

Evaluation of Induction Training: A Survey of Low and Mid-level Managers at Nepalese Development Banks

Arhan Sthapit¹

Induction training is important to apprise the new entrants about the organisation and to orientate and socialise them with its philosophy, goals, work culture, procedures, systems, compensation (salary, leaves, facilities, etc.) and expected employee-behaviours. The article is based on the author's recent survey (November-December, 2011) as to how managers evaluate the induction training of their respective organisations in terms of Kirkpatrick's (1983, 2004) four-level/criteria training evaluation model (Reaction, Learning, Behaviour and Results). Surveying a sample of low and middle-level managers of Nepalese development banks established after F/Y 2005/06, the study found that the induction training as effective in terms of 'learning,' and ineffectual on the 'Behaviour-change' criterion. The findings of the study should prove instrumental in providing important inputs to human resource managers, policy-makers and HRD-professionals.

Introduction

A modern organisation's conducting induction training is justified for its purpose to help new employees to fit smoothly into the organisation by socialising them to the organisational culture consisting of shared values and norms that define behaviours of its employees (Singh and Sthapit, 2008).

Induction training is absolutely vital for new starters (Ibid). Good induction training ensures new recruits are retained, and then settled in quickly,

¹ Lecturer, Public Youth Campus, Tribhuvan University

comfortably and happily to a productive role. Induction training is more than skills training. It is about the basics that seasoned employees all take for granted: what the shifts are; where the notice-board is; what is the routine for holidays, sickness; where is the canteen; what the dress code is; where the toilets are; and what the expected behaviours are. New employees also need to understand the organisation's mission, goals, values and philosophy; personnel practices, health and safety rules, and of course the job they are required to do, with clear methods, timescales and expectations.

Induction training is distinct from both pre-service and in-service training (Smith and Ingersoll, 2004). Pre-service refers to the training and preparation that candidates receive before employment (including clinical training). In-service refers to periodic upgrading and additional training received on-the-job, during employment (Ibid). Theoretically, induction programmes are not additional training per se but are designed for new members of the organisation.

A number of studies seem to provide support for the hypothesis that well-conceived and well-implemented induction programmes are successful in increasing the job satisfaction, efficacy, and retention of new employees (Smith and Ingersoll, 2004).

Smith and Ingersoll (2004) reported that induction training programmes in US schools helped the new entrants cope with the job's practicalities and adjusting to the work environment. It further reported that the induction training also helped reduce employee turnover.

It all underscores the need for making induction training programmes more effective and is based on the evaluation of such training programmes.

In evaluating the training and HRD programmes, Kirkpatrick (1994, 2004) offered a four-level model or framework in 1967 and modified them by 2004. Meanwhile, Galvin (1983) proposed a CIPP model (context, input, process and product) and Brinkerhoff (1987) devised a six stage framework. Philips (1996) developed a five-level model (reaction and planned action, learning, applied learning on the job, business results and return on investment) that was largely

modified from the Kirkpatrick model. In view of its specific nature, the current study on the induction training evaluation has adopted the Kirkpatrick model embedded in: a) Reaction, b) Learning, c) Job Behaviour and d) Results.

Reaction evaluates of how participants have reacted to the training, while evaluation of *learning* is to measure to what extent the learning objectives have been attained.

Behaviour evaluation is to assess to what extent job behaviour has changed as required when the trainees have returned to their jobs. Sutaarson (2010) categorised induction training under the behaviour training, as the study on training effectiveness of middle-level managers at LUCAS-TVS Ltd of Chennai, India, found the induction training concentrating more on behaviour of the new inductees. Goldstein and Ford (2002; cited in Alipour, et al, 2009) stressed that training must cause behaviour-change (i.e., skill transfer for job performance), thereby resulting in organisational performance.

Likewise, the evaluation of *results* gives the basis for assessing the benefits of training against its cost (Armstrong, 2010). Results are necessarily reflected in the job performance of newly inducted employees after they have returned from the training to their respective jobs.

Statement of the Problem

In view of the imperative need of the top management to build an effective team of good employees, supervisors and officers at the workplaces, induction training programmes should be designed and delivered in an effective way.

Therefore, it requires that reliable '*inputs*' and feedback be taken from the concerned officers and managers to develop and deliver the training. Therefore, Nepalese organisations are also required to perform proper evaluation of their induction programmes, so that they can develop better induction-training programmes to ensure improved '*outputs*' to the organisation and concerned work-teams. However, no such research was found during the current study in the country, let alone the development bank sector. Therefore, the current study

is an attempt to fill a part of the lacuna existing in the induction training evaluation.

The study holds significance for its using first-hand primary data collected from managers and decision-makers who –working at the lower and middle levels of management—are in constant touch with functional level employees and subordinates. Hence it can, to a large extent, capture the typical situation of induction training in emerging Nepalese organisations established after 2005/06. The managers’ evaluation of induction training can offer the insights that may serve as an important basis for developmental actions while the managers’ make decisions on HRM, HRD and specific induction training.

Objectives of the Study

- To examine how Nepalese development bank managers evaluate induction training programmes at their organisations, and
- To assess the policy options required to make induction training more effective for officers/managers in future.

Methodology

Research Approach and Sample

The study is based on Exploratory and Analytical research design. It has used the self-administered questionnaire survey based on a purposive sampling method keeping in view the study purpose of getting cooperation from otherwise busy managers of the banks.

The development banks established after the establishment of Loktantrik (democratic) polity in Nepal. Fiscal year 2005/06 was chosen as the sample enterprises, since the growth of development banks accelerated significantly after the democratisation and politico-economic liberalisation process in Nepal. The study has encompassed middle and lower-level managers of Nepalese development banks. A questionnaire was initially pre-tested on 10 officers, and the modified one was issued to 75 sample managers between November and December, 2011. Of them, there were 60 usable responses, i.e., 80 percent

success rate which is fairly large enough to avoid the requirement of calculating ‘non-response bias.’

Theoretical Model and Questionnaire

For evaluating induction training effectiveness, the questionnaire has been devised from a theoretical model of Rao’s HRD audit questionnaire that measures training effectiveness in terms of reaction, learning, job-behaviour and results as embedded with the Kirkpatrick model (1983, 2004).

The questionnaire called for respondents’ opinion on the four criteria/levels (of the Kirkpatrick model) constructed on a five-point Likert scale by assigning 1 to the extreme negative and 5 to the extreme positive.

Analysis Tools

To examine the data for addressing the research objectives, the study has made use of percentage analysis, and ranks based on mean values (also based on median whenever mean-values for two or more variables stand equal).

There is room for using non-parametric approaches, which are free of specific assumptions concerning the distribution of differing opinions (agreed and disagreed about the training evaluation statements). So, the significance of differing opinions regarding the induction training has further been tested using a non-parametric binomial statistic calculated as under:

$$Z = \frac{A - E}{\sqrt{NP(1-P)}}$$

Where, A is the actual number of differing opinions, E equals to N multiplied by P, is the expected number of differing opinions, N is the number of respondents, and P is the expected percentage of differing opinions.

Under the null hypothesis of no effect, P = 0.5, the binomial Z statistic tests whether the proportion of positive to negative opinions exceeds the number expected or not.

Limitations

However, the study suffers from using a study-sample of a limited number of development banks that too located in the Kathmandu Valley. Likewise, limitations could also result from surveying personal perception of only lower and middle level managers as it has done without surveying the top-level managers. Likewise, the use of purposive/judgemental sampling could also limit the reliability of the study.

Its limitation also stems from the application of the 4-level Kirkpatrick model (1983, 2004) alone whereas a number of other paradigms have also emerged in the context of assessing the training effectiveness.

Data Analysis and Discussions

The article has presented and analysed the data relating to the evaluation of induction training in order to draw answers to research objectives.

Respondents' Profile

The respondents were those bank managers who have been exposed to induction training at their banks. More than one-fourth of those surveyed were middle-level managers (26.7 percent) and nearly three-fourths (73.3 percent) the low-level managers (known usually as officers in the Nepalese banking sector). Table 1 shows that majority (73.3 percent) of the respondents were male, reaffirming a heavily male-dominated management scenario of the country. Nearly two in every three respondents held master's degree and the rest had bachelor's degree of education.

Age-wise, the respondents are relatively younger as they all were below 50 years. Over 63 percent of them belonged to the group of 31-39 years while those aged below 30 years accounted for 23.3 percent. Only 13.3 percent of the respondents were relatively matured at 40-49 years.

Table 1: Respondents' Profile

Variables	Number	%	Variables	Number	%
<i>Gender</i>			<i>Hierarchies</i>		
Male	16	26.67	Low-level Managers	44	73.33
Female	44	73.33	Mid-level Managers	16	26.67
<i>Total</i>	<i>60</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>60</i>	<i>100.0</i>
<i>Education</i>			<i>Age Groups</i>		
Intermediate	-	-	Less than 30 years	14	23.33
Bachelor	22	36.67	30-39 years	38	63.33
Masters	38	63.33	40-49 years	8	13.33
PhD, MPhil	-	-	50 years and above	-	-
	<i>60</i>	<i>100</i>		<i>60</i>	<i>100</i>

Source: Author's Survey, 2011

Evaluation of Induction Training

Nepalese middle and lower level managers have opined that the induction training in their organisations is most effective in terms of learning criterion (mean value 4.10). They have largely agreed that induction training has provided new entrants with ample opportunities for 'Learning' as intended by their organisations. Furthermore, they have ranked 'Results' second (mean value 3.83) and 'Reaction' third (mean value 3.80).

However, it follows from Table 2 that Nepalese development bank managers have found the induction training programmes just yield little in bringing out

positive changes in new recruits' 'Behaviour.' Theoretically, it may, however, be argued that better results from any training and human resource development efforts ensue from the positive change in Learning, Reaction and Behaviour of the target trainees.

Evaluation of Induction Training By Management Levels

Categorised by their management hierarchies or levels, both low and middle level managers of Nepalese development banks have shared similarity in ranking the induction training programmes by the four-level criteria (Table 2). They all have believed that the 'Learning' is the highest ranked criterion for evaluating the induction training in their respective organisations.

Similarly, both levels of managers resembled in placing the 'Behaviour' criterion at the last (fourth) rank; describing the induction training as ineffectual in bringing about positive change in newcomers' job behaviour.

However, the two levels of managers have swapped the ranks for 'Reaction' and 'Results.' While mid-level managers have found induction-trainees' 'Reaction' better than their junior counterparts, the low-level managers preferred placing 'Results' at the second rank vis-à-vis their seniors' third.

Hence, two things may be inferred from the finding. One, because of their higher position at the organisational hierarchy, it may be natural that the mid-level managers get reports of better 'Reaction' from the induction-trainees. Alternately, low-level managers tend to get more easily convinced with the change observed in job 'Results' after the new recruits' induction training than the mid-managers do; the explanation may be further attributed to the fact that low level managers—the first-line supervisors—are usually in a better position to have direct contact with newly inducted human resources.

Evaluation of Induction Training: A Survey of Low and Mid-level Managers at Nepalese Development Banks

Table 2: Evaluation of Induction Training Programmes

Management levels \ Evaluation criteria	Low-level Managers		Mid-level Managers		Total	
	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank
LEARNING	4.00	1	4.38	1	4.10	1
REACTION	3.73	3	4.00	2	3.80	3
BEHAVIOUR	3.36	4	3.75	4	3.47	4
RESULTS	3.82	2	3.88	3	3.83	2

Source: Author's Survey, 2011

Evaluation of Induction Training By Managers' Gender

From Table 3, it can be observed that both male and female managers have ranked first and fourth (last) the criteria of 'Learning' and 'Behaviour' respectively. But, in evaluating the output of the induction training, female managers have ranked 'Results' before 'Reaction' reversing their male counterparts' ranks for the same evaluation-criteria. The difference may be construed as the gender-driven evaluation of the induction training.

Table 3: Evaluation of Induction Training Programmes by Managers' Gender

Gender \ Evaluation criteria	Male		Female	
	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank

Evaluation of Induction Training: A Survey of Low and Mid-level Managers at Nepalese Development Banks

LEARNING	4.09	1	4.13	1*
REACTION	3.77	2	3.88	3
BEHAVIOUR	3.55	4	3.25	4
RESULTS	3.73	3	4.13	2*

*Ranks modified after calculating the median (in addition to mean)

Source: Author's Survey, 2011

Evaluation of Induction Training By Managers' Education

Based on the mean values of all the four evaluation criteria, both bachelor and master degree holders have ranked 'Learning' and 'Behaviour' first and fourth (last) respectively (Table 4). Thereafter have the managers with master's degrees found the induction training effective on the criteria of 'Results' (2nd rank) and 'Reaction' (3rd rank), respectively.

Interestingly, based on both mean and median values, the ranking by the bachelor's degree holders have got stuck up on the very second rank for both 'Results' and 'Reaction'. Arguably then, since the ranks based on the total of all respondents (Table 2) as well as those of master degree holders (Table 4) are second and third for 'Results' and 'Reaction' respectively, the bachelor's degree holders' ranks also may be approximated accordingly. Therefore, ranks by both master and bachelor degree holders may be put forth sequentially for 'Learning,' 'Results,' 'Reaction' and 'Behaviour.'

On the whole, the managers' education level makes no significant impact on their evaluating the induction training on the four-level criteria.

Table 4: Evaluation of Induction Training Programmes by Managers' Education

Education Degrees Evaluation criteria	Bachelor's level		Master's level	
	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank
LEARNING	4.00	1	4.16	1
REACTION	3.73	2* (3)	3.84	3
BEHAVIOUR	3.27	4	3.58	4
RESULTS	3.73	2* (2)	3.89	2

Source: Author's Survey, 2011

*Ranks are based on both mean and median values. The ranks modified from those of all respondents and of master degree holders have been given within the parenthesis.

Evaluation of Induction Training By Managers' Age

Table 5 shows that, while regrouping the managers' age into the categories of 'below 30 years' and '30 years and above', all have ranked 'Learning' and 'Behaviour' first and fourth (last) respectively. But, the two age-groups have swapped the ranks for 'Results' and 'Reaction' indicating their different opinions. While the managers aged 30 years and above have placed 'Results' before 'Reaction,' younger managers have permuted the ranks the other way round.

Table 5: Evaluation of Induction Training Programmes by Managers' Age

Evaluation criteria	Age groups			
	Below 30 years		30 years and above	
	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank
LEARNING	4.14	1	4.09	1
REACTION	3.71	2	3.83	3
BEHAVIOUR	3.14	4	3.57	4
RESULTS	3.43	3	3.96	2

Source: Author's Survey, 2011

Binomial Z-Test of Differences between 'Disagreed' and 'Agreed' Responses

In view of the difference observed between the managers' opinions (agreed and disagreed) about the four different training evaluation criteria, a z-test has been performed on the data by formulating the following hypothesis:

Hypothesis:

H₀: *There is no significant difference between the 'agreed' and 'disagreed' opinions expressed by respondents about the four criteria statements*

H₁: *There is a significant difference between the 'agreed' and 'disagreed' opinions expressed by respondents about the four criteria statements*

Since the z-value of manager-opinions for all four criteria is larger than the expected value of 2.575 at 1 percent level of significance (see Table 3), the result has rejected the null hypothesis. Hence, there is a significant difference in the Nepalese managers' opinions (agreed and disagreed categories) when they evaluate the induction training programme at their respective organisations.

Evaluation of Induction Training: A Survey of Low and Mid-level Managers at Nepalese Development Banks

Table 6: Binomial Z-Test of Differences between 'Disagreed' and 'Agreed' Responses

Evaluation Criteria	Respondents	Extremely disagreed (1)	Disagreed to some extent (2)	Neutral (3)	Agreed to some extent (4)	Extremely agreed (5)	Total	Disagreed (1+2)	Neutral (3)	Agreed (4+5)	Total of 'agreed' and 'disagreed'	Z-value
Learning	Number	0	4	10	22	24	60	4	10	46	50	
	%	0	6.67	16.67	36.67	40		6.67	16.7	76.7		-5.940*
Reaction	Number	0	4	18	24	14	60	4	18	38	42	
	%	0	6.67	30	40	23.33		6.67	30	63.3		-5.246*
Behaviour	Number	4	2	28	14	12	60	6	28	26	32	
	%	6.67	3.33	46.67	23.33	20		10	46.7	43.3		-3.536*
Results	Number	0	0	20	30	10	60	0	20	40	40	
	%	0	0	33.33	50	16.67		0	33.3	66.7		-6.325*

* significance measured at 1 per cent level

Source: Author's Survey, 2011

Conclusion

In evaluating the induction training of development banks, the managers' education level has made no impact on their ranking of four evaluation criteria (levels). The study has also found no effect of such other demographic variables as age, gender and hierarchies (management-levels) on the managers' giving the two extreme ranks (first and fourth) to 'Learning' and 'Behaviour' respectively. But from the data analysis, some level of impact of these three variables can be identified on the remaining two evaluation-criteria of 'Results' and 'Reaction'.

Keeping aside the 'neutral' expressions, the binomial z-test on the differing opinions (on agreement and disagreement) has also highlighted the significant differences between such opinions of the managers.

Overall, the induction training programmes at Nepalese development banks have fared well to augment the new recruits' learning. But the induction training—the study has found—has hardly contributed to bringing about the positive change in their job-behaviours. Between these two extremes have the managers ranked 'Results' and 'Reaction,' when evaluating the induction training efforts.

As the policy implication, the training and HRD managers should more purposefully design the induction training in such a way that expected improvement in behaviour of the new recruits can be brought about. There is also room for focused efforts for improving the results and reactions from the induction-trainees. Since the effectiveness of any induction training programme is necessarily measured in terms of learning, reaction, behaviour and results, well-concerted efforts to consolidate it on all four fronts should prove fruitful and rewarding.

Further studies would also evaluate the induction training on more models than Kirkpatrick's 4-level design. More research works may also be expected in commercial banks and other organisations of the country.

References

- Alipour, M., Salehi, M, Shahnava, A. (2009). A Study of on the Job Training Effectiveness: Empirical Evidence of Iran. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 4 (11). Retrieved from www.ccsenet.org>
- Armstrong, M. (2010). *Essential Human Resource Management Practice: A Guide to People Management*, India: Kogan Page.
- Goldstein, I.L., and Ford J.K. (2002). *Training in Organizations: Need Assessment, Development, and Evaluation*, in Alipour et al (2009), A Study of on the Job Training Effectiveness: Empirical Evidence of Iran, *International Journal of Business and Management*, 4 (11).
- Kirkpatrick, D.L. (1983). Four steps to measuring training effectiveness, *Personnel Administrator*. 28 (11) in Armstrong, M (2010), *Essential Human Resource Management Practice: A Guide to People Management*, India: Kogan Page.
- Kirkpatrick, D.L. (1994). Evaluating Training Programs: The Four Levels. In Werner & Desimone (2006). *Human Resource Development*, New Delhi: Cengage Learning. Indian Edition. pp 186-187.
- Kirkpatrick, D.L. (2004). A T&D Classic: How to start an objective evaluation of your training program. In Werner & Desimone (2006). *Human Resource Development*, New Delhi: Cengage Learning. Indian Edition. pp 186-187.
- Rao, T.V. (1999). *HRD Audit Questionnaire*, New Delhi, India: Oxford & IBH Publishing.
- Rao, T.V. (1999). The Training Effectiveness *Questionnaire*. (Online resources).
- Singh, T.M. and Sthapit, A. (2008). *Human Resource Management: Text and Cases (1st ed.)*. Kathmandu, Nepal: Taleju Prakashan.
- Smith, T.M. and Ingersoll, R.M. (2004). What Are the Effects of Induction and Mentoring on Beginning Teacher Turnover? *American Educational*

Evaluation of Induction Training: A Survey of Low and Mid-level Managers at Nepalese Development Banks

Research Journal, American Educational Research Association. 41(3), 681-714. Retrieved from: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3699442>

Sutaarson, M (2010), *Assessment of Training Effectiveness and the Impact of the Performance of Middle Level Managers at LUCAS-TVS Ltd., Padi, Chennai*. (Unpublished Thesis, M.Tech. in HRD). University of Madras, NITTTR, Chennai. <used from NITTTR Resource Centre, Chennai>.

Werner, J.M. & DeSimon, R.L. (2006). *Human Resource Development: Foundation, Framework and Application*. New Delhi: Cengage Learning. Indian Edition.

Zahrly, J. & Tosi, H. (1989). The differential effect of organizational induction process on early work role adjustment. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 10, 59-74. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org>