7-1-2006

Training impact analysis - applying the modified combined model of Kirkpatrick's and Phillips' training evaluation to measure the training impact

Toshio Fujita
Institute of Business Administration, Karachi, Pakistan

ARTICLE

Training Impact Analysis
Applying the modified combined model of Kirkpatrick„s and Phillips„ Training Evaluation to measure the Training Impact

Toshio Fujita

The most difficult area in practicing the effective training has been the establishment of practical model to enable to quantify the impact of training. No doubt, without the relevant evaluation of the Training Impact, the implementation of effective training, on which the organizational sustainability and success depend, would be totally unfeasible. Author has long been concerned with the lasting consequences of its effect. Significance of it is multiplied in the Public Sector which has even wider social ramifications.

The concern was culminated when author encountered the comment made by Mr. Hamdi Al-Taba'a, Chairman of the Jordanian Business Association on January 25, 1999, i.e., "Many officials are biased in the evaluation of their subordinates due to interference of personal factors and the absence of fairness in dealings with others. The absence of institutionalization, lack of job description, and the assignment of inadequate persons in public jobs contribute to non-compliance with the ethical values of public jobs." Which implies the grave influence on both Public Sector Reform and any Private Sector Restructuring effort.

The case introduced here has been derived from the work – **Training Impact Analysis Report to National Institute for Training (NIT) Jordan** – done by author together with staff of the Institute (NIT) in Amman, Jordan, with the special permission of Mr. Osamah Jaradat, Director General of the Institute, and Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA) by which author was seconded to the Institute as a Senior Volunteer from April 2001 to January 2003. Author is specially thankful to NIT Team Members, Mr. Ziad ALLAN, Ms. Rand Al-HINDAWI, Mr. Moh'd Al-RA'OUD and Mr. Fares SABAHAT for sparing their very scarce time.

INTRODUCTION

This article provides you with the case of detecting managers' unconscious subjective evaluation to their subordinates who are participating in training course, and aims to design the effective training course through the process of analyzing the contradictory training effect perceived by managers and subordinates as written by Wiliam B. Werther and Keith Davis, "---supervisors may use training sessions as a means to banish troublemakers." in their book "Human Resources and Personnel Management, Fifth Edition". The Jordanian Civil Servants' Training Impact Analysis case introduced below reveals the hidden and impedimental problems to the Effective Training, and shows some recommendation to solve them.

TRAINING IMPACT ANALYSIS REPORT TO NIT

I. Objective:
Achieving the distinguished administrative performance of Jordanian Civil Servants by delivering the most effective/efficient *training programs categorized as one of the highest priority programs in Jordanian Administrative Reform Programs - through objective Training Impact Analysis (Measurement).*

II. Aims & Methodology:

1. **Aims:** *Developing the Dynamic Training Programs to facilitate the Public Sector Workers the ownership of administrative change process, and to promote ongoing Jordanian PRS (Public Sector Reform).*

2. **Methodology:** Modified combined model of Kirkpatrick's "Four Levels of Evaluation" and "The Phillips Five Levels ROI (Return on Investment) Framework" has been applied to measure the NIT's Training Impact. In practice, questionnaires - mainly based on the above two models adjusted to fit the administrative performance evaluation and regional culture - to the past NIT training programs participants and their supervisors have been generated. Especially the fifth level of the Phillips model has been changed to measure *citizen oriented behavior* from the training ROI measurement originally designed for the training of private sector employees.

3. **MODIFIED FIVE LEVEL EVALUATION CRITERIA:**

   (1) Reaction – Trainees' satisfaction to the training amenity, such as training environment, course organization, contents of training, qualification and characteristics of NIT trainers, training facilities, and trainees' general perception of NIT Training Programs.

   (2) Learning – Acquired knowledge, skills, expertise required in Public Administration esp. in the fields of work procedure, basic behavioral theory, and communication skills.

   (3) Behavior (a) – Improved individual trainees' behavioral skills and positive change of attitude, esp. in the team work through "How to deal with others." on the job site.

   (4) Behavior (b) – Behavioral/Attitude Change when applying acquired skills/expertise, esp. "Improved Work Procedure" for the *better administrative performance of the organization. Increased coordinating skills with both colleagues and bosses through enhanced understanding of their institutions' culture, thereby promoting PRS.*

   (5) Results – *More Citizen Oriented Behavioral Change,* i.e., more increased awareness and responsiveness to the public interests, **thereby defending the public interests even under internal and external pressures, eventually achieving "Culture of Excellence".**

4. **Total 47 questionnaires** (approx. 10 questionnaires for each level criteria) were sent to randomly sampled 800 government employees from *total 5,211* who had participated NIT training program through the year 2002 to July 2003 *from 20 selected Ministries, Departments, Agencies and Institutions,* expecting *approx. 500 ~ 650* responses (sample size).

III. Statistical Rationale for the Sample Size:

Applied Model:
Sampling Model without Replacement from a Small (Limited) Population.

$$n = \frac{N z2\ 6^2}{(N-1)\ e^2 + z^2 6^2} \quad \ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots (A)$$

Where:

n	:	Valid responses (sample size).
z	:	Normal deviate.
N	:	Population size (in our case: 5, 2 11 i.e., total of targeted participants).
6	:	Standard deviation of population (In our case: reasonably assumed to be 1.0, since the grading points of each questionnaire ranges from 1.0 to 5.0).
e	:	Tolerable error of the calculated sample mean from the actual population mean.

1. **In case we can receive 500 samples,** and assuming the probability that the calculated mean from the sample differs from the actual population mean by more than (e) is 0.05 (Risk), then corresponding normal deviate is found from "Normal Distribution Table" to be z = 1.96. Substituting these values into the above Model Formula III – (A)

$$500 = \frac{5211\ (1.96)^2\ (1.0)^2}{(5211-1)\ e^2 + (1.96)^2 (1.0)^2}$$

then e = 0.083

Ex. Suppose the calculated sample means from a certain questionnaire is 3.5, and then we can estimate the actual population means: μ will be within the range of,

$$3.5 - 0.083 < \mu < 3.5 + 0.083$$
$$3.417 < \mu < 3.583$$

i.e., difference from 3.5 is ± 2.37%, with 95% probability.

2. **In case we can receive 650 samples,** likewise, e = 0.072.
   Ex. Suppose the calculated sample mean from a certain questionnaire is 3.5, then likewise, we can estimate the actual population mean: μ will be within the range of,

$$3.5 - 0.072 < \mu < 3.5 + 0.072$$
$$3.426 < \mu < 3.572$$

i.e., difference from 3.5 is $\pm$ 2.06%, with 95% probability.

From the above two cases: the population mean is estimated to be between 3.4 and 3.6 (which is only 2.37% difference from the sample mean: 3.5 calculated from the random sample) with 95% probability in case we can receive at least 500 responses from our 800 circulated questionnaires' sheet.

Actually 579 participants each responded to 47 questions, which were more than enough to estimate the credible statistical value of the population. Later we sent similar questionnaires to participants' bosses asking their evaluation – 17 questionnaires re. evaluation of participants and 11 questionnaires re. evaluation of non-participants. Each 51 and 57 responses re. participants and re. non-participants from approx. 200 concerned bosses, which were again more than sufficient to obtain statistically reliable results.

All of the above survey data have been statistically processed, i.e., frequency distribution, mean value, standard deviation, and variance were calculated for each question – 47 questions addressed to training participants, 17 questions to their bosses asking evaluation of participants, and 11 questions to bosses asking evaluation of their subordinates who had not participated in any training program at NIT throughout the year 2002 to July 2003 – then wherever appropriate and applicable, t-test, Chi-square test, and F-test were carried out to analyze the characteristic of each target group. Statistics, tables, and graphs are attached to this report.

IV. ANALYSIS OF SURVEY RESULTS (REF. MAINLY APPENDIX 1.)

Level (1) Reaction - Trainees' reaction at this level is excellent, especially trainers' style to lead the classroom discussion has been highly appreciated. This is verified by the highest evaluation ratings to the second part Question No. S-6, S-10 – S-14, S-16 by participants. – Appendix: 2.

However, the following two points should be noted;

1. The second part Question No. S-1, S-2 referring to the advanced media/methods usage in line with the program contents were moderately rated. – Appendix: 2.

2. The same part Question No. S-17 – S-19 which are related to the relevant timing

12

and period when implementing programs in line with the contents were rated relatively low. – Appendix: 2.

Level (2) Learning – Acquisition of knowledge, skills, expertise in Public Administration has also been highly appreciated by participants which is unquestionably proved by the highest ratings to all the related Questions No. F-1 & F-2 of the first part, S-3 – S-9 of the second part, and T-1 – T-4 of the third part to participants. – Appendix: 2.

Level (3) Behavior (a) – **The Training Programs relating to the improvement of participants' attitude towards jobs, and to the skills in dealing with others are highly appreciated by participants** (Ref. Question No. F-3, F-4 of the first part to participants), and their bosses reasonably recognize participants' increased teamwork skills (Ref. Question No. T-7 of the third part to participants and No. 2 to bosses' evaluation of participants' performance). – Appendices: 2, 3.

However, **in spite of the participants' increased confidence in teamwork skills, their bosses are not necessarily aware of participants' increased skills at the actual job site, for example, participants' reaction to other people's feeling etc.** (Ref. Question No. T-5, T-9 of the third part to participants and No. 1, 4 to bosses' evaluation of participants). – Appendices: 2, 3.

This becomes more obvious in the bosses' **very low rating to the participants' ability to avoid unnecessary conflicts, although the participants feel significantly confident after training in this skill** (Ref. Question No. T-12 of the third part to participants and No. 7 to bosses' evaluation of participants). – Appendices: 2, 3.

Consequently it is reasonably understandable that training effects to the communication skills and transfer of training contents to colleagues at the actual job site are just above the fair rating by bosses, but again rated high by participants (Ref. Question No. T-10, T-11 of the third part to participants and No. 5, 6 to bosses' evaluation of participants). Appendices: 2, 3.

Bosses' evaluation of non-participants' behavior in this level, as it can be easily imagined, is generally higher than ratings by bosses' evaluation of participants (Ref. Question No. 2, 5, 7 to bosses' evaluation of participants and Question No. 2, 3, 4 to bosses' evaluation of non-participants). - Appendices: 2, 3, 4.

Level (4) Behavior (b) – Both participants' and bosses' evaluation of participants are noticeably high to the programs related to work procedures and to understanding of their institutions' culture. Furthermore, bosses' evaluations of participants' performances in these two competences are – even surprisingly - exceptionally higher than bosses' evaluation of non- participants' (Ref. Question No. T-13, T-14 of the third part to participants, Question No. 8, 9 to bosses' evaluation of participants, and Question No. 5, 6 to the bosses' evaluation of non-participants). – Appendices: 2, 3, 4.

However, bosses' ratings of the programs related to the following competencies in respect of participants' change of behavior at their job site after training, which will have direct linkage with Organizational Development and/or Administrative Reform, are **significantly lower than other two evaluations.**

1. **Making Decisions taking long/short-term consequences into consideration** and if necessary making decisions under insufficient information (Ref. Question No. T-16, T-18 of the third part to participants – to these Questions, participants' confidence in their acquired skill is high - and No. 11 to the bosses' evaluation of participants). – Appendices: 2, 3.

2. **Convincing and coordinating with bosses to transfer the new skills and methods acquired from NIT Training Programs to their organization** (Ref. Question No. T-19, T-20 of the third part to the participants, and Question No. 13, 14 to bosses' evaluation of participants). – Appendices: 2, 3.

To the programs relating to the decision-making priority and problem-solving competencies, again bosses' evaluations of participants are of lower ratings than those of participants' (Ref. Question No. T-15, T-21, of the third part to the participants and No. 10, 15 to the bosses' evaluation of participants). – Appendices: 2, 3.

Level (5) Results - The programs which are related to the Role of Civil Servants in delivering the public services are given significantly higher rating by both participants and bosses, however, t-Test still reveals the significant difference between these two evaluations, i.e., bosses' evaluation is still significantly lower than participants'.

The evaluation of programs related to **the training to cope with the decision-making under internal/external** pressures, and to defend the decision effectively when faced with criticism are **significantly low rated by bosses even though highly evaluated by participants.**

It can be noted that bosses are either not expecting too much from training or not perceiving participants' increased self-confidence after training (Ref. Question No. T-17, T-22, T-23, T-24 of the third part to participants and No. 12, 16, 17 to bosses' evaluation of participants). – Appendices: 2, 3.

These perception gaps among bosses and subordinates are too excessive to be slighted, since these causes serious obstacles, especially when Jordanian PSR is targeting Citizen Centered, Results Focused, and Transparent Government.

Comprehensive Analysis:

In spite of all the above level by level analysis, the following points must be still reiterated taking the results of t-Test, i.e., - Null Hypothesis: no difference between two Mean values – into consideration;

(1) **To all of the 17 questions, bosses' evaluation of participants' performance after training are significantly lower** (t-Test: Null Hypotheses: strongly rejected even though set at 99% confidence interval) **than participants' self evaluation, except increased understanding of participants' institutions' culture. – Appendix: 1.**

(2) Comparison of bosses' evaluation of participants' performance with non-participants' again reveals that, **except institutions' culture understanding and work procedure,** to all the other questions bosses' evaluations of participants' performances when compared to non-participants' are either statistically of same ratings (t-Test: Null Hypotheses: accepted) or statistically of lower ratings (t-Test: Null Hypotheses: rejected) as already pointed out. – Appendix: 1.

Esp. **participants' competences stated below are significantly low rated by bosses when compared with non- participants'** as statistically verified by t-Test results (Null Hypotheses: strongly rejected).

(a) **Ability to avoid irrelevant conflicts.**
(b) **Making decision taking long/short-term impacts into consideration.**
(c) **Effective coordination with bosses when introducing new methods or transferring training contents into the job site.**

(3) Summing up the above two points, it may well be said that either of the following inference can be introduced;

(a) **bosses' lack of confidence in the participants' competences, whether or not participating in training, compared with non-participants'** has been too much entrenched to give fair review to participants' enhanced performances even after training.

or

(b) **participants' self confidence after training has been too much aggrandized to be rectified to** the proper level.

15

V. RECOMMENDATION

To the Level 1: (Training Environment)

1. More consideration should be given to the compatibility of advanced training Media/Methodology with the program contents.

2. More attention should be paid to the training timing/scheduling and the length of the training period depending on participants' convenience as well as the program contents.

To the Level 2: (Acquisition of Knowledge, Skills and Expertise)

As far as the analysis of this survey concerns, any specifically imminent recommendation cannot be found.

To the Level 3: (Trainees' Individual Behavioral Improvement)

1. **Both bosses and participants** should be urgently trained for **"Effective Communication Skills"** by applying the same training methods, which has already been successful for the program of "Dealing with Public".

2. **Bosses should be more conscious of participants' improved confidence and initiatives** in dealing with others after training, and at the same time bosses should be strongly advised to acquire **"Motivation Skills"** as well as advanced skills of **"Performance Appraisal".**

To the Level 4: (Behavioral Change toward Organizational Change)

1. The following intensive training for **all the senior managers,** esp., of Category 1 & 2 should be carried out;

    a. **Change Management** (Basic Organizational Theory, Leadership Models, and Case Studies of Other Countries' Public Sector Reform (PSR) in line with Delegation & Decentralization)
    Workshop and/or Seminar: 3 days for each session.

    b. **Institutional Performance Appraisal** (If possible, Case Studies of Other Countries should also be included.)
    Workshop and/or Seminar: 3 days for each session.

2. To the subordinates, the following intensive training should be held immediately;

    a. **How to Deal with Bosses** : (Case study 3 days)
    b. **Problem-Solving**   : (Case study 3 days)
    c. **Decision-Making**   : (Case study 3 days)

16

To the Level 5: (Citizen Oriented Behavioral Change)

1. **To all the concerned senior managers;**

> a. **Workshop for Jordanian PSR**   : (3 days)
> b. **Workshop for Other Countries' PSR** : (3 days)

2. **To both bosses and subordinates;**

> a. **Negotiation Skills**   : (Case study 3 days)
> b. **Stress Management**   : (Case study 3 days)
> c. **Strategic Decision-Making under**
>   **Internal/External Pressure**   : (Case study 3 days)

FINAL COMPREHENSIVE RECOMMENDATION:

NIT in the current situation – in addition to normally required mission as a national training institute – has its unique mission different from any similar institutes of other countries, whether developed or developing, i.e., NIT must cope with the demanding needs for Civil Servants to be facilitated the real ownership of "Change"/PSR.

This can only be achieved through well thought-out training programs based on the perceived reality of Jordan.

In this context, the following five programs could be envisaged;

1. Currently ongoing Jordanian Public Sector Reform requires the immediate reactivation of the whole Public Sector Organization. NIT Training Policy shall, therefore, be directed to put **more emphasis on Training of Trainers for each Governmental Unit.**

2. **Trainees' "Transfer of Training" to their organization through presentation of training contents on returning to their job site shall be institutionalized. Consequently,** NIT is also advised to maintain almost day-to-day coordination in respect of HRD with each training unit of other Governmental Organization, of which procedures, if possible, should be legislated by Civil Service by Law.

3. More individually oriented **Career Path Program in line with the NIT Training should be institutionalized** to increase PSWs' morale and to enhance their initiative.

4. **More practically oriented training program, such as "Hybrid IT-Work Simplification Program" linked with IT skill is recommended to support E-Government Reform policy.**

5. **In order to make quick breakthrough to reactivate Public Sector (or to initiate Administrative Reform), "Special Pilot Training Program" for limited numbers of senior staffs (approx. 150-200) from Government Organization should be institutionalized as an urgent necessity.**

Conceivable training programs for "Special Pilot Training Program" are:

(1) **Case Studies on PSR in other countries** (3 days each for one session).
(2) **Change and result oriented managements** (3 days each for one session).
(3) **Motivation & Leadership** (3 days each for one session).
(4) **Special Study/Analysis to remove the obstacles in promoting Jordanian PSR** (3 days each for one session).

Recommendable Next Steps for Further Analysis of This Impact Survey:

1. To carry out Chi-square test to test the null Hypothesis whether BRTP/BRTNP and BRTP/PE are identical or not, which supplement the results of t-Test reported in this document.

2. To carry out Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) to determine whether or not there are any differences among BRTP/BRTNP and BRTP/PE to further supplement and confirm the results of t-Test in this report.

3. The same statistical processing could be applied to analysis and identification of the differences among each Level of Five-Level Model of Evaluation Criteria, which could also be applied to the analysis of Department by Department Training Impact by making necessary modifications to each questionnaire for the design of more relevant customer-oriented NIT Training Programs.

REFERENCES

Masaru Nishio. "Public Administration", Tokyo, Yuhikaku Co. Ltd., 1997.

Raymond A. Noe. "Employee Training & Development", 2nd Edition, New York, NY McGraw-Hill, Inc. 2002.

Jack J. Phillips. "Handbook of Training Evaluation and Measurement Methods", 3rd Edition, Houston, TX, Gulf Publishing Company, 1997.

Lawrence L. Lapin. "Statistics for Modern Business Decisions", New York, Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc. 1973.

Kenneth N. Wexley & Gary P. Latham. "Developing and Training Human Resources in Organizations", Upper Saddle River, New Jersey, Prentice Hall, 2002.

18

Bernard Burnes. "Managing Change", 3rd Edition. Harlow Essex, England, Peason Education Limited, 2000.

"National Training Draft Plan (2003-2005), Final Report - October 2002, (Part One)", International Center for Administrative and Leadership Development.

Dr. Zuhair Al-Kayed, Team Head. "An Integrated Report on The Best Practices in the Civil Services Reform for the Sustainable Human Development in Jordan", January 2000.

William B. Werther, Keith Davis. "Human Resources and Personnel Management", 5th Edition, McGraw-Hill, Inc., 1996.

ABBREVIATIONS

NIT	National Institute for Training
HRD	Human Resource Development
ROI	Return on Investment
PSR	Public Sector Reform
PSW	Public Sector Worker
Re	Reaction
PE	Participants' Evaluation (of NIT Training Programs)
BRTP	Bosses' Reaction (Evaluation) to Participants' (Performance)
BRTNP	Bosses' Reaction (Evaluation) to Non-Participants' (Performance)

APPENDICES

Appendix No. (1)   Questionnaires in Training Impact Analysis Survey, Dated 1/12/2003 (Incl. T-Test Results)

Appendix No. (2)   Questionnaires Sheet to Participants

Appendix No. (3)   Questionnaires Sheet to Bosses' Reaction (Evaluation) to Participants' (Performance)

Appendix No. (4)   Questionnaires Sheet to Bosses' Reaction (Evaluation) to Non-Participants' (Performance)

19

APPENDIX NO. (1)

Questionnaires in Training Impact Analysis Survey

(Evaluation Rating System: Excellent 5, Very Good 4, Good 3, Fair 2, Poor 1)
t- Test between PE & BRTP and BPRT & BPRNT

Confidence Interval 99%, Null Hypothesis: Mean - No Difference
Accept: 0   Reject: X

Mean Value Grading:
A >= 3.35   C >= 3.20   E < 3.15
B >= 3.30   D >= 3.15

Above mean value grading is for convenience purpose only to make quick comparison among each mean value possible. Statistically significant differences among each mean value are tested by t-Test. F-, S- & T- denote Question Numbers of First, Second, Third part respectively of Questions to participants.

F: First Section S: Second Section T: Third Section	Suggested Training Courses	To the Participants (PE)		To the Bosses	
				Re.: Participants (BRTP)	Re: Non-Participants (BRTNP)
Level (1) (12 Qs.)		S-l	C+		
		S-2	B		
		S-6	A++		
		S-IO	A++		
		S-ll	A++		
		S-12	A++		
		S-13	A++		
		S-14	A+		
		S-16	A		
		S-17	D+		
		S-18	C-		
		S-19	C-		
Level (2) (12 Qs.)		F-I	A++		
		F-2	A+		
		S-3	A+		
		S-4	A+		
		S-5	A++		
		S-7	A+		
		S-8	A++		

F: First Section S: Second Section T: Third Section	Suggested Training Courses	To the Participants (PE)		To the Bosses Re: Participants (BRTP)			Re: Non-Participants (BRTNP)		
Level (2) (12 Qs.)		S-9	A++						
		T-I	A++						
		T-2	A+						
		T-3	A+						
		T-4	A+						
Level (3) (ll Qs.)	(1) Effective Communication Skills (2) Motivation Skills (3) Performance Appraisal	F-3	A$^+$						
		F-4	A$^+$						
		S-15	A	*1	*3		*2	*4	
		T-5	A$^+$	X ↓	1	D^{++}↔	O	1	D^{++}
		T-6	A$^+$						
		T-7	A^{++}	X ↓	2	B ↔	O	2	A
		T-8	A$^+$	X ↓	3	D			
		T-9	A$^+$	X ↓	4	E			
		T-10	A	X ↓	5	C$^+$↔	O	3	B$^-$
		T-11	A	X ↓	6	C			
		T-12	A$^+$	X ↓	7	E$^-$ ↓	X	4	B
Level (4) (8 Qs.)	(1) How to deal with bosses (2) Problem-Solving (3) Decision-Making	T-13	A$^+$	X ↓	8	B ↑	X	5	D$^+$
		T-14	A	X ↓	9	A ↑	X	6	B$^-$
		T-15	A	X ↓	10	C$^-$			
		T-16	A	X ↓	11	E$^-$	X	7	D$^+$
		T-18	B						
		T-19	C$^+$	X ↓	13	E$^-$			
		T-20	C$^+$	X ↓	14	E$^-$ ↓	X	9	C
		T-21	B$^+$	X ↓	15	C			
Level (5) (4 Qs.)	(1) Workshop for PSR (2) Negotiation Skills (3) Stress Management (4) Strategic Decision-Making under Internal/External Pressure	T-17	A	X ↓	12	E$^-$↔	O	8	E$^+$
		T-22	A$^+$	X ↓	16	A ↔	O	10	A
		T-23	A	X ↓	17	E$^-$ ↓	X	11	D$^+$
		T-24	A						

21

NOTES:

(1) All the above mean values for each question have been within 95% confidence interval by t-test.

(2) *1 : t-test results between PE & BRTP

   *2 : t-test results between BRTP & BRTNP

   *3 : Question Numbers to BRTP (Contents of lateral Question Numbers are all equivalent.)

   *4 : Question Numbers to BRTNP (Contents of lateral Question Numbers are all equivalent)

(3) ↕ : Statistically higher mean value (t- Test Result, Confidence Interval 99%)

   ↕ : Statistically lower mean value (t-Test Result, Confidence Interval 99%)

   ↔ : Statistically no significant difference between two mean values (t- Test Result, Confidence Interval 99%)

APPENDIX NO. (2)

Questionnaires Sheet to Participants

Statement	Poor 1	Fair 2	Good 3	Very Good 4	Excellent 5

First:

1	The training program provided good information for me.					
2	It helped me develop my skills at work.					
3	It improved my attitudes towards the job.					
4	It increased my competence dealing with others.					

Second:

1	Advanced training media were used in line with the training program content					
2	Modem training methods were used to relay information and ideas.					
3	My nomination to the program was based on my need at work					
4	Training content is convenient for the practical status.					
5	Topic of the program can be applied in practice.					

22

Statement	Poor 1	Fair 2	Good 3	Very Good 4	Excellent 5
6 The training content is interconnected in terms of topics.					
7 There is harmony between objectives of the training program and my real training needs.					
8 Objectives of the training program were clear to me.					
9 Objectives of the training program fit my academic level.					
10 The set time was completely used for training.					
11 I felt satisfied with the method of the trainer's dealing with participants. I am also happy to participate in the program.					
12 The Trainer gave time to ask questions freely.					
13 The trainer showed a good competence in the program topics and good knowledge of the scientific content.					
14 Relevance of content to levels of participants.					
15 If my immediate boss is provided with the training content, he'll cooperate with me to transfer the training impact to my work.					
16 The distributed content is set with logic and attractive layout.					
17 Relevance of the program timing to participants.					
18 Period of program is relevant to the program content.					
19 Timing of program is relevant to the application and practice of required skills.					

Statement	Poor 1	Fair 2	Good 3	Very Good 4	Excellent 5
Third:					
1	What I learnt from the program is adequate to the objectives and tasks of my job.					
2	The training program I joined fulfilled its objectives.					
3	I feel satisfied after the end of the program when I prepare some proposals relevant to the theme of the program.					
4	I feel satisfied with planning after the end of the program.					
5	The program helped me improve my feelings with others' thinking.					
6	My participation in the program helped me increase the degree of professional satisfaction.					
7	My participation increased the skills of my working team.					
8	The program helped me improve my ability to express others' feelings verbally and non-verbally					
9	My participation in the program helped me improve my ability to do the right job by expecting others' reactions towards this job.					
10	The program improved my ability to relay others' views accurately and clearly.					
11	The training programs helped participants transfer the training result to their colleagues at work.					
12	The training program helped me improve my ability to avoid irrelevant disputes.					
13	The training program influenced my competence to facilitate procedures of my work.					
14	The training program helped me comprehend the culture of my institution well.					

	Statement	Poor 1	Fair 2	Good 3	Very Good 4	Excellent 5
15	The training program helped me define the importance of decision-making or not making in certain times.					
16	Now, 1 have the ability to make decisions taking into consideration the long and short-term impacts of such decisions.					
17	The training program influenced my ability not to revoke my decision upon alternative analysis in case this decision is targeted with criticism.					
18	Now, 1 have the ability to make decisions although information available is not enough in case of prompt decision.					
19	The training program helped me have a better ability to convince my bosses to allow me to apply what 1 acquired of skills at the training programs.					
20	The training program increased my ability to coordinate with my bosses to remove obstacles that prevent me from applying new skills and methods at work.					
21	1 can solve problems at work by applying what 1 learned at training despite of obstacles at my institution.					
22	1 have full comprehension now of the role of employee in delivering the public service to its receptor.					
23	The training program contributed to improving my ability to deal with internal and external pressures that affect my performance.					
24	The training program helped me improve my ability to make decisions while dealing with others in order to maintain a public interest in case there is a severe objection to this decision.					

APPENDIX NO. (3)

Questionnaires Sheet to Bosses' Reaction (Evaluation) to Participants' Performance

Statement	Poor 1	Fair 2	Good 3	Very Good 4	Excellent 5

First:

	Statement	Poor 1	Fair 2	Good 3	Very Good 4	Excellent 5
1	Training programs helped develop ability of participants to feel with others.					
2	Training programs contributed to enhancing professional team skills for participants.					
3	Training programs helped participants to express feelings of others verbally.					
4	Training programs enhanced the ability of participants to do the right job by expecting reactions of others towards this job.					
5	The program developed abilities of participants to relay others' points of view accurately and clearly.					
6	Training courses contributed to having participants transfer what they learnt to their colleagues at work.					
7	The training programs helped develop ability of participants to avoid irrelevant disputes.					
8	Training programs affected the competence of participants to facilitate procedures at work.					
9	Training programs helped develop the comprehension of participants of their institution's culture well.					
10	Training programs developed the ability of participants to define the importance of time when making decisions.					
11	Participants gained ability to make decisions taking into consideration long and short-term consequences of such decisions.					
12	Training programs helped improve ability of participants to defend their decisions based on alternative analysis in case such decisions were severely criticized.					

26

	Statement	Poor 1	Fair 2	Good 3	Very Good 4	Excellent 5
13	Training programs contributed to the development of participants ability to convince their bosses to permit them apply what they learnt of skills at the training programs.					
14	Training programs increased the ability of participants to coordinate with their bosses to remove obstacles they face when applying new skills and methods at work.					
15	Training programs contributed to the development of participants' ability to solve problems at work by applying the training content they learnt.					
16	Training programs helped participants comprehend the role of the employee delivering the public service for its targeted groups.					
17	Programs contributed to the development of participants' ability to deal with internal and external pressures that affect their performance.					

APPENDIX NO. (4)

Questionnaires Sheet to Bosses' Reaction (Evaluation) to Non-Participants Performance

	Statement	Poor 1	Fair 2	Good 3	Very Good 4	Excellent 5
First:						
1	The employee has a better feeling with others.					
2	The employee has better team skills.					
3	The employee is more capable of relaying views of others accurately and clearly.					
4	The employee is more capable of avoiding unnecessary conflicts.					

Statement	Poor 1	Fair 2	Good 3	Very Good 4	Excellent 5
First:					
5 The employee is more competent in simplifying the work procedures.					
6 The employee has a better capacity of understanding the culture of his institution positively.					
7 The employee is better at decision-making taking into consideration the long and short-term impacts of this decision.					
8 The employee is better at defending his decisions made upon the alternative analysis in case this decision is criticized.					
9 The employee is better at coordinating with his bosses to remove barriers that prevent him from applying skills and methods learnt to his work.					
10 The employee has a better understanding for the role of the employee in delivering the public service for those receiving such services.					
11 The employee is better at dealing with the internal and external pressures that affect his performance.					

> *"The demands that corporations, especially larger ones, continue to expand their efforts to help society achieve its economic and social objectives are strong, growing and not likely to diminish. To meet these demands in an appropriate fashion, corporations will continue to perfect the institutional notion of the social point of view in their decision-making processes."*
> **Hewlett-Packard, Institutionalizing Social Concerns in Business: in Business Government and Society, a Managerial Perspective.**