strategies for managing a diverse and global workforce* (6<sup>th</sup> ed.) USA: Dryden Press.
- Cascio, W. F. (1992). *Managing human resource* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). New York: McGraw Hill Inc.
- CHEMS (1999). *Survey of Training Providers on University Management for Commonwealth university staff*. Retrieved January 18, 2009 from <http://www.arcc.edu.au/avcc/staffdev/buttetin.htm>.
- Cheng, E. W. L., & Ho, D. C. K. (2001). A review of transfer of training studies in the past decade. *Personnel Review*, 30 (1), 102 – 118.
- Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2008). *Research methods in education*. New York: Routledge.
- Cole, G. A. (2004). *Management theory and practice* (6<sup>th</sup> ed.). London: T J International
- Cole, G. A. (1997). *Personnel management: Theory and practice* (4<sup>th</sup> ed.). London: Ashford Colour Press.
- Cowling, A., & Lundy, O. (1996). *Strategic human resources management*. Australia: Thomson.
- Dawra, S. (2001). *Human resource development and personnel management*. New Delhi: Radha Publications.
- DeNisi, A. S., & Griffin, R. W. (2001). *Human resource management*. New York: Houghton Mufflin Company.
- Dolliver, S. K. (1993). To train or not to train? *Supervision*. 54(10), 12-18.
- East Tennessee State University. (2009). *Employee performance evaluation procedure guide*. Retrieved October 26<sup>th</sup>, 2009 from <http://www.etsu.edu/humanres/guide.htm>.
- Effah, P. (1998). The training and development of academic librarians in Ghana (Electronic version). *Library Management*. 19, 37-41.
- Fink, O. (1995). *How to sample in surveys*. California: Sage Publications Inc.

- Fricker, J. (1994). In J. Prior (Ed), *Gower handbook of training and development* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Hamshire, England: Gower Publishing Ltd.
- George, D., & Mallery, P. (2003). *SPSS for windows step by step: A simple guide and reference. 11.0 update* (4<sup>th</sup> ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Gupta, K. (1999). *A practical guide for needs analysis*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass/Pfeifer.
- Handy, L. A. W. (2008). *The importance of work environment variables on transfer of training*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, North Carolina University, USA.
- Hakala, D. (2008). 16 ways to measure employee performance. Retrieved October 26<sup>th</sup>, 2009 from <http://view.atdmt.com/MON/view/172019384/direct/01/>
- Harbison, E. H. (1973). *Human resources, the wealth of nations*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Harris, M. (2000). *Human resource Management : A practical approach* (2 ed.). USA: Harcourt College Publishers.
- Haskell, R. E. (1998). *Reengineering Corporate Training: Intellectual Capital Transfer of Learning*. Westport, C. T.: Quorum Books.
- Heneman III, H. G., Schwab, D. P., Fossum, J. A., & Dyer, L. D. (2000). *Personnel/human resource management*. New Delhi: Richard D. Irwin Inc.
- Hitchcock, G. & Hughes, D. (1995). *Research and the teacher*. London: Routeledge.
- Holbrook Jnr., R. L. (2002). Contact points and flash points: Conceptualising the use of justice mechanisms in the performance appraisal interview. *Human Resource Management Review* 12, 101 – 123.
- Holten, E. F. III., & Baldwin, T. T. (2003). *Making transfer happen: An action perspective on learning transfer systems*. San Francisco, C. A.: Jossey-Bass
- Holten, E. F. III, Bates, R., & Rouna, W. E. A. (2000). Development of generalised transfer system inventory. *Human Resource Quarterly*, 11(4), 333 – 360.
- Kreicie, R. V., & Morgan, D. W. (1970). *Determining sample size for research activities: Educational and psychological measurement*. New York: Sage Publications Inc.

- Kunder, L. H. (1998). *Employees' perception of the status and effectiveness of the training and development system and the value of training and development*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Virginia.
- Lee, H. D., & Nelson, O. W. (2006). *Instructional analysis and course development*. Homewood, IL: American Technical Publishers.
- Lee, Y. S. (2007). *An approach to identify effective learning outcomes for a training programme*. Unpublished masters thesis, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Blacksburg, Virginia.
- Leimbach, M. P., & Baldwin, T. T. (1997). *How research contributes to the HRD value chain*. San Francisco: Berrett Koehler.
- Lim, D. H., & Morris, M. L. (2006). Influence of trainee characteristics, instructional satisfaction and organisational climate on perceived learning and training transfer. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 17(1), 85 – 115.
- Landale, A. (1994). *Gower handbook of training and development. Gower in association with the Institute of Training and Development*.
- Marczyk, G., DeMatteo, D., & Festinger, D. (2005). *Essentials of research design and methodology*. New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons Inc.
- Martinez, J., & Martneau, T. (2001). *Introducing performance management in national health systems: Issues and policy implementation*. An IHSD Issues Note.
- Mathis, R. L., & Jackson, J. H. (2002). *Human resource management*. (2<sup>th</sup> ed.). Canada: Thomson Learning Co.
- McNamara, C. (n.d). *Employee training and development: Reasons and benefits*. Retrieved January, 2009 from [http://www.mapnp.org/library/trng\\_dev?/basics/reasons.htm](http://www.mapnp.org/library/trng_dev?/basics/reasons.htm).
- McClelland, S. D. (2002). *A training needs assessment for the united way of Dunn County Wisconsin*. Unpublished masters dissertation. University of Wisconsin – Stout.
- Meggison, D., Banfield, P., & Joy-Mathews, J. (1999). *Human resource development* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). London: Kogan Page Ltd.
- Meggison, D., & Gibb, S. (2001). In Redman, T. & Wilkinson, A. (Eds.). *Contemporary human resource management: Text and cases*. London: Pearson Education Limited.

- Mullins, L. J. (2007). *Management and organisational behavior*. (8<sup>th</sup> ed.) Harlow, England: Pearson Education Ltd.
- Naming, A. (2005). *Performance appraisal of administrative staff: Usage and perceptions*. Unpublished masters thesis, Auckland University of Technology, Auckland.
- Needs Assessment Matrix. (n.d). Retrieved June 18, 2009 from [http://www.ceismc.gatech.edu/mm\\_tools/analysis.html](http://www.ceismc.gatech.edu/mm_tools/analysis.html)
- Nfila, C. (2005). *Training needs analysis for Bachibanga Compay Limited in Botswana*. Unpublished masters dissertation, University of Wincosin-Stout.
- Noe, R. A. (1986). Trainees attributes and attitudes: Neglected influences on training effectiveness. *Academy of Management Review*, 11(4), 361 – 365.
- Noe, R. A. (2005) *Employee Training and Development* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). Boston: McGraw-Hill Irwin.
- Noe, R. A, Hollenbeck, J. R., Gerhart, B., & Wright, P.M. (2004) *Human resource management*. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Noe, R. A, Hollenbeck, J. R., Gerhart, B., & Wright, P.M. (2007) *Management and organisational behaviour* (8<sup>th</sup> ed.). London: Pearson Education Ltd.
- Noe, R. A. & Schmitt, N. (1986). The influence of trainee attitudes on training effectiveness: Test of a model. *Personnel Psychology*, 39, 497 – 523.
- Nowack, K. M. (1991). A training needs analysis. *Training and Development Journal*, 45 (4), 69 – 73
- Nsowah-Nuamah, N. N. (2005). *Basic statistics*. Accra: Acadec Press.
- Nwadinigwe, I. P. (2005). *Foundamentals of research methods and statistics*. Lagos: Sibon Books Limited.
- Opoku, J. Y. (2002). *A short guide to research writing in the social sciences and education* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Accra: Ghana Universities Press.
- Price, A. (2004). *Human resource management in a business context* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Australia: Thomson Learning Co.
- Prior, L. (2003). *Using documents in social research*. London: Sage.

- Rosner, R. (1999). Training is the answer ... but what was the question? *Workforce*, 78, 42 – 50.
- Rouiller, J. Z., & Goldstein, I. L. (1993). The relationship between organizational transfer climate and positive transfer of training. *Human Resources Development Quarterly*, 4 (4), 377 – 390.
- Sangweni, S. S. (2003). Performance management as a leadership and management tool. *SDR*, 2, 4.
- Sarantakos, S. (2005). *Social research* (4<sup>th</sup> ed.). New York: Pelgrave Macmillan.
- Shermerhorn Jnr, J. R. (1984). *Management for productivity* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.) New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Silliman, B. (2004). Building healthy marriages through early and extended outreach with youth. *Journal of Psychology and Theology*, 31, 270-282.
- Sproull, N. L. (1988). *A handbook of research methods: A guide for practitioners and students in social sciences*. Metuchen: Scarcrow.
- Stone, N. (1991). Does business have any business in education? *Harvard Business Review*, 69(2), 46 – 62.
- Tannenbaum, S., & Yukl, G. (1992). Training and development in work organisations. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 43, 399 – 441.
- Training Magazine for Staff. (1997). 1997 Industry Report: A statistical picture of employee training in America. *Training*, 34, 45-67.
- Trochim, W. (2000). *The research methods knowledge base* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Cincinnati, O. H.: Atomic Dog Publishing.
- Twumasi, P. A (2001). *Social research on rural communities*. Accra: Ghana Universities Press.
- UCC .(2009). *Final accounts 2007*. Directorate of Finance. (Unpublished)
- UCC. (2006). *Scheme of service for senior and junior staff of universities in Ghana*. (Unpublished)
- UCC (2002). *Training policy for junior and senior staff*. Division of Human Resource. (Unpublished)
- Werther, W, B. Jnr, & Davis, K. (1996). *Human resource and Personnel Management* (5<sup>th</sup> ed.). Boston: McGraw Hill Inc.

Whaley, H. M. (2006). *Gender differences in the preferred methods of training, needs and interests and hindrances and motivators for sexual harassment training*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Tennessee, Knoxville.

**APPENDIX A**  
**QUESTIONNAIRE**  
**(For Senior Staff)**

A study is being conducted into how training and development programmes offered by public universities influence the performance of senior staff of the universities.

I am happy to inform you that you have been selected to participate in the study by filling in the attached questionnaire. You are therefore respectfully requested to provide objective responses to the items in the questionnaire as they apply to you. You are assured that the information you provide will be used for only academic purpose and therefore your confidentiality is assured. For this reason, you are kindly asked **NOT** to write your name on this questionnaire.

Thank you.

**N.B. *Training and Development*** – in this study is defined as any activity (excluding orientation and induction) provided for staff for the purpose of improving their skills so as to improve their performance or to prepare them for higher tasks in the future.

**PART ONE**

**Biographical Data**

Please tick [✓] or write as appropriate in the spaces provided.

(1) Gender: Male [ ] Female [ ]

(2) How old are you?

i) Below 30 years [ ] iv) 50 - 59 years [ ]

ii) 30 - 39 years [ ] v) 60 years and above [ ]

iii) 40 - 49 years [ ]

(3) Please, for how long have you worked with this University?

i) 1 – 5 years [ ] v) 21 – 25 years [ ]

ii) 6 – 10 years [ ] vi) 26 – 30 years [ ]

iii) 10 – 15 years [ ] vii) 31 – 35 years [ ]

iv) 16 – 20 years [ ] viii) Above 35 years [ ]

(4) Please what is your present rank?

Please specify .....

(5) What is your highest educational qualification?

a) Second Degree (M.Phil, M.Sc. etc) [ ] (c) University Diploma, H. N. D. [ ]

b) First Degree (B.Ed., B.Com. etc) [ ] (d) Others (Please specify) .....

.....



**PART TWO**

**Nature of Training and Development Programmes in the University**

Please tick [] or write as appropriate in the spaces provided.

(6) How many training and development programmes have you participated in the last five years? .....

(7) Indicate the type of programme(s) by ticking []. (Please, as many as apply)

<b><u>TYPE</u></b>	<b><u>NO. OF TIMES</u></b>
a) Workshop [ <input type="checkbox"/> ]	[ <input type="checkbox"/> ]
b) Seminar [ <input type="checkbox"/> ]	[ <input type="checkbox"/> ]
c) Conference [ <input type="checkbox"/> ]	[ <input type="checkbox"/> ]
d) Schooling [ <input type="checkbox"/> ]	[ <input type="checkbox"/> ]
e)Others (Please specify) .....	

(8) How long did this/these programme(s) you attended last?

<b>Programme</b>	<b>Duration</b>	<b>Venue</b>
a) Workshop [ <input type="checkbox"/> ]	.....	.....
b) Seminar [ <input type="checkbox"/> ]	.....	.....
c) Conference [ <input type="checkbox"/> ]	.....	.....
d) Schooling/Study Leave [ <input type="checkbox"/> ]	.....	.....
e) Others (Please specify) .....	.....	.....

**Factors Influencing Participation in Training and Development Programmes in the University**

Please, indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree to each of the following reasons as being factors that influenced your participation in the training and development programmes by ticking [√] in the appropriate column.

**SA = Strongly Agree      A = Agree      N = Neither      D = Disagree**  
**SD = Strongly Disagree**

No.	Reason	SA	A	N	D	SD
9	Encouragement(s) from colleagues/peers					
10	Recommendation(s) from superior(s)					
11	To enable me gain promotion					
12	To help improve upon my work performance					
13	To acquire a higher qualification/ further knowledge (self development)					
14	To prepare me for future tasks (e.g change in technology, change in job, etc)					
15	To gain recognition (Prestige, recognition)					
16	Because they were compulsory					
17	In response to identified institutional need(s) i.e. After a discussion between me and university authorities.					

Any other reason? (Please indicate) .....

.....

**Relevance of Training and Development Programmes.**

Please, indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree to each of the following statements as to how relevant the programme(s) you attended are to your job by ticking [√] in the appropriate column.

**SA = Strongly Agree      A = Agree      N = Neither      D = Disagree**  
**SD = Strongly Disagree**

		<b>SA</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>SD</b>
18	Courses were directly related to the content of my job					
19	I have acquired skills, which I am now using on my job					
20	I have acquired new skills and knowledge for future use					
21	I have gained better understanding of my job					
22	The programme(s) objectives matched with my idea of what should be taught.					

Any other way? (Please indicate) .....

.....

### Training Resources and Methods Used

Please, indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree to each of the following statements as to the appropriateness of the resources and methods used in the training and development programme(s) you attended by ticking [√] in the appropriate column.

**SA = Strongly Agree      A = Agree      N = Neither      D = Disagree**  
**SD = Strongly Disagree**

		<b>SA</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>SD</b>
23	The teaching personnel were competent in their delivery					
24	I am satisfied with the quality of the overall training programme					
25	The course materials provided were excellent both in quality and quantity (Physical)					
26	The course materials covered adequate content					
27	I was satisfied with how examinations were conducted					
28	I was satisfied with feedback received from examinations					
29	The length of time for the programme(s) was/were adequate					
30	The teaching methods adopted enhanced understanding and transfer on to my job					
31	There was/were direct and immediate benefit(s) to the programme(s). e.g. pay rise, promotion and certificates.					

### **Influence of Training and Development Programmes on Staff Performance**

Please, indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree to each of the following statements as to how the training and development programme(s) have influenced your performance by ticking [√] in the appropriate column.

**SA = Strongly Agree      A = Agree      N = Neither      D = Disagree**

**SD = Strongly Disagree**

		<b>SA</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>SD</b>
32	The programme(s) provided me with new ways of thinking about my job (creativity and initiative)					
33	My work output has increased (Quantity)					
34	I make fewer errors than before (Quality)					
35	I am able to complete tasks within shorter times (Timeliness)					
36	I feel better motivated to work (Preparedness to work)					
37	My competency level has improved (e.g. Better decision making, positive attitude to work)					
38	Interactions during such courses have helped me improve my human relations skills					
39	I have won more respect from people					

Any other way? (Please indicate) .....

.....

### Obstacles that Hinder Transfer of Training

Please, indicate the extent to which the following factors at your work place hinder you from transferring what is learnt onto your job by ticking [√] in the appropriate space.

		<b>To a Greater Extent</b>	<b>To a Little Extent</b>	<b>To No Extent</b>
40	Inadequate materials and equipment			
41	Lack of support from superiors			
42	Lack of cooperation from colleagues			
43	Lack of cooperation from subordinates			
44	Administrative procedures (e.g. bureaucracy /red tape, etc)			
45	Lack of opportunity to practice developed skills (e. g. when work is not provided)			
46	There is no motivation to apply what is learnt. (No direct reward or punishment)			

Any other obstacle? (Please indicate) .....

.....

### Suggestions for Improvements

Indicate your level of agreement or disagreement to the following statements by ticking [√] in the appropriate space.

**SA = Strongly Agree   A = Agree   N = Neither   D = Disagree   SA = Strongly Disagree**

		<b>SA</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>SD</b>
47	Participants should be involved in determining their training needs					
48	Senior Staff should be exposed more frequently to training and development programmes					
49	Participation in training programmes should be considered in the promotion of staff					
50	Participants of training programmes should be awarded with certificates.					

Please, what other ways do you think training and development programmes for Senior Staff can be enhanced to help improve on their performance? .....

.....

## **APPENDIX B**

### **INTERVIEW GUIDE “I”**

#### **(FOR HEADS OF DEPARTMENTS/UNITS)**

##### **A. Ice Breaking Activity**

- Introduce yourself to interviewee and encourage him/her to introduce himself/herself.
- Explain the purpose of the study to interviewee and indicate the role he/she will play in the interview session.
- Explain your operational definition of Training and Development and other terms to interviewee.
- Inform interviewee on how you intend to record the information and seek his consent.

##### **B Main Issues**

###### 1. Nature of training and development programmes.

- Please what type of training and development programmes have your subordinates (senior staff) ever participated in?
- How often did the senior staff attend each of these programmes?
- How long did these programmes last?

###### 2. Factors which influence recommendation for participation

- Please which of the training and development programmes did you recommend for your senior staff?
- What were your reasons for such recommendations?



- What training and development programme(s) did the university recommend for the senior staff?
  - What were the reasons for such recommendations?
  - Which of the training programme(s) was/were at the request of the senior staff?
  - What were the reasons for such request(s)?
3. Relevance of training programmes
- Please what knowledge/skills/attitudes from these training programme(s) do you think were directly related to their present job?
  - Which of them do you think will be beneficial to them in the near future?
4. Influence of training and development programmes on performance.
- Please, how has/have the training programme(s) influenced the performance of your staff in the following areas?
    - i. Quality of work e.g. errors committed
    - ii. Quantity of work e.g. total output
    - iii. Motivation e.g. morale to work
    - iv. Understanding of your job e.g. creativity and initiative
    - v. Human relations skills.
    - vi. What other way(s) has/have this/these programme(s) influenced the performance of your senior staff?

**THANK YOU.**

## APPENDIX C

### INTERVIEW GUIDE “II”

#### (FOR TRAINING AND DEVELOPMENT SECTION)

#### **A. Ice Breaking Activity**

- Introduce yourself to interviewee and encourage him/her to introduce himself/herself.
- Explain the purpose of the study to interviewee and indicate the role he/she will play in the interview session.
- Explain your operational definition of Training and Development and other terms to interviewee.
- Inform interviewee on how you intend to record the information and seek his consent.

#### **B Main Issues**

1. Nature of training and development programmes.
  - Please what type of training and development programmes do you organise for your senior staff employees?
  - How often do the senior staff attend each of these programmes?
  - How long do these programmes last?
2. Factors which influence recommendation for participation
  - Please which of the training and development programmes did your office recommend for your senior staff?
  - What were your reasons for such recommendations?

- What training and development programme(s) did the heads/immediate supervisors request for their senior staff?
- What were the reasons for such requests?
- Which of the training programme(s) was/were at the request of the senior staff?
- What were the reasons for such request(s)?

2 b. How do you obtain information for the purpose of deciding on which training programmes to recommend for your senior staff?

3. Relevance of training programmes

- Please what knowledge/skills/attitudes from these training programme(s) do you think were directly related to their present job?
- Which of them do you think will be beneficial to them in the near future?
- Please what is your assessment of the cost involved in these programmes and the benefits to the university and staff?

4. Influence of training and development programmes on performance.
  - Please, how has/have the training programme(s) influenced the performance of your staff in the following areas?
    - i. Quality of work e.g. errors committed
    - ii. Quantity of work e.g. total output
    - iii. Motivation e.g. morale to work
    - iv. Understanding of your job e.g. creativity and initiative
    - v. Human relations skills.
  - What other ways has/have this/these programme(s) influenced the performance of your senior staff?
5. Please how do you obtain information on how the training and development programmes influence the performance of the senior staff?
6. Please, what should be done to improve training and development programmes for senior staff of University of Cape Coast?

THANK YOU.





**APPENDIX F**

*University of Cape Coast*  
Division of Human Resource  
**Training and Development Section**

**TRAINING CALENDAR: JANUARY TO SEPTEMBER, 2009**

<b>Month</b>	<b>Topic</b>	<b>Target Group/Participants</b>
<b>February</b>	a) Workshop: Effective Monitoring and Supervision	All Team Leaders/Supervisors within the Directorate of Physical Development and Estate Management
	b) Workshop: Procurement Procedures and Calculation of F.T.E.	All Heads and Assistant Head Porters
<b>March</b>	a) Training Security on Campus I	Selected Security Personnel
	b) Retreat: Senior Management (Registrars Outfit)	All Deputy Registrars/Senior Assistant Registrars & Assistant Registrars
	c) Training: Records Management	All Clerks and Senior Clerks
<b>April</b>	a) Training/Workshop: Committee Servicing	All Senior Assistant Registrars/Assistant Registrars
	b) Training/Workshop: Directorate of Finance	All Selected Staff within Directorate of Finance
	c) Training/Workshop: Directorate of Internal Audit	All Selected Staff within Directorate of Internal Audit
<b>May</b>	a) Management Seminar: Managing yourself, your work and your subordinates	All Senior Registrars & Assistant Registrars
	b) Training/Workshop: Students Counselling	All Hall Tutors
<b>June</b>	a) ICT Workshop:	Clerical and Administrative Staff Senior Management Staff
	b) Training (Grading) Laboratory Management Practices	Laboratory Assistants (To be continued in August)

*Training Schedule Cont.*

<b>July</b>	a) Seminar: Mail Management b) Training: Office Management	Clerks/Senior Clerks/Administrative Assistants Senior/Principal/Chief Administrative Assistants
<b>August</b>	a) Training: Human Resource Management Practices b) Training (Grading) Laboratory Management Practices c) training/Workshop: Directorate of University Health Services	All Staff within Division of Human Resource Laboratory Assistants (Should start in June 2009) Selected Nurses/Doctors

In addition to the above, the individual Sections and Directorates would be encouraged to organise tailor-made in-service training programme for their staff.

E. O. Agyenim-Boateng (Ph. D.)  
Senior Assistant Registrar







## APPENDIX I

### Questionnaire for Deans/Heads of Department/Section/Unit – U.C.C.

#### Introduction

The questionnaire below has been designed to enable the Training and Development Section to evaluate its recent seminar on Mail and Records Management for clerical staff of the University. It is intended to guide us in organizing subsequent programmes of this nature. You are kindly invited to help us to evaluate and improve our training programmes by frankly answering the following questions.

Thanks in advance for your co-operation.

- 1) Please have you noticed any change(s) in the way nominee(s) handle(s) and manage(s) mails and records at the Department since he/she attended the last seminar on mail and records management?  
Yes            [ ]    (Please go to 2)  
No             [ ]    (Please go to 3)
- 2) If yes, how will you describe the changes in the way he/she/they handle(s) and manage(s) mails and records?  
Positive       [ ]  
Negative      [ ]
- 3) Sir/Madam, is there any thing(s) that he/she/they was/were doing but has/have started doing in the area of mail handling and management since the seminar? .....
- 4) How will you rate your nominee's/nominees' performance before the seminar in the area of mail and records handling and management?  
Exceptional    [ ]  
Above average [ ]  
Average        [ ]  
Below average [ ]  
Unsatisfactory [ ]

5) How will you rate your nominee's/nominees' performance after the seminar in the area of mail and records handling and management?

Exceptional [ ]

Above average [ ]

Average [ ]

Below average [ ]

Unsatisfactory [ ]

6) Based on your assessment to questions 1 – 5, would you say the seminar has been beneficial to your Faculty/Department/Section/Unit?

Yes [ ]

No [ ]

7) Please, give reasons for your answer to question 6.

.....  
.....  
.....  
.....

8) Please, in what areas would you recommend further training for you clerical staff?

.....  
.....  
.....

9) Sir/Madam, kindly give any suggestion(s) for improvement of Training and Development Section's training for junior and senior staff of the University.

.....  
.....  
.....

Thank you for your assistance.

Dr. E. O. Agyenim-Boateng  
**Senior Assistant Registrar (T&D)**

