

**ASSESSMENT OF HUMAN RESOURCE TRAINING  
AND DEVELOPMENT PRACTICES IN THE  
EDUCATION SECTOR OF SNNPRS**



**BY  
MESTIE MEKONNEN DAMTIE**

**SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES  
ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY**

**JULY 2007  
ADDIS ABABA**

**ASSESSMENT OF HUMAN RESOURCE TRAINING  
AND DEVELOPMENT PRACTICES IN THE  
EDUCATION SECTOR OF SNNPRS**



**BY  
MESTIE MEKONNEN DAMTIE**

**SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES  
ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY**

**JULY 2007  
ADDIS ABABA**

**ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY  
SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES**

ASSESSMENT OF HUMAN RESOURCE TRAINING AND  
DEVELOPMENT PRACTICES IN THE EDUCATION SECTOR OF  
SNNPRS

**BY  
MESTIE MEKONNEN**



**COLLEGE OF EDUCATION DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL  
PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT**

**Approved By the Board of Examiners**

Dr. Fekunwankalem Alemu

Chairman, Department  
Committee

[Signature]

Signature

Dr. Tilaye Kassahun

Advisor

[Signature]

Signature

Worke Mekonnen

External Examiner

[Signature]

Signature

Dr. Fekunwankalem Alemu

Internal Examiner

[Signature]

Signature

**ASSESSMENT OF HUMAN RESOURCE TRAINING  
AND DEVELOPMENT PRACTICES IN THE  
EDUCATION SECTOR OF SNNPRS**

**A THESIS SUBMITTED TO THE SCHOOL OF  
GRADUATE STUDIES  
ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY**

**IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS  
OF THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS IN  
EDUCATIONAL PLANNING AND  
MANAGEMENT**

**BY  
MESTIE MEKONNEN DAMTIE**

**JULY 2007  
ADDIS ABABA**

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

I would like to thank my thesis advisor, Tilaye Kassahun (Dr.), for his valuable professional guidance and technical assistance throughout the work of this thesis.

I would also like to thank the SNNPRS Education Bureau for its sponsorship, AAU for its financial assistance, my wife, Sister Yeshiwork Mitekie Woldie for her unreserved, financial and material support and encouragement, my sons Abel, Henok and HaileIyesus and my daughter Mekeds for their patience and moral support, Woizerit Rahel Tekalign and Muna Awol for their unreserved efforts in typing this thesis and finally to my friend, Ato Tefera Eshete, for his assistance in editing the thesis.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Acknowledgements -----	i
Table of Contents -----	ii
List of Tables -----	iv
Abbreviations -----	v
Abstract -----	vi
<b>CHAPTER ONE</b>	
INTRODUCTION -----	1
1.1. Background of the Study -----	1
1.2. Statement of the Problem -----	4
1.3. Objectives of the Study -----	6
1.3.1 General Objectives -----	6
1.3.2 Specific Objective -----	6
1.4. Significance of the Study -----	6
1.5. Delimitation of the Study -----	7
1.6. Limitation of the Study -----	7
1.7. Definition of Key Terms -----	8
1.8. Organization of the Study -----	8
<b>CHAPTER TWO</b>	
REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE -----	9
2.1. The Concept of Human Resource Training and Development -----	9
2.1.1. Human Resource Training -----	9
2.1.2. Human Resource Development -----	10
2.1.3. Education -----	10
2.1.4. The Relationship Between Training and Development -----	11
2.2. Components of Human Resource Training and Development -----	12
2.2.1. Management Development -----	12
2.2.2. Employee Training and Development -----	13
2.3. The Benefits of Training and Development -----	14
2.3.1. The Benefits of Training and Development for Organization -----	14
2.3.2. Benefits of Training and Development for the Employees -----	15
2.4. The Process of Human Resource Training and Development -----	15
2.4.1. Training Policy -----	16
2.4.2. Human Resource Training and Development Needs Assessment -----	16
2.4.2.1. Reasons for Training and Development Needs Assessment -----	16
2.4.2.2. Assessing and Identifying Training and Development Needs -----	17
2.4.2.2.1. Organizational Analysis -----	17
2.4.2.2.2. Task Analysis -----	18
2.4.2.2.3. Individual/Person Analysis -----	19
2.4.3. Formulation of Training and Development Objectives -----	20

2.4.4. Designing Training and Development Programs -----	21
2.4.5. Implementation of Training and Development Programs -----	22
2.4.5.1. Selecting the Content of Training Programs -----	22
2.4.5.2. Selecting Appropriate Facilities and Premises of the Training Programs -----	23
2.4.5.3. Selecting the Appropriate Trainers and Trainees -----	23
2.4.5.4. Selecting Appropriate Time and Training Environment-----	24
2.4.5.5. Selecting Appropriate Training and Development Methods -----	24
2.4.5.5.1. On-the-Job Training and Development Methods-----	25
2.4.5.5.2. Off-the-job Training and Development Methods -----	27
2.5. Evaluating Training and Development Programs-----	29
2.5.1. Purpose of Evaluation of Training and Development Program---	30
2.5.2. Approaches to Evaluation of Training and Development Programs-----	31
2.5.3. Stages of Training and Development Program Evaluation-----	32
2.6. Problems of Human Resource Training and Development-----	33
<b>CHAPTER THREE</b>	
RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODS -----	35
3.1 Research Methods-----	35
3.2 Population and Sampling Techniques -----	35
3.3 Data Source and Instruments of Data Collection -----	36
3.4 Administration of the Data Gathering Instrument -----	37
3.5 Data Analysis -----	37
<b>CHAPTER FOUR</b>	
PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA -----	38
4.1. Characteristics of the Study Population -----	38
4.2. General Information-----	41
4.3. Training and Development Needs Assessment -----	46
4.4. Objectives and Focuses of Training and Development Programs-----	61
4.5. Selection of Trainees, Trainers and Contents -----	65
4.6. Delivery Methods of Training and Development Programs-----	76
4.7. The Practice of Evaluating Training and Development Programs-----	93
4.8. Major Problems/Constraints to Prepare and Implement HRTDP -----	98
4.9. Possible Suggestions Forwarded by Respondents-----	102
<b>CHAPTER FIVE</b>	
SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS-----	104
5.1 Summary -----	104
5.2. Conclusion -----	110
5.3 Recommendations -----	111
Bibliography-----	116
Appendix A	
Appendix B	
Appendix C	
Appendix D	
Appendix E	
Appendix F	

## LIST OF TABLES

	<b>Page</b>
Table 4.1: Personal Information-----	39
Table 4.2.A: Arrangement and Types of TDP -----	42
Table 4.2.B. Contents of TDP, Job Assignment and Strategic Plans-----	44
Table 4.3.A: Identification of Training and Development Needs -----	47
Table 4.3.B: Prioritizing Training and development needs -----	57
Table 4.4: Training and Development Objectives and Focuses of the Programs -----	62
Table 4.5: Selection of Trainees, Trainers and Contents -----	67
Table 4.6.A: Induction or Orientation Programs -----	77
Table 4.6.B: Techniques and Ways of TDPs -----	84
Table 4.7: Evaluation of Training and Development programs -----	94
Table 4.8: Major Problems/Constraints for Preparing and Implementing Training and Development Programs-----	99
Table 4.9: Problems Observed in the TDPs Delivered in SNNPRS Education Sector-----	100
Table 4.10: Possible Suggestion of Respondents -----	102

## ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

CBB	-	Capacity Building Bureau
ETP	-	Education and Training Policy
FDRE	-	Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia
HR	-	Human Resource
HRD	-	Human Resource Development
HRIS	-	Human Resource Information System
HRM	-	Human Resource Management
HRP	-	Human Resource Planning
HRTD	-	Human Resources Training and Development
HRTDP	-	Human Resources Training and Development Program
MCB-		Ministry of Capacity Building
MoE-		Ministry of Education
NGOs-		Non Government Organizations
PHRDP-		Project for Human Resources Development Programs
RCBB	-	Regional Capacity Building Bureau
REB	-	Regional Education Bureau
SNNPR	-	Southern Nations, Nationalities and Peoples Region
SNNPREB-		Southern Nations, Nationalities and Peoples Region Education Bureau
SNNPRS-		Southern Nations, Nationalities and Peoples Regional State
SNNPRSC-		Southern Nations, Nationalities and Peoples Regional State Council
SWEO-		Special Woreda Education Office
SWEOs-		Special Woreda Education Offices
TAEO-		Town Administration Education Office
TAEOs-		Town Administration Education Offices
TD-		Training and Development
TDP	-	Training and Development Program
TGE	-	Transitional Government of Ethiopia
TDNA-		Training and Development Needs Assessment
TOT-		Training of Trainers
TTI-		Teacher Training Institute
WCBO	-	Woreda Capacity Building Office
WEO	-	Woreda Education Office
WEOs-		Woreda Education Office
ZCBD	-	Zone Capacity Building Department
ZCBO	-	Zone Capacity Building Office
ZED	-	Zone Education Department
ZEDs-		Zone Education Departments

## ***Abstract***

*The main purpose of this study is to assess the practices that have been carried out by the various offices of the SNNPRS education sector in training and development of their human resources since 1995 E.C. and to investigate those constraints to prepare and implement human resources training and development programs.*

*To this effect, descriptive research method was employed by which questionnaires, interview and documentary analysis were used as instruments of data gathering. The data were collected from 31 randomly selected offices out of 177 offices in the region. A total of 56 officials and 104 experts were included as subjects of the study. The collected data were analyzed with a help of appropriate descriptive and inferential statistics.*

*The findings of the study indicated the absence of the practice of conducting systematic needs assessment practices. Besides that most of the offices had no human resources training and development plans. During delivery of the training and development programs objective of TDP had not been well presented to trainees. Offices of the sector had no clear and transparent training and development criteria for selecting trainees and trainers; training and development opportunities had been offered to individuals depend on their personal relationships and good will of top-level managers and immediate supervisors. Furthermore, the practice of utilizing on -the -job training and development methods, long -term off -the -job training methods and arranging induction programs to new recruit and new job holders had been neglected. The findings also revealed the absence of evaluating the training and development programs. The practices of preparing and implementing training and development programs had been constrained by the inadequate budget, attitudes of management, absence of clear directives, lack of managerial and technical skills to design and implement the training and development programs. It was also found that the programs delivered constrained from lack of training of trainers, shortage of materials and allocating of in sufficient time.*

*Based on the findings of the study, the following are recommended; appropriate attention needs to be given to; conducting TNA, allocation of the necessary budget for TDP, planning TDP, training of trainers, arranging of induction programs, applying on-the-job methods, conducting and institutionalizing the practice of evaluating TDP, arranging awareness creation programs and formulating clear and transparent TDP directives and arranging TOT programs.*

# CHAPTER ONE

## INTRODUCTION

This chapter includes background of the study, statement of the problem, significance of the study, delimitation of the study, limitation of the study, definition of key terms and organization of the study.

### 1.1. Background of the Study

Any organization needs different kinds of resources, which are essential for its day-to-day activities, and achievements of organizational goals. These resources are material, financial, information and human resources. Among these resources human resource (HR) is the most important and decisive one. HR is crucial for effective functioning of any organization. Nowadays, organizations operate in a complex and changing environment that highly influences their growth and expansion. To cope up with this changing environment and also with scientific, social and technological advancements, organizations need to develop and train their employees. The quality of the HR and the degree of its utilization determine the success of the organization (Heneman and others 1996: 386; Megginson, 1981: 64-65; Flippo, 1984: 199). It is also believed that through training and development the organizations can solve the problems of employees' obsolescence and make them up-to-date, motivated and committed.

According to Mondy (1991:265) human resource training and development (HRTD) is planned and continuous effort by management to improve employees' competency level and organizational performance through training, education and development programmes.

At present, many countries gave great emphasis to training and development in relation to policymaking and management research. Countries, which faced economic problems, gave considerable attention to training and development and try to investigate the ways to improve productivity and increase economic growth (Mabey and others, 1998: 87). Moreover, developing countries used training and development of human resources as a fast track for development. For example, a research conducted in Taiwan by Lin (1997: 39-42) described that HRTD is one of the three areas of human resource management (HRM), which draw much attention at present and for the future. Training and development have

helped tap human researches in the country and contributed significantly to economic success.

In Ethiopia modern administration of government organizations started during the times of Emperor Menilik II. However, there was no significant change in the system to provide training and development programs for the government employees. According to Melaku (2004: 3), the importance of training and development of civil servants got attention after the establishment of the Central Personnel Agency by proclamations on Negarit Gazeta No. 23, 1961 and No. 269.1962. These proclamations mentioned the importance of training and development aimed to provide effective and efficient service to the society. During the two former regimes of the country, Training and Development Programs (TDPs) were provided to increase the productivity of the employees at a certain extent.

However, still the civil service was interwoven by a serious of problems. It was inefficient and ineffective to provide quality services to the public and meet organizational missions. So the government of Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia (FDRE) realized the necessity of change in the system. Since 2002 the government of the FDRE introduces the Civil Service Reform Program at the various structures of the government organizations to improve the capacity of the civil service for the ultimate achievement of development goals of the country. It was aimed to attain better performance of employees and preparing them for higher responsibility. Accordingly, government organizations organized training and development programs; identify the needs and prepared plans and budgets for its implementations. At federal level, the Ministry of Capacity Building was set up and in each organization civil service reform officers are appointed for its implementation. Strategic plans of organizations are prepared to achieve organizational goals.

In Ethiopia, with the formulation of the new Education and Training Policy in 1994, the education management system was reorganized into different levels. At Federal level, the Ministry of Education (MoE); at regional level, Regional Education Bureau (REB); zonal level, Zone Education Department/Desk (ZED); Woreda level, Woreda Education Office (WEO), and the schools. All of which have their own authority and responsibility to

undertake educational development. At each hierarchal level the structure has its own required human resources (PHRDP Office, 1996: 39; MCB, 2005:27).

Southern Nations, Nationalities and Peoples Regional State (SNNPRS) is one of the regional states of the FDRE which was established on the basis of proclamation No. 7/1992. At present the Region is divided into 13 zones, 8 special woredas and 1 town administration unit, 104 former woredas and 32 new established woredas. Under which there are 3391 primary and 126 first cycle secondary and 37 preparatory schools, 4 teachers education colleges, 9 TVET institutions colleges. (SNNPREB, 2006:1). Furthermore, today there are six universities.

Like other government sector organizations the SNNPRS education sector also adopted the Civil Service Reform Program at its head and branch organizations. Emphasis was given to the training and development of employees. However, the programme faced problems to achieve the desired result (SNNPREB: 2006: 3). However, the training and development programmes provided in the education sector of SNNPRS faced different problems such as mismatch between job and employees, poor performance, employees lack of initiative and commitment to do their daily tasks, etc. These problems were created due to inadequate and in effective training and development need assessment, using outdated training methods, short duration and inconsistency of the training programs, lack of adequate knowledge and training among those who organize and provide the training.

At present time in the SNNPRS education sector, many education and training opportunities are provided for employees and managers locally and abroad. If it was carefully planned, these training programs contributed for achieving the intended goals of the sector, otherwise, it affects the development of the Region, causes dissatisfaction among employees and wastage of resources. Therefore, training and development should be planned and designed to help the organization to accomplish its objectives. Determining organizational training and development needs is a crucial issue in setting the objective. So this study tries to assess the HRTD practices in the region.

## **1.2. Statement of the Problem**

Human Resource is one of the most important resources of any organization. It determines the development and competitiveness of the organization. In Ethiopia, the government organizations made great efforts to create favorable environment for effective utilization of this resource. The current Education and Training Policy (ETP) of the country under its educational management part (TGE, 1994: 30-31) indicates the importance of employee development that the management of teachers and other professional personnel principles including professional growth with overall rights and duties. Added to this criterion for professional development, employees will get continuous education and training.

It is, however, essential to see whether the ideal expectation of the policy has gone accordingly in the world of practical application. As compared with other sectors in the region the education sector is the biggest one in terms of organizational structure and size of HR since its foundation. At present it has about 48,000 government employees at office (regional, zonal, woreda) and school (primary, secondary, teacher training and college) levels (SNNPREB, 2007:7).

The delivery of efficient and effective human resource training and development programmes (HRTDP) maximized the productivity of employees and improves their performance, however, the training and development programs (TDP) offered at the various levels of the education sector of SNNPRS lacked focus and systematic planning to maximize the performance of employees and the organization as a whole. Even there is no consultation with the stakeholders before they are conducted.

From observations at different regional education conferences, annual educational performance evaluations and supervision reports the training and development of HR remained at low level (MCB, 2005:129-30). Inadequately trained leadership in the educational organizations adversely affects the progress of education because success in any educational institution depends significantly on good leadership. Moreover, trainings were also organized without adequate needs assessment and identification of the crucial areas of organizational problems of performance of individual employees. Some times less emphasis is given in the selection of appropriate trainees. Sometimes opportunities given to individuals who had no proper relation with the job and the training or the workshops

offered. In most cases fresh employees or new transferred employees are forced to undertake their job tasks without proper orientation and training by their respective regional, zonal and woreda education offices, colleges and schools. In many organizations of the sector orientation of the employees towards their job is not considered as organizational culture but as neglected aspect.

Even though TDP are offered to the employees/ officials, there is no systematic and organized evaluation of the program after the training. Besides, there is no special consideration given to the training of trainers. Using outdated and limited methods are characteristics of the TDP conducted at various levels. Moreover, some of the trainings offered to the employees and managers are short in duration and the trainers faced shortage of time for preparation and to cover the contents of the trainings so as to provide the desired skill and create behavioral change. So this inadequate and inefficient training and development of employees didn't improve the poor performance and the low commitment of individuals in undertaking their daily tasks and meeting organizational objectives. There exists a gap between job requirements and actual performance. Therefore, the situation demands systematic and planned approach in order to solve the problems of HRTD.

Hence, the main purpose of this study is to investigate the status of HRTD practices in the regional, zonal, woreda education offices and schools. Thus, in order to respond the purpose of the study, this research paper attempts to give answers for the following basic questions.

1. How often are training and development needs assessed in the offices of the education sector of SNNPRS?
2. What were the objectives and focus areas of training and development programs?
3. What were the selection criteria for trainees, trainers and contents?
4. What methods and ways of human resource training and delivery system have been used in the different offices of SNNPRS education sector?
5. How were human resource training and development programs evaluated in the offices of SNNPRS?
6. What were the challenges or problems encountered in implementing effective and efficient human resource training and development programs?

## **1.3. Objectives of the Study**

### **1.3.1 General Objectives**

The general objectives of this study are to assess the HRTD practices that had been carried out by the various offices of the SNNPRS education sector in training and development of their human resources since 1995 E.C. to investigate those constraints to prepare and implement HRTDPs, and to provide possible recommendations.

### **1.3.2 Specific Objective**

The study has the following specific objectives

- Assess the status of HRTDPs at regional, zonal and woreda level.
- Identify the major factors which affected the planning and implantation of TDPs in the sector
- Provide possible recommendation towards the issue, for policy makers at regional level.
- Establish better system of managing employee training and development programs.

## **1.4. Significance of the Study**

Qualified and trained HR, which is so important for the effective performance of education organizations and development of the region as a whole, however, it is one of the scare resources of the region. At the woreda level SNNPRS is much more deficient in this regard. Hence, there is a need for development of management education, training and proper orientation for specific tasks. This need becomes very crucial and urgent for the accomplishment of desired objectives for professional and management positions in the education sector of the Region at the various structures. HRTD played a great role in creating best quality public servants as well as good managers in the education sector of the region to meet the intended developmental goals.

Therefore, the study has the following significance in that

1. Indicate the status of HRTD practices and create awareness among the education administrative officials and employees at the regional, zonal, woreda and school level.

2. Identify the major problems that affect HRTD in the education structures in the Region and provide information for education officials, decision makers and planners to give attention for this issue.
3. Suggest valuable recommendation (solutions) for the education officials and decision makers how to tackle the constraints and maximize HRTD practices in the education sector of the region.
4. Serve as a stepping-stone and reference for interested individuals and student researchers to conduct further research in the area.

### **1.5. Delimitation of the Study**

The scope of the study is delimited at regional level and SNNPRS is selected intentionally because it is relatively large in size, nationally and culturally diversified Region and there is a problem of qualified and efficient HR at the various hierarchical structure of the sector. SNNPRS has 13 zone and 8 special woredas and 1 Town administrative unit a total of 136 woredas (36 WEOs and 18 TAEOS) and 3554 primary and secondary schools (SNNPREB, 2006:4). However, it is difficult to include all these in the study, therefore, to make the study simple, manageable and reliable the scope of the study is restricted only on REB, 5 zones 20 Woreda 5 town administration and 3 special woreda education offices.

Moreover, the study is delimited to HRTD practices, in the education sector on general education part since 1995 E.C. and particularly in the regional education bureau, zone education department, woreda education offices and town administration education offices.

### **1.6. Limitation of the Study**

In conducting this study, the student researcher encountered some constraints, which may serve as factors that contributed to the limitation of the study. These included unavailability of some of the informants on the required time due to frequent meetings and field works, unavailability of and inaccessibility of the required data as expected, reluctance of some respondents to devote time to fill out and return the questionnaires on time, shortage of time and financial support. Moreover, the student researcher faced secretary problems which causes the damage of final documents which in turn causes shortage of time, to the student researcher to check, edit, proof-read and improve the material and extra costs. All those forced the student researcher to submit the work with certain limitations.

## 1.7. Operational Definitions

- Development** - Knowledge, skills, attitudes and perceptions (The systematic process of education, training and growing by which a person learns and applies informations (Megginson, 1981: 205).
- Human Resource**-The people who are directly or indirectly involved in the teaching learning activities.
- Officials** This context refers to those heads of REB, ZED and WEO, team leaders, department heads, service heads, and section heads in REB, ZEDs, WEOs and TAEOs
- Orientation** The planned introduction of new employees to their jobs, coworkers and the organization (Mathis and Jackson, 1997: 284).
- Region** In current Ethiopian context refers to the main division of the country, the self-governing unit, designed for administrative or political purposes (TGE, 1992:6).
- Special Woreda** In current Ethiopian context, refers to the administrative subdivision of the region in which the social, economic, political and management capacity is less organized than a zone (SNNPRSC,1995:7).
- Training** Is the process used to improve knowledge, skills, attitudes and the individuals to be more effective in their present job or prepare them for future assignment (Saiyadain, 1994: 217).
- Woreda** Refers to administrative sub- division of a zone, which is the basic administrative hierarchy of a national or regional government (TGE, 1992:8).
- Zone** In Ethiopian context refers to administrative subdivision of the region (TGE, 1992:7).

## 1.8. Organization of the Study

The structure of this research paper consists of five chapters. The first chapter deals with the background of the study, statement of the problem, significance of the study, delimitation of the study, limitation of the study and definition of key terms. The second chapter deals with the review of the related literature. The third chapter provides the research design and methodology employed to collect and analyze the data. The fourth chapter provides the presentation and analysis of the data and interpretation of the findings. The fifth chapter presents the summary of the findings, conclusion and recommendations of the study. Finally, a list of reading materials used in the study is attached followed by appendices.

## CHAPTER TWO

### REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE

This chapter includes, the concept of human resource training and development, components of human resource training and development, the benefits of training and development, the process of human resource training and development; human resource training and development needs assessment, formulation of training and development objectives, designing training and development programs, implementation of training and development programs (selecting appropriate training and development methods, selecting the contents of training programs, selecting appropriate facilities and premises, selecting the appropriate trainers and trainees and selecting appropriate time and training environment), evaluating training and development programs and problems of human resource training and development.

#### **2.1. The Concept of Human Resource Training and Development**

HRTD is the one among the many functions performed in HRM. It is a vital activity as it improves the skills, knowledge and ability of employees in the areas of job performance, creative innovation, decision-making and leadership, which determines the success, or the failure of the organization. The concept HRTD is wider in its scope, which includes three essential terms such as training, education and development.

##### ***2.1. Human Resource Training***

Different authorities defined the term training in different ways. However, all these definitions have similar connotations/meanings/. Training is the process of providing employees with specific skills or helping them to correct deficiencies in their performance (Gomez-Mejia, Blakin and Cady, 1995: 293). It is those activities that serve to improve individual's performance on a currently held job or on one related to it. It is also a process by which people acquire knowledge or skill to attain organizational goals (Mathis and Jackson, 1997: 282; Wills, 1993: 9).

Training is a continuous and systematic development and purposeful method of improving employee's knowledge, skill and attitudes. It is designed to maintain or improve current job performance. Mostly, training is directed at helping employees perform better on their current jobs. In doing this it ensures that the organization has the workers with the skills and knowledge it needs to achieve its strategic objectives. Besides, this training programs help to train new employees to the level of performance required in their jobs quickly and economically. Moreover, training makes employees ready to take responsibility in the future (Armstrong, 2001: 543-544; Stonner and Freeman, 1989: 285).

### ***2.1.2. Human Resource Development***

Many scholars provide different definitions to the term human resource development (HRD). According to the definition of Megginson (1981: 205; Andargachew, 1973:289) development is the 'systematic process of education, training and growing by which a person learns and applies information, knowledge, skills, attitudes and perceptions. On the other hand, Mondey and others (1990:270) cited in Hailesellassie (1999: 42) defined human resource development as a "planned continuous effort by management to improve employee competency level and organizational performance through training, education and development programs". Moreover, development refers to teaching managers and professionals the skills needed for both present and future jobs. Mostly organizations provide regular TDP for employees and managers (Griffin, 2000: 208).

According to Harris and DeSimone (1994: 10) HRD can be defined as "a set of systematic and planned activities designed by any organization to provide its members with the necessary skills to meet current and future job demands." HRD activities should began when an employee joins an organization and continue throughout his or her career. regardless of whether that employee is a manager or a semi-skilled worker must respond to job changes and integrate to long term plans and strategies of the organization in order to ensure the efficient and effective use of resources.

### ***2.1.3. Education***

Education is "learning general subjects and broad generalized knowledge" (Megginson, 1981: 205). It is very personal and is concerned with ensuring that a person has the skills to

make his way in life and society. Mondy also stated that education "consists of activities that are conducted to improve the overall competence of an individual in a specific direction and beyond the current jobs" (Haileselassie, 1999: 43). In most cases, there is no clear division among training, development and education. It is difficult to distinguish between education, training and development. In reality they are only different aspects of the same idea, which is to develop HR (Kenny, Donnely and Reid, 1983: 2-5).

#### *2.1.4. The Relationship between Training and Development*

Training and development have relationship; however, the terms are not synonymous. Mathis and Jackson (1997: 313-314) have explained that, there is the existence of distinction between training and development. Training is a learning process whereby people acquire skills and knowledge to aid in the achievement of goals. Training provides employee with specific identifiable knowledge and skill for use on their present job. On the contrary, they also explained development as being broad in scope and focusing on individual gaining new knowledge and skills useful for present and future jobs"

Development is different from training in that it is often the result of experience and the maturity that comes with it and it focuses on less tangible aspects of performance such as attitudes and values. Where as training focus on learning specific behaviors and actions, demonstrate techniques and processes. It is a short-term and its effectiveness is measured by performance appraisals, cost benefit analysis, passing test or certification. Development focuses on understanding information concepts and context, develop judgments, expand capacities for assignments, and long-term in duration. Its effectiveness measured qualified people available when needed; promotion from within possible HR-based competitive advantage (Mathis, and Jackson, 1997: 314).

Through the development of present employees, the personnel department reduces the organizations dependence on hiring new employees. If workers are developed properly, the job openings found through human resource planning (HRP) more likely to be filled internally. HRD is also an effective way to meet several challenges faced by most large

organizations. These challenges include employee obsolescence, socio-technical changes and employee's turnover (Werther and Others, 1985: 220).

Based on the above points we can summarize that, training focuses on the improvement of knowledge, skills and abilities specific to a particular task or job. Development activities in contrast, have a long-term focus on preparing future responsibilities while increasing the potentialities of employee to perform their current job (Harris and DeSimone 1994: 10).

## **2.2. Components of Human Resource Training and Development**

The two main components of HRTD are management development and employee training and development (Cartwright and Others, 1993: 96; Griffin, 2000: 208).

### ***2.2.1. Management Development***

Managers are the main decision makers in any organization and an effective management process as crucial to the success and future of organization. One of the major purposes of management process is maximizing the organizations current and future capability in achieving its goals (French, 1987: 379). Management development is essential both for the organization and the individual manager. Unless managers are appropriately developed, organization resources may not be managed well. Therefore, management development should be seen as a way of imparting the knowledge and judgment needed by managers to meet the strategic objectives of the organization. Among these skills are leading, dealing with change, helping subordinates, controlling when necessary and providing feedbacks (Mathis and Jackson, 1997: 323; Pinnington and Edwards, 2000: 203).

Management development is a systematic process of growth and development by which managers develop their abilities to manage and to respond to the situation of change. It would be achieved as a result of participation in formal ways of instruction conducted by organizations and also with experiences on the job. It is concerned with improving performance of the managers by giving them opportunities for growth and development. It is a planned effort, which is concerned with improving their performance in their present roles and preparing them for higher responsibilities in the future (Armstrong, 2001: 579; Rao and Rao, 2000: 292).

### ***2.2.2. Employee Training and Development***

Employee training and development is one of the components of HRTD. It is an important HRM strategy, which has played a key role in creating stability that the sector has traditionally enjoyed and in the implementation of the new changes observed in the sector (Glueck and Milkovich, 1982: 437; Newell and Scrabough, 2002: 166).

Employee training and development is a set of planned and systematic activities designed by the organization to provide its members with the necessary skills to meet current and future job demands. Moreover it is a process of learning experience of any kind where by individuals and groups acquire increased knowledge, skills, values and/or behavior. Its outcomes didn't stop through time and are to be long lasting (Harris and Desimone. 1994: 2; Harrison, 2000: 2). All members of the organization should participate in the training and development program. It should begin when an employee joins an organization and continue throughout his career (Harris and DeSimone, 1994: 2).

The orientation or education of a new employee is a crucial issue of employment, training and development. The employee's acceptance of a job is the entrance in to the organization in which the employee as part of the organization will seek satisfaction. It enables clear his doubts at the work place and to increase his/her performance. When the employ has been engaged he/she must be clear as to when he/she begin work and to whom he has to report. A written form of engagement containing these particulars avoids misunderstanding. Written statements describing the ways of the organization and the rules governing the work and employees should be given to him or explained by someone who is conversant with these rules. Job descriptions and brochure setting out the most pertinent work rules and explaining any important points of conduct, especially where personal safety is concerned, may be written for this purpose underlining the more important rules and regulations (Prasad and Bannaraje, 1985:104-105; Ivancevich and Glueck, 1989:522).

Today's trend is train and develops employees for promotion. Many organizations recognized that the training and development of employees is an important investment in the organization, which in time should be turned through the employees increased capacity to contribute (Crooker, 1986: 111; Heneman and others, 1996: 419).

- Orient new employees to their jobs and the organization
- Improve present and future job performance
- Use as a remedial for improving performance deficiencies.
- Up grade employees skills to adapt new advances and innovations (job changes)

In general, employee training and development is a critical process by which organizations can improve the levels of knowledge and skills of their employees to the point where they are able to achieve high productivity, quality of output, lower cost. It also helps the organization to achieve competitive advantage and to provide an excellent services and organizational progress. And its greatest benefits for individuals are to do with personal competence, growth, adaptability and continuous employment (Harrison, 200: 1; Harris and DeSimone, 1994: 1-2).

### **2.3. The Benefits of Training and Development**

Training and development have a lot of advantages to employees and the organization if it is carried out in a planned and systematic way (Werther and Davis, 1989: 309).

#### ***2.3.1. The Benefits of Training and Development for Organization***

The advantage of training and development for the organization are numerous. The following are the major advantages: it improves productivity: properly oriented new employees will get "up to speed" quicker and perform at higher quality levels than those not given such training. It saves time and effort. Formal orientation programs reduce the time and effort required of supervisors to train new employees. In addition to these, based on the kind of job needs the organization will develop future effectiveness. Some potential objectives are to help organization grow, to adapt technical development to fulfill responsibilities and to provide greater job satisfaction (Holt, 1993: 334; Megginson, 1981: 206; Davar, 1994:118-119). Nowadays training and development is used by many organizations for two main reasons. Through training and development important skills such as problem solving skills, communication skills and team building skills are developed. It enhances employee's commitment through motivation. That is why organizations are giving emphasis to training their human resources.

### ***2.3.2. Benefits of Training and Development for the Employees***

Some authors express the advantages of training and development for employees. They say employees are trained how to apply their knowledge to practical aspects of the job, to improve productivity and quality, to help an organization fulfill its future personnel needs (Meggison, 1981: 220; Mamoria and Pareek, 1980: 252). Moreover, Holt (1993: 384) stated that, training and development develops realistic job expectation for new employees often they have inaccuracy on work expectations. It improves employment sustainability. This shows when there is turnover in break periods the new employees lack self-confidence and suffer from anxiety about their job.

Besides, training and development have benefits for the individual employee in this regard Werther and others, (1985: 208-210) mentioned the following benefits of training and development for the employees: helps the individual towards better decision making and effective problem solving skills, foster a sense of recognition, achievement, growth, responsibility and desire for advancement, aids in encouraging and achieving self development and self-confidence, etc.

Training and development in general has so many advantages for an organization as well as the individual and is an important tool for effective HRM. Therefore, educational organizations must give due attention for continuous skill training and development of employees. It is also believed that through training and development the organizations can solve the problems of employees' obsolescence and make them up-to-date, motivated and committed. At the present and future changing and competitive environment training and development of HR makes organizations successful competitors.

## **2.4. The Process of Human Resource Training and Development**

The process of HRTD must be systematic and directed towards the accomplishment of some organizational objectives, such as more efficient production method, improved quality of products or services and reducing operational costs. Systematic training is likely to make organizations efficient and progressive (Rue and Byars, 1992: 203).

In the systematic approach to training first the job is analyzed and defined. Then the employees being considered for training are studied whether they satisfy the required standard. Next, training is given and an appropriate record kept. After that, the performance achieved is measured and an attempt is made to evaluate the cost of training comparing with the benefits gained by the improved performance of employees (Graham, 1984: 167; Armstrong and Dawson, 1985: 212; Schermerhorn, 1993: 272; Getahun Hailu, 1990:2).

#### ***2.4.1 Training Policy***

In implementing TDP, it is essential to ensure that each organization has its own training and development policy. Having training and development policy in general has the following importance. It helps to highlight the organization's approach to the training function, provide guidance for design and execution and provides information regarding to the programs to all employees. It helps in the identification of policy areas in training. Since resources are scarce it prioritized according to felt needs. Besides, a training policy document helps to communicate the organization's interest regarding on employee's career development and also gives the employee the opportunity to better prospects through training (Monappa and Saiyadain, 1999: 180; MCB, 2005:75; Wills, 1985:8).

The training policy at Woreda, Zonal and regional or federal level that regulates the selection of trainees and trainers, evaluation of training effectiveness and certification of trainees after participation. For the TP to be effective, formulating training policy should be a matter of urgency for the policy makers at all levels of the government structure.

#### ***2.4.2. Human Resource Training and Development Needs Assessment***

##### ***2.4.2.1. Reasons for Training and Development Needs Assessment***

Training needs is a gap that exists between the requirements of given job and the actual performance of the trainees (Rudrabasavaraj, 1979:141). The needs for training arise for many reasons. Nowadays we are living in a constantly changing world. The fast growth of science and technology changes the job from its original specification. What seems good today may become poor tomorrow. Therefore, every organization insists to prepare for training and development programs to up-date the competence of their employees in order to fit into new situations in the world of work (French, 1987: 346). External factors of the organization such as performance deficiencies, changes in governmental legislations have

effects on organization operations, which demanded training. Moreover, organizations try to overcome the problems caused by various reasons such as retirement, promotion, transfer, and death through training and development programs. The need for training is thus unquestionable if the HR is to be effectively used (Milkovich and Glueck, 1985:330-31; Turell, 1980: 4-12; French, 1987: 346; Kefyalew Alemu, 1990:5-6).

#### ***2.4.2.2. Assessing and Identifying Training and Development Needs***

In a systematic model of training needs assessment, analysis is concerned with identifying the work, which is not performed, and the standards of training that gives a solution. Moreover, conducting the training need assessment in three ways requires systematical analysis specifies trainings. These are organizational analysis, task (job) analysis and individual (person) analysis (Bratten and Gold, 1994: 237; Rue and Byars, 1992: 239; Kefyalew, 1990:20).

##### ***2.4.1.2.1. Organizational Analysis***

Organizational analysis is a systematic effort to understand where training effort needs to be emphasized in an organization. It involves a detail analysis of the organizational structure, culture, business climate, human and other resources, long and short-term goals, and mission. An in-depth analysis of these factors would facilitate an understanding of deficiencies that need to be rectified. Since training cannot overcome all deficiencies, other inputs could also be used in relation to training inputs. Moreover, the main purpose of organizational analysis is to identify the overall organizational needs and the level of support for training that exists in the organization (Gomez-Mejia, Blakin and Cardy, 1995: 297; Monappa and Saiyadain, 1999: 182; Getahun, 1990:5).

The process of organizational needs analysis also involves an assessment of the gap between the desired level of knowledge, skill and competencies and the actual performance of current levels; identification of the learning objectives, designing and choice of activities in the delivery of training and evaluation (Storey and Sission, 1993: 156-158).

Monappa and Saiyadain (1999: 182) describe that achieving a clear understanding of the short and long-term goals of the organization plans is the first step in organizational analysis. They further explained that long-term objectives are the broad directions in which the organizations would move a long period of time. And these long-term objectives are

broken down into specific strategies and short-term goals for each department or section. These short-term goals are constantly in need of adaptation to the changing environment. Therefore, from the training point of view the manager would need to examine if there are any specific training inputs that could contribute towards the attainment of organizational objectives.

Organizational analysis is one of the ways to diagnose training needs, which considers the organization as a system. The identification of the knowledge, skills and abilities that will be needed by the employees in the future as both jobs and the organization change is an important part of the organizations human resources planning (Mathis and Jackson, 1997: 291; Simon, 1990:29).

In the organizational needs analysis managers used different sources of information and operational measures such as grievances, accident records, exist interviews, observations, complains from customers, training committee observations, equipment utilization figures and wastage or quality control. Furthermore, managers used records on absenteeism, turnover tiredness and accident rates, which provide objective evidence of problems, occurred. These records and information should be examined carefully to determine if problems could be fully or partially solved through training. In any case organizational analysis identify any information which plays a major role in determining whether training will be offered and the type of training that would be most appropriate (Gomez-Mejia, Blakin and Cardy, 1995: 297; Mathis and Jackson, 1997: 291-292).

#### ***2.4.2.2.2. Task Analysis***

Task analysis is a detailed examination of the job, its components, its various operations and the conditions it has to be performed. Its main focus is on the duties and tasks of the job throughout the organization, which job requires training, rather than individual. Analysis of the job and its various components specifications will indict the skills and training required to perform the job at the required standard. Every job has the intended standard of performance. Unless such standards are met the interrelated jobs and the existence of the organization will be affected. If the standards are set for the performance of the job and made clear, it is possible to know whether the job is being performed at the desired level of out put or not. Knowledge of the task will assist in identifying what knowledge, skill and attitude the

employee should have to perform the job adequately (Mathis and Jackson, 1997: 292; Monappa and Saiyadain, 1999: 183).

The main purpose of task analysis is to get adequate information about the tasks and its various components to establish performance standards, which would be useful to identify training needs. The other part of task analysis consists the skills required to perform the tasks, which are technical/professional skills, administrative and interpersonal skills and their levels at knowledge, competency and proficiency level. Therefore, by comparing the requirements of jobs with the knowledge, skills and abilities of employees training needs can be identified (Crocker, 1986: 111; Monappa and Saiyadain, 1999: 184; Mathis and Jackson, 1997: 292; Gomez-Mejia, Blakin and Cardy, 1995: 297; MCB, 2005:11).

#### *2.4.2.2.3. Individual/Person Analysis*

Person or individual analysis is the third component of diagnosing training needs. It focuses on individual employee. his/her skills, abilities and the inputs required for job performance. It is used to determine who needs to be trained and what skills; knowledge and attitudes should be improved. Training is necessary when there is a discrepancy between employee's performance and the organization's standards (Mathis and Jackson, 1997: 292; Heneman et. al, 1996: 391; MCB, 2005:12).

There are many sources which causes performance problems, most of which would not be affected by training. However, the only source of performance problem that can be addressed through training is a deficiency that is under the trainee's. Therefore, the assessment is done particularly when an individual employees' performance could obviously be improved by clear-cut training action (Gomez-Mejia, Blakin and Cardy, 1995: 297; Graham, 1984: 168).

There are different approaches and sources of information in the individual analysis to identify where the individual employee requires training and if so what kind of training. The most common approach is using performance appraisal data. In some cases the human resource information system (HRIS) can be used to identify individuals who need training in specific areas. The source of most performance rating is the supervisor/line manager. But

both the managers and other employees can be surveyed, interviewed and tested. And their suggestions towards the problem and their recommendations towards the actions be carefully reviewed (Mathis and Jackson, 1997: 292). In general ideas for training needs can come from an analysis of an individuals or groups typical behavior.

The sources of information for individual training and development needs according to Monappa and Saiyadain (1999: 184-185; Getahun, 1990:9-10) are: observations at place of work, examination of job schedules, interviews with supervisors and employees, cooperative studies of good versus poor employees to identify differences, skills and training gaps and HRIS (records) and Production/performance reports.

After training and development needs had been identified they have to be prioritized. The organizations should focus in considering the availability of training facilities, training institutions, budget, trainees; trainers capability and level of motivation, importance and urgency of needs, the cost effectiveness of the organization (Monappa and Saiyadain, 1999: 180-181),

#### ***2.4.3. Formulation of Training and Development Objectives***

After identifying training and development needs the next step is a defining objective of training and development. In the process of training and development activities, the needs assessment phase should provide a set of objectives for programs that might be designed (Gomez-Mejia, Blakin and Cardy, 1995: 298). It should come up with precise and clearly defined objectives. This is because, it is the objectives that express the purposes to be achieved, provide the basis for planning of program contents, and selection of training and development methods, and permit control and evaluation of results (Heneman, et al. 1996: 394-395). Objectives are statements, which stated intended outcomes of a training and development program. They state what trainees should accomplish when a program is over. They guide the selection of program content and to some extent guide selection of methods and techniques. They also serve as the criteria against which a program can be evaluated when it is over. In other wards, they also serve as criteria against which the ultimate success of a program is evaluated (Heneman, and others, 1996: 395).

The objectives of training and development should be related to the training and development needs identified in the need analysis phase, without clearly set objectives it is

not possible to design a training and development program. Moreover, after it has been executed it will direct the other way of measuring its effectiveness (Aswathappa, 2002: 182; Getahun, 1990:22). The success of training should be measured in terms of the objectives set. Good objectives are measurable objectives for training can be set in any area by using the following four dimensions (Mathis and Jackson, 1997: 293-94): of quantity of work resulting from training of quality of work after training time lines of work after training and cost saving as a result of training. Training objectives are essential for a successful training of HRTDP and they are used by the organization to evaluate the program's success. In this regard, Werther, and others (1985: 213), stated that an evaluation of training needs results in training and development objectives and these objectives should state the desired behavior and the conditions under which it is to occur. They served as the standard against which individual performance and the program can be measured.

#### ***2.4.4. Designing Training and Development Programs***

Once an employee training and development plan is drawn up it is then necessary to design the various training programs that will be offered or to rework. In each case this involves setting instructional objectives, determining program content, and deciding on training methods and techniques. The designing work may be done by specially designated training and development professionals especially for programs to be offered several items, or left to the individual instructors (Heneman and others, 1996: 395).

Programs must be designed in a planned way in such away that the objectives of the program could help organizations to grow, adapt to technological developments, fulfill social responsibilities and proved greater job satisfaction. Depending on the kinds of needs to be addressed, a number of TDP can be designed. Besides, it is important to design programs based on training and development principles (Megginson, 1981: 206).

According to Tracey (1984: 6-7), the following principles of training and development have to be considered in designing programs. Training programs must use delivery system that is selected on the basis of training effectiveness, available technology, cost effectiveness and results, training programs must be validated to ensure effectiveness prior to full scale

implementation, training programs must provide ample opportunities for trainees to apply and practice newly acquired knowledge and skills.

#### ***2.4.5. Implementation of Training and Development Programs***

Implementation of TDP is the stage where TDP are put in to practice. This involves conducting of a training program in accordance with the design. Program implementation involves three activities planning program implementation, preparing and organizing program activities and executing the program (Campagna 1998, 128).

In the process of training and development implementation involves the selection of the content of the program, the selection of qualified trainers and identification of training methods. Training resources mainly include human (trainers and support staff), financial (operational budget) and material (teaching and residential facilities, training equipment etc) resources.

The trainer should build a rapport with the trainee and clearly guide him into learning and digesting new knowledge and techniques. Instruction should be given completely, clearly and patiently and free flow of communication and participation should be encouraged forwarding some questions are essential like: what a training program should address? Who participate in the program? Who are trainers, what methods and techniques are to be used in the training, what learning principles are needed, when is the program conducted? These questions must be asked and get replay in the process of training implementation (Chandan, 1995: 180; Awathappa, 2002: 183).

##### ***2.4.5.1. Selecting the Content of Training Programs***

In the implementation of TDP the most important activity that should be performed before the beginning of any training program is determining the content of the program. The content of the training program should be determined entirely by the learning and training needs analysis and assessments of what needs to be done to achieve the agreed training objectives (Armstrong: 2001: 558). Thus the content may seek to teach specific skills, provides knowledge or try to influence attitudes. Whatever the content, the program must meet the needs of the organization and the participants (Werther, et. al., 1985: 213). Thus, training courses should be designed on those training needs that are consciously determined.

The courses must address the real performance problems of the organization or behavioral deficiencies of the employees. In designing the training content, the concerned bodies must identify, organize and sequence the subject matter (content) that is going to be thought.

#### ***2.4.5.2. Selecting Appropriate Facilities and Premises of the Training Programs***

The other important activity that should be performed in HRTDP implementation are regarding to facilities. What physical facilities are required/available: what training media and support services are required; what facilities are required; what recreation facilities are available, where should training even take place, where should participants be accommodate. In this regard, selecting appropriate facilities and premises of the training program is crucial to conduct the training program effectively. In many cases, it is usual for a training department to have “training premises and various types of training equipment with in the direct control in the organization, premises and equipment are shared with other departments, and it is highly desirable for the training departments to handle them fully (Reid and Barrington. 1999: 321; Campagna: 1998: 128-129; Bell, 1997: 374) training aids must be relevant to the purpose for which they were created and the training levels of understanding.

#### ***2.4.5.3. Selecting the Appropriate Trainers and Trainees***

Selecting the appropriate trainers and trainees is one of the most important components of HRTDP. In trainer’s selection, the institution can use internal staff specialist, or human resource managers or supervisors, or hired professional trainers or external instructors or a combination of these instructors. The trainers should provide guidance and assistance and furnish the subject matter expertise; and the trainees receive the designed content of instruction with active participation (Tracey, 1984: 344).

With regards to the selection of trainees according to Rothwell and Kazanas (1994: 27) and Getachew (1998:220) the learner who should be selected must be open to learning, possesses the self concept that he/she is an active learner, is willing to take initiative and responsibility for learning, loves to learn, is capable of demonstrating creativity, possesses a future orientation and able to use basic study and problem solving skills.

Hence, to be effective and efficient, the training program must be providing with trainees who have been carefully screened and selected for suitability. Thus, it is advisable to select the correct trainers and trainees to be able to achieve the best training programme results a little or no costs (Truelove, 2000: 239).

#### *2.4.5.4. Selecting Appropriate Time and Training Environment*

The process of selecting appropriate training time and environment is the other important activity to be performed in HRTDP implementation. Consideration with regard to timing of training should be done. When the training should start and finish, in relation to this, what the best time of day would be to take time away from the work place. Whereas, in deciding the selection of training environment, the designers must look the factors like training objectives, training strategy, trainees population, training area, safety requirements and costs (Tracey, 1984: 333-335). Among the training environment the selection of appropriate learning classrooms are needed.

#### *2.4.5.5. Selecting Appropriate Training and Development Methods*

It is one of the stages of HRTD process. Training and development methods are the means by which designed programs are put in to effect. After all the necessary activities are completed, the appropriate method to the program should be selected (Monappa and Saiyadain, 1999: 186; Mathis and Jackson, 1997: 298). The training methods to be used are required to meet the training objective, content, and the interest of the trainee. As to Singh (1996), it has to consider the knowledge, skills, views and attitudes of trainees, the instructional space, the number of trainees, the amount of time assigned, and the availability of training materials. There are a number of training and development methodologies having their own features. The major teaching methods are lecture and discussion methods, case study method, self instruction and programmed instruction method, field training methods, in basket/ in-try/methods, distance/correspondence training methods, simulation and games methods, the jury/small group/method and role playing method. Hence, the selection of the appropriate method should be made based on certain rationale (Saiyadain, 1999: 223; Monappa and Saiyadin, 1999: 187-188). Training can take place either on the job or off the job, and it can be delivered through a variety of techniques (Slides and videotapes, computers, simulations, virtual reality and classroom instruction).

The common type of training offered using these techniques are skills training, retraining, gross functional training, team, creativity training, or literacy training. There is no one particular best method of training to work at all situations, so a trainer has to select the method or a combination of methods considering the training purpose and other variables.

Thus, considering different techniques and conditions should choose the most effective and efficient training methods, to meet the stated objectives of training. The selection of appropriate method depends on cost-effectiveness, desired program content, appropriateness of facilities, trainee as well as trainer preferences and capabilities, and the learning principles. However, depending on the content and type of the program more than one method can be used in a particular training and development program (Werther and Davis, 1981: 315). Generally, the most widely used training and development methods or approaches are discussed under the following two broad categories, i.e. on-the-job training and off- the-job training.

#### ***2.4.5.5.1. On-the-Job Training and Development Methods***

On-the-job training refers to learning while actually performing a particular work or job. It takes place in the work setting and during the actual job performance (Milkovich and Bourdea, 1991: 421; Mathis and Jackson, 1997: 294). Learning takes place in the real work place or situation using the office, documents, materials, facilities and tools that have been used that no special space or equipments are required. In this method, managers or first line supervisors and experienced employees instruct and demonstrate for others (Mitchell, 1982: 457; Milkovich and Bourdea, 1991: 421-422; Graham, 1984: 169-170). On-the-job training is a method to be used for training and development of employees and managers. "Real management development occurs on the job, where a person learns to make decisions live with them" Kerrigan and Luke (1987: 84-86). On-the-job training activities include periodic performance reviews; observation and critique of how the junior manager is working, solving problems, and managing; regular consultation on operating matters and the like. A number of specific methods are used in on-the-job training. Some of the most widely used methods are discussed below.

#### **2.4.5.5.1.1. Coaching**

Coaching is an important form of on-the-job training and development method. "It is the process of ensuring that employee development occurs in the day to day supervisor-subordinate relationship" (Heneman and others, 1996: 404). Therefore, the performance level and the conditions under which it occurs must first be analyzed, and then, the necessary face-to-face communication between employee and supervisor or the subordinates and the superior must be made in view of improving and maintaining effective performance (Harris and DeSimone, 1994: 265). Therefore, for coaching to be effective, supervisor-subordinate relationship should be based on partnership, mutual trust and confidence (Graham, 1989: 231). However, there are problems in coaching. First, if coaches were incompetent, there would be high risk of transmitting incorrect working methods. Secondly, coaches may not have adequate time. Thirdly, most managers are ill prepared to coach employees and feel uncomfortable in those too (Gomez-Mejia, Blakin and Cardy, 1995: 341).

#### **2.4.5.5.1.2. Mentoring**

Mentoring is "a developmentally oriented relationship between senior and junior colleagues or peers" (Gomez-Mejia, Blakin and Cady, 1995: 340). Moreover precisely, Anderson in Bhatta and Washington (2003: 212) states that mentoring is "a nurturing process in which a more skilled or more experienced person, serving as a role model, teacher and sponsor, encourages, counsels and briefs a less skilled or less experienced person for the purpose of promoting the latter's professional or personal development.

Mentoring is an important form of management or employee development. Mentoring, according to Bhatta and Washington (2003: 212-213), is a useful development intervention for the following reasons: mentors and protégés choose each other by mutual agreement therefore, there is open and trusting relationship between them, it is evaluative and there is constant feedback from the mentor to the protégé, it is more guidance- oriented than a strict teacher-student or trainer-trainee relationship and there are no penalties, it is more than likely to be based on shared experiences of the mentor and the protégé. Furthermore, mentoring is a continuous learning such that even everyday professional experiences can be

shared on going basis: and is long-term in duration and the relationship results changes in roles or organizations. Mentoring is generally based on the assumption that most staff development takes place on-the-job learning so that, both the mentor as well as the protégé benefit out of it.

#### ***2.4.5.5.1.3. Job Rotation***

Job rotation is also another approach in training and development of employees as well as managers on their job. This approach involves assigning trainees on various jobs for a specified period of time with the objective of broadening their experience. Job rotation, therefore, provides trainees the opportunity to work and be familiar with various departments, units and sections in an organization (Ramasamy, 2003: 262-263).

#### ***2.4.5.5.1.4. Advantages and Disadvantages of On-the-Job Training***

The advantages of on-the-job training are it is less costly than off-the-job training, learning will take place on the equipment which will be actually used when the trainee is proficient there are no transfer of learning problems and the trainee is in the productive environment from the beginning. Conversely, on-the-job training has some disadvantages. Success depends on the ability and time availability for trainer, there could be some incidences like producing low quality of out puts, annoyed customers, wastage of materials etc (Milkovich and Bourdea, 1991, 421). There could be risk of being exposed to inefficient methods (Graham, 1984: 170).

#### ***2.4.5.5.2. Off-the-job Training and Development Methods***

Off-the-job training and development approaches conducted away from the work setting like in-service programs. In other words, the training can be conducted with in or off the organizations, but the trainees are not engaged in their usual task or production activity (Schermerhorn 1989: 274; Graham, 1989: 216). This type of training (Ramasamy, 2003: 263-265) includes special causes and lectures, conferences, case study, role-playing and management games.

#### ***2.4.5.5.2. Special Course and Lectures:***

It is some of the knowledge based training methods. The basic concepts and theories, principles and pure applied knowledge of the particular subject are imparted to the participants. This type of training is aimed at giving fundamental information to the trainees.

#### ***2.4.5.5.2.5. Advantages and Disadvantages of off-the-Job Training***

According to (Graham, 1984: 170-171) off-the-job training have the following advantages:

- i. As a special instructor gives the training, it should be of higher quality.
- ii. Special equipment, simplified if necessary, can be used.
- iii. The trainee can learn the job in planned stages, using special exercises to enable him to master particularly difficult aspects.
- iv. The long-term off-the-job training may be less costly because it enables workers to reach higher standards of speed and quality.
- v. It is free from the pressures of payment by results, schemes, noise danger or publicity.
- vi. The trainee will learn correct methods from the outset.
- vii. The trainee doesn't damage valuable equipments or produce spoiled work or scrap.
- viii. It is easier to calculate the cost of off-the-job training because it is more self-contained than on-the-job training.

Off-the-job training has also its own disadvantages. Firstly, what is learnt may not be transfer back to the job as the classroom situation and equipment used might be different from the actual job situations. Secondly, there is a risk that some employees may consider it as an opportunity to enjoy as a result of which learning may not take place. Thirdly, it may involve higher cost (Kerrigan and Luke, 1987: 184; Gomez-Mejia, Blakin and Cardy, 1995: 302).

### ***2.5 Evaluating Training and Development Program***

Evaluating training and development program is not a one-time process. It is an ongoing through out the entire stages of the training program. Evaluation is a process of obtaining information and using it to make judgments and decision. Evaluation of the training program is performed during the assessment, design and implementation. Silberman (1990: 260) also states that one can design his/her active training program to provide for obtaining feedback and evaluation data on an ongoing basis so that she/he can make adjustments earlier on time.

The implementation of training and development serves as a transformation process. Untrained employees are transformed in to capable workers and present works may be

developed to assume new responsibilities. To verify the programs success, personnel managers increasingly demand that training and development activities be evaluated systematically. Lack of evaluation may be the most serious problem in most development and training efforts.

Any education is said to be efficient if the quality and quantity are at maximum from the use of a given volume of resource inputs. It is obvious that educational products are the outputs of a system measured in terms of skills, attitudes transmitted to students. The wish of every country is to expand education to get maximum cost benefit return. To reach this goal institution should train their employees. In addition to training the content of the subject, the quality of trainers, the materials used, training process. the efficiency of trainees should have to be evaluated continuously, because evaluation is the total value of training course and program in the context of improving effective performance towards organizational objectives.

### *2.5.1. Purpose of Evaluation of Training and Development Programs*

The main purpose of evaluation is to collect and document learner performance in a training course, as well as on the job (Tracey, 1984: 440; Silberman, 1990: 260). Training and development program evaluation can serve for many purposes with in an organization. According to Phillips, (Harris and DeSimon, 1994: 167-168) evaluation can contribute to the organization to:

- Determine weather a program is accomplished its objectives
- Identify the strength and weakness of a program
- Determine the cost/benefit ratio of a program
- Decide who should participate in the future program
- Identify which participants benefited the most or least from the program
- Reinforce main points to be made to participants
- Gather data to assist in making future programs
- Determine if the program was appropriate
- Establish data base to assist management in making decisions

may say they enjoyed the training and learned a lot but the true test is whether their job performance improves after their training (Griffin, 2000: 209).

Kirkpatrick (1997: 48) also suggested four major approaches to the evaluation of training and development. These include the systems approach, which is concerned with the improvement of training and development approach, the trainees oriented approach-which focuses on the training effects that are valued by trainees, the cost effective or statistical approach-which is concerned with measurement and the analysis of data in ways that support administrative decision making about training, and the research approach-which is concerned with both carrying out research in to the training and development and systematically evaluating the affect of training and development program.

### ***2.5.3. Stages of Training and Development Program Evaluation***

It is important to evaluate training in order to assess its effectiveness in producing the learning output was planned and to indicate where improvements or changes are required to make the training even more effective. It is at the planning stage that the basis up on which each category of training is to be evaluated and should be determined (Armstrong: 2001: 570). Hence, the evaluation of training and development should be an in built activity that starts from the beginning. These are:

***Formative evaluation-*** This phase includes all the evaluation activities during preparation such as the evaluation of the needs and justification for the training, adequacy of preparation of work, participants' background and appropriateness, the availability of the necessary resources for the training in both quality and quantity for the training and development.

***Process evaluation-*** this is the evaluation of the training while it is in operation. This is mainly done on the form of daily review. It mostly focuses on whether daily activities are being executed according to plans. It offers the chance to obtain immediate feedback and make necessary improvement to increase the effectiveness of the program while it is in progress.

***Summative evaluation-*** at the end of the training event the whole program is evaluated to find out if it has achieved its immediate objectives. Participants' opinions are gathered through employing different data collection approaches and instruments.

Newell and Scarborough (2002: 163-164) and Kirkpatrick (2000: 136) suggested four levels. These levels representing a sequence of ways to evaluate training and development programs. As one moves from one level to the next one, the process becomes more difficult and training consuming, but provides information that is more valuable. These are:

**1. Reaction-** measures how well the participants like the program, including its content, the trainer, the methods used, the surrounding in which training took place. Reaction, measures how those participated in the program react to it.

**2. Learning-** learning criteria measure changes in attitudes, knowledge and skills of the trainees.

**3. Behavior-** at this level it can be assessed how the trainee is behaved differently because of the training and development. It is possible for training to do well on test performance during the training, yet not able; the same skills on their jobs behavior assessment provides insight in to the transfer of learning from classroom to the work environment and the barriers encountered when attempting to implement the new techniques learned and developed.

## **2.6. Problems of Human Resource Training and Development**

HRTD activities in organizations can be influenced by different factors. HRTD efforts are subject to certain common mistakes and problems. Most of the problems are resulted from inadequate planning and lack of coordination of efforts. According to (Mathis and Jackson (1997: 326) the common problems in HRTD are inadequate needs analysis, trying out fad programs or training methods, abdicating responsibility for development to staff, trying to substitute training for selection, lack of training among those who lead the development activities, using “courses as the road to development”, encapsulated development, attitude of managers, availability of resources and financial problems. Some of the common HRTD problems in any organizations are presented below.

### ***Attitude of managers***

The attitude of managers is one of the crucial factor in HRTD. Managers who fail to value training and development are less likely to appreciate its benefit, this is in turn may affect the attitude of employees. Mabey, Graeme and Storey in Melaku (2004: 47), states that “management tends to regard training an operative expense rather than an investment. Top level

management makes decisions regarding the allocation of resources for training and development programs. Besides, support from top-level management is crucial in integrating training and development activities in the strategic plan.” In general if top-level management have no willingness and does not provide the necessary support it would be difficult to expect positive outcomes from training and development programs or to initiate a program. According to Getachew (1998:220) the failure of central institutions to take active role in training their employees is one of the reason for the lack of able manpower to implement government directives in the civil services.

#### *Availability of resources*

The other constraint to training and development is the availability of resources. HRTD is an expensive activity that requires expenditure of resources in terms of money, materials and facilities, time and personnel. Organizations that have considerable shortages in either of these resources face problems to conduct HRTD programs. It is one of the problems that affect HRTD. In the case of Ethiopia it is caused mainly by budgetary constraints (Getachew, 1998:220). Most institutions do not have a separate budget for training and those that usually placed funding requests for training purposes from budgetary sources. The amount of funding available will clearly affect the amount and quality of education that can be undertaken. Moreover, absence of funding has deprived training and development units from access to appropriate instruments and long-term training and development programs.

## **CHAPTER THREE**

### **RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODS**

#### **3.1 Research Methods**

Descriptive survey research method was employed to conduct the study because this method involves systematic collection and presentation of data and to justify the current nature and magnitude of the factors that affect human resource training and development practices.

#### **3.2 Population and Sampling Techniques**

Southern Nations, Nationalities and Peoples Regional State has 14 zones, 8 special woredas, 1 town administration and 3,554 schools. So it is difficult to include all of these in the study. Therefore, to make the study manageable and reliable, 5 zones and 3 special woredas were selected as sample, namely: Sidama, Gediyo, Silti, Wolayta and Kembata Tembaro zones and Alaba, Amaro and Burji Special Woredas. Simple random sampling technique was employed to make the sample representative because these areas have a diversity of population and many of the WEOs are found there. They have almost similar geographical features and socio-economic situations with the other parts of the region. It was intentional to use such sampling technique because the sampled zones and special woreda offices relatively found to have problems of training and development. From each zone, 4 sample woredas were also selected by using simple random sampling techniques to make representative of the sample of the study. However, 5 sample town administrations selected in the above sample zones using availability sampling technique because this technique may help in selecting TAEO's where they are available in order to identify the problems and status of human resource training and development practices.

Education officials and experts were selected to respond using purposive sampling technique because it enabled the researcher to select experienced and knowledgeable people towards the issue under study and capable of providing reliable information. So 14 officials and 26 experts from REB, 2 officials and 4 experts from each ZED and WEO and 1 official and 3 experts from each TAEO involved. The table below shows the total number of respondents.

No.	Offices	Respondents			Interviews
		Officials	Expert	Total	
1	SNNPREB	14	24	38	1
2	ZEDs	10	20	30	5
3	WEOs	46	92	138	23
4	TAEOS	8	10	46	5
	Total	75	15	226	34

### 3.3 Data Source and Instruments of Data Collection

In this study two types of data were collected. Primary data source were the region, zone, woreda and town administration education officials and experts due to the fact that they have better knowledge and experience about the problem of the study and provide direct information. Books, documents and statistical abstracts were reviewed as a secondary data.

To conduct the study, questionnaire and interviews were used. One type of questionnaire was prepared for officials and experts. The questionnaire contains many close ended and some open-ended items. The Likert's five scale system was also used in the questionnaire such type of questionnaire was selected because it provides a greater uniformity of responses and it is easy to proceed. Moreover, when items are close ended respondents would able to select from the list of answers provide to them. The questionnaire was prepared in English and then translated into Amharic to create easy communication and for obtaining reliable data.

To strengthen the information obtained through questionnaires, structured interviews were prepared to collect data from region, zone, woreda and town administration education and training experts.

To realize the appropriateness and reliability of the questionnaire, pilot testing was conducted in Sidama ZED, Awassa Town Administration Education Department and SNNPREB. Twenty questionnaires were distributed. Based on the feedbacks collected from the pilot testing, amendment (modification) on the questionnaire was made on certain items of the questionnaire. In section I the 9 items were reduced to eight by omitting item 7 of the

pilot questionnaire which required to indicate the respondents departments, teams or sectors due to the fact that there existed the merging of these structures at woreda level. In section II, part I of the pilot questionnaire contained 5 items, however, based on the feed backs of the pilot test, these generalized items were modified and made 10 specific items. Section II, part III of the pilot questionnaire contained 71 items, however, depend on the feedback, 15 of the unnecessary items were omitted and reduced to 55 items. Furthermore, part IV item 2 of the pilot questionnaire the 10 options were made to 25 specific items based on the information of the pilot test.

### **3.4 Administration of the Data Gathering Instrument**

According to the time schedule of the study, sufficient questionnaire and interview formats were prepared and duplicated to overcome the problems of shortage and loss in the field. Then a total of 226 questionnaires were duplicated and dispatched to 75 education officials and 151 experts. Out of these, 56 (74.67%) from officials and 104 (68.87%) from experts a total of 160 (70.80) questionnaires were properly field in and returned.

Interview was planned to conduct with 34 training experts and interviewees were pre-informed about the interview through the officials; however, due to meetings some of them were not available. Only 18(52.94%) of interviewees were available as schedule and interviews were conducted only with them, whereas, questionnaires were dispatched and collected with greater follow-up by the student researcher to obtain maximum return.

### **3.5 Data Analysis**

The data collected from the field were organized, tallied, and analyzed properly. Based on the nature of the items and variables, different statistical tools were employed with the consultation of the advisor and statistician. Percentages, weighted means, the chi-square test and spearman's rank order correlation coefficient were employed using SPSS. Using such statistical tools the data was analyzed and interpreted.

## **CHAPTER FOUR**

### **PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA**

This chapter deals with the presentation and analysis of data. It consists of two sections. The first section treats the characteristics of respondents in terms of sex, age, educational qualification, position and work experience. The second section discusses the main part of the study, the analysis and interpretation of data that were collected through questionnaire, interview and document analysis.

#### **4.1. Characteristics of the Study Population**

The main sources of information were education officials (office heads, department/division heads and team leaders) and experts in SNNPRS Education Bureau, Zone Education Departments, Special Woreda/ Woreda Education Offices and Town Administration Education Offices. A total of 226 questionnaires were prepared and distributed to officials and experts that had more than three years of services in their respective offices.

Accordingly, out of the total 226 questionnaires distributed to officials and experts 160 (71.8%) were filled out properly and returned. In addition to the questionnaires, to raise the quality of data, interviews were conducted with 18 training experts and also document analysis was made.

As shown in Table 4.1 among 160(100%) of the total respondents 56(35%) were managerial employees and 104 (65%) were experts. While female respondents were purposefully selected in the sample to identify their roles in these positions, it was found that majority (98.8%) of the officials and 97.1% of the experts were males. This indicated the participation of females in these positions in the sector was low. There are many factors which affect female's access to these positions. Among these, some of the factors may be attributed to the low rate of female's participation in higher education during the previous times. Therefore, it needs sufficient effort and commitment to improve the condition in increasing females' access to these positions.

**Table 4.1: Personal Information**

No	Item	Respondents					
		Officials		Experts		Total	
		N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Sex						
	Male	55	98.2	101	97.1	156	97.5
	Female	1	1.8	3	2.9	4	2.5
	<b>Total</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>104</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>160</b>	<b>100</b>
2	Age						
	18 – 25 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
	26-30 years	2	3.6	2	1.9	4	2.5
	31-35 years	3	5.3	13	12.5	16	10.0
	36-40 years	21	37.5	30	28.9	51	31.9
	41-45 years	16	28.6	26	25.0	42	26.2
	46-50 years	7	12.5	20	19.2	27	16.9
	> 50 years	7	12.50	13	12.5	20	12.5
	<b>Total</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>104</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>160</b>	<b>100</b>
3	Qualification						
	Certificate (TTI)	4	7.1	8	7.7	12	7.5
	Diploma	6	10.7	24	23.1	30	18.8
	BA. /B.SC.	45	80.4	68	65.4	113	70.6
	M.A. /M.S.C	1	1.8	4	3.8	5	3.1
	PHD	-	-	-	-	-	-
	<b>Total</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>104</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>160</b>	<b>100</b>
4	Filed of Specialization						
	Management	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Economics	-	-	-	-	-	-
	EdPM	13	23.2	28	26.9	41	25.6
	Languages	10	17.9	17	16.4	27	16.9
	Social Sciences (others)	12	21.4	25	24.0	37	23.1
	Natural science	8	14.3	16	15.4	24	15.0
	Pedagogic	9	16.0	10	9.6	19	11.9
No specialization	4	7.2	8	7.7	12	7.5	
	<b>Total</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>104</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>160</b>	<b>100</b>
5	Name of the organization						
	REB	10	17.9	20	19.2	30	18.7
	ZED	8	14.2	10	9.6	18	16.3
	WEO	35	62.5	68	65.4	103	64.4
	TAE0	3	5.4	6	5.8	9	5.6
	<b>Total</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>104</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>160</b>	<b>100</b>
6	Current position						
	Office Head	16	28.6	-	-	16	10.0
	Department/Division head	3	5.4	-	-	3	1.9
	Team Leader section head	37	66.0	-	-	37	23.1
	Expert	-	-	104	100	104	65.0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>104</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>160</b>	<b>100</b>
7	Service year in present position						
	1- 5 years	48	85.7	77	74.0	125	78.2
	6 - 10 years	5	8.9	16	15.4	21	13.1
	11 - 15 years	2	3.6	7	6.7	9	5.6
	Above 16	1	1.8	4	3.9	5	3.1
	<b>Total</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>104</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>160</b>	<b>100</b>
8	Total Service Years						
	1 – 5 years	1	1.8	-	-	1	0.6
	6 – 10 years	2	3.6	5	4.8	7	4.4
	11 – 15 years	18	32.1	46	44.2	64	40.0
	Above 15 years	35	62.5	53	51.0	88	55.0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>104</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>160</b>	<b>100</b>

With regard to the age distribution, the majority (31.9%) of the respondents were in the age group of 36-40 years. Very few respondents were within the age group of 26-30 years. While there was no any respondent below the age of 25, this shows that there were no newly recruited employees included in the sample.

With regards to educational qualification, the majority (70.6%) of respondents 80.4% of the officials and 65.38% of experts were bachelor degree holders. While there were few graduates of TTI (7.5%) and 18.8% of the respondents were diploma holders and very few second-degree holders (3.1%). This shows that most of them have adequate qualification in relation to the required jobs. However, the existence of diploma and TTI graduates in the sector indicated that there is a need for upgrading them in the future.

With regard to the field of specialization, the majority (25.6%) of the respondents, 23.2% of the officials and 26.9% of the experts were specialized in educational planning and management. The rest were specialized in different fields of studies. However, 7.5% of them were not specialized in any field. Concerning their specific organizations, all the respondents were selected from REB, ZED, WEO and TAEO. They represented the education sector hierarchy. Majorities were selected from WEO.

With regard to their current positions 10.0%, 1.9%, 23.1%, 65.0% were office heads, department/division heads, team/section heads and experts respectively. Regarding their service years in current positions, the majority (78.2%) of the respondents grouped in the range of 1-5 years. The rest few were grouped in other ranges in descending order. This shows that the frequent civil service reform structural adjustments (re-structuring) practices in the sector affected most of the experienced employees in shifting their former jobs to other positions jobs within the office or the sector.

Concerning the total year of services, majority (55.0%) of the respondents, 62.5% of the officials and 51.1% of the experts had served for more than 15 years in the office or in the sector. About 40% of the respondents served for about 11-15 years. While very few grouped in 1-5 years range. This information suggested that most of the employees had long year services but due to the restructuring of their offices reshuffle to other positions or directly transferred their jobs from teaching before the structural adjustment.

## **4.2. Arrangement, Types and Contents of TDPs, Job Assignment and Strategic Plans**

Nowadays, many organizations realized the significance and crucial role of training and developing their human resources for their survival. Therefore, they gave emphasis for this issue because through training and development important skills such as problem solving, communication and team building skills are developed. Likewise training and development increases the motivation and commitment of employees to achieve organizational goals. So, education sector organizations also organized training and development programs for their employees based on such idea. This part of the study served as a background of the main section of the study tries to investigate whether training and development programs had been conducted in the sector or not. An attempt was also made to identify those who designed or organize these programs, the type and contents of the programs and the level of participation.

As it was shown in Table 4.2.A in item 1, all (100%) of the respondents confirmed that short term training or development programs were provided in the sector.

With regard to long-term training programs, an overwhelming majority (86.9%) of them (76.8% of the officials and 92.3% of the experts) replied that their offices didn't provide any long-term program. While the remaining 23.2% of the officials and 7.7% of the experts responded that their offices provided such programs. The information obtained through interviews with the education programs and human resources training and development experts and the document analysis indicated that long term programs were rarely provided to employees when training opportunities were given as quotas by the MOE (AAU-EdPM), RCBB, and when teachers' candidates were insufficient. The Chi-square-test of P-value at 0.006 revealed that there is a statistically significant difference between the responses of the two groups, indicating that the proportion of those disagreed is higher than those agreed regarding the existence of long-term training. The proportion (23.2%) of the officials agreed with the existence of long-term training programs is greater than the experts (7.7%). Long-term off-the-job training programs were rarely provided in the sector-but there was no any long-term on-the-job training or development program.

**Table 4.2.A: Arrangement and Types of TDP**

No	Item	Respondents						$\chi^2$	P-value
		Officials		Experts		Total			
		N	%	N	%	N	%		
1	Did your office provide short-term training or development programs for its employees and managers since 1995 E.C? A. Yes B. No	56	100	104	100	160	100		
	<b>Total</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>104</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>160</b>	<b>100</b>		
2	Did your office provide long-term training programs for its employees and managers? A. Yes B. No	13	23.2	8	7.7	21	13.1	7.691	0.006
	<b>Total</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>76.8</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>92.3</b>	<b>139</b>	<b>86.9</b>		
3	Did you attend any short or long-term training or development programs provided in the education sector? A. Yes B. No	48	85.7	90	86.5	138	86.2	0.021	0.885
	<b>Total</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>14.3</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>13.5</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>13.8</b>		
4	If your answer for item 3 is "Yes", who organized or designed them? REB	31	64.9	43	47.8	74	53.62		
	ZED	9	18.8	10	11.1	19	13.8		
	WEO	8	16.7	13	14.4	21	15.2		
	MOE	6	12.5	4	4.4	10	7.3		
	RCBB	24	50	17	18.9	41	29.7		
	ZCBD	22	45.8	17	18.9	39	28.3		
	WCBO	12	25.0	11	16.6	27	19.6		
	MCB	2	4.2	1	1.1	3	2.2		
	OTHERS	5	10.4	2	2.2	7	5.1		
	<b>Total</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>138</b>	<b>100</b>		
5	What kinds of program you have attended Since 1995 E. C? A. Educational study tour abroad	5	10.4	1	1.1	6	4.3		
	B. Educational study tour to other offices	-	-	-	-	-	-		
	C. Attending distance education through correspondence	1	2.1	2	2.2	3	2.2		
	D. Attending formal education in higher institutes	2	4.2	2	2.2	4	2.9		
	E. Attending formal education abroad /scholarship/ M. A /MSC/M.ED B.A /B.SC /B.ED	-	-	-	-	-	-		
	<b>Total</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>		
	F. Short-term seminars, workshops and conferences	48	100	90	100	138	100		
	<b>Total</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>138</b>	<b>100</b>		

Level of significance=0.05

As it can be observed in the table 4.2.1 in item 3, about 86.7% (138) of the respondents 48 (85.7%) of the officials and 90 (86.5%) of experts attended the training programs provided in (for) the sector. While the rest 13.8% (22) of them (14.3% (8) of the officials and 13.5% (14) of the experts), didn't attend any program at all. The interviews with training experts also confirmed that few of the employees didn't attend training or development programs

because of their personal problems and due to the coincidence of field works and urgent routine works with the training programs. Further they asserted that within May of this year (2007) it was planned to provide a seven-day's workshop for all the employees who work at the various offices of the sector. It was also observed from the current operational plan of REB during the document analysis. Moreover, the programs were started at the zonal towns before the student researcher have completed his field trip. The chi-square ( $P\text{-value} = 0.885$ ) shows there is no statistically significant difference between the two group of responses, which implies that majority of the respondents agreed that they had attended short term or long term training programs.

As it is shown in table 4.2.1, item 4 indicated those who organized/designed the training and development programs. Accordingly, based on responses REB, RCBB, ZCBD, WCBO, WEO, ZED, MoE and others (NGO's) organized or designed these programs. According to these responses majority (53.6%) of those who attend the training and development programs (64.9% of the officials and 47.8% of the experts), participated in the programs organized by REB. The second, third, fourth majority of respondents attended the programs organized by RCBB, ZCBD and WCBO. This indicated that the capacity building offices organized various programs for the sector due to the merging of the education sector structure with capacity building. It also reveals that among the programs the dominant were civil service reform programs. ZED and WEO were the fifth and the sixth in the rating which, confirms the above assumption but later they were separated from the capacity building offices during the late 1998 E.C. The table also indicated MOE, MCB and NGOs also organized training programs for the sector.

Concerning the type of programs they had attended Table 4.2.1, item 5 reported the following. Among those who attended training and development programs (160) all (100%) of them attended short-term seminars, workshops and conferences. About 4.3% of the respondents (10.4% of the officials and 1.1% of the experts) joined educational study tour abroad, while 2.2% of them (2.1% of the officials and 2.2% of the experts) attended distance education through correspondence. About 2.9% of them (4.2% of the officials and 2.2%) of the experts attended formal education in higher education institutions. However, there was no any one who attended scholarship abroad. From the above information we can conclude that attending formal education through distance education or learning in higher education institutions found

at a lower level. Relatively greater emphasis was given to short-term programs, however, the training experts during the interview asserted that the number of short-term programs were few and not adequate enough which allowed the participation of the majority of the employees and to equip them with efficient technical skills.

**Table 4.2.B. Contents of TDPs, Job Assignment and Strategic Plans**

N	Items	RESPONDENTS					
		Officials		Experts		Total	
		N	%	N	%	N	Rank
1	Contents (topics) of the training and development programs given since 1995 E.C.						
	a. Leadership	16	28.57	4	3.85	20	12
	b. Human resource management	13	23.21	2	1.92	15	14
	c. Material management	1	1.79	1	0.96	2	
	d. Change management	15	16.79	1	0.96	16	13
	e. Result oriented performance appraisal	40	71.43	85	81.73	125	1
	f. Business process reengineering	40	71.43	85	81.73	125	1
	g. Service delivery	40	71.43	85	81.73	125	1
	h. Computer training	18	32.14	14	13.46	32	10
	i. Information technology	29	51.79	11	10.58	40	6
	j. Supervision	18	32.14	7	6.73	25	
	k. Civics and Ethical education	20	35.71	24	23.08	44	5
	l. Special needs education	-	-	-	-	-	
	m. Curriculum development	2	3.57	4	3.85	6	15
	n. Educational research	4	7.14	2	1.92	6	15
	o. Gender and HIV/AIDS education	22	39.29	40	38.46	62	4
	p. Decentralization of administration	27	48.21	8	7.69	35	9
	q. Planning	8	14.29	6	5.77	24	11
r. Teachers development	29	51.79	11	10.58	40	6	
s. Reforms on the quality of education	29	51.79	11	10.58	40	6	
t. Text book management	-	-	1	0.96	1	17	
u. Adult education	-	-	1	0.96	1	17	
2	Did the contents of the programs you have attended directly related to your job?						
	A. Yes	46	95.8	85	94.4	131	94.9
	B. No	2	4.8	5	5.6	7	5.1
	<b>Total</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>138</b>	<b>100</b>
3	If you have attended and completed either formal education or distance education or scholarship, did you get the proper placement and benefits?						
	A. Yes	2	66.7	2	50	4	57.1
	B. No	1	33.3	2	50	3	42.9
	<b>Total</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>100</b>
4	If your answer for question 3 is "No" what is the reason?						
	The vacant position is below my qualification	1	100	2	100	3	100
	Recruitments /job assignments/ are performed through personal relationship	-	-	1	50	1	33.3
	Managerial problem in assigning the educational upgraded individuals on the right position	-	-	1	50	1	33.3
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>100</b>
5	Does the strategic plan of your office incorporated employees training and development?						
	A. Yes	33	58.9	26	25.0	59	36.9
	B. No	23	41.1	78	75.0	101	63.1
	<b>Total</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>104</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>160</b>	<b>100</b>

Concerning the contents of the programs, Table 4.2.B, item 1 presented the following information. Regardless of the frequency and duration of the programs, the contents were ranked according to the number of participants' responses. The contents of the civil service reform programs (Result oriented appraisal system, business process reengineering and service delivery) ranked first, followed by gender and HIV/AIDS education. Civic and ethical education ranked a third group followed by reform on the quality of education, information technology, and teachers' development as the fourth group. While material management, textbook management and adult education ranked the least. However, no one confirmed that special education was given as a content of the program. From the above information it is possible to deduct that main emphasis was given to civil service reform program contents than others and no emphasis was given to special needs education. The interview also confirmed that the current direction of the training and development programs mainly concentrated on such issues. It is possible to deduce that the sector also paid attention to gender and HIV/AIDS education.

Regarding the relationship of the contents towards their job, Table 4.2.B item 2, about 98.8% of the officials and 94.4% of the experts replied that the contents of the training programs had direct relationship with their jobs. But very few officials (4.8%) and experts (5.6%) expressed their disagreement. Since majority of the respondents attended the contents of the civil service reform programs, they could be able how to plan and perform their jobs/tasks and deliver better services to the customers. Therefore, it is possible to conclude that the contents had direct relationship with their jobs.

As it is observed in Table 4.2.B in item 3, respondents were asked if they had attended and completed long-term training programs and got the proper placements or benefits. Among 7 individuals who had attended and completed their long-term training only 4 (57.1% of them 2(66.7%) of officials and 2 (50%) of the experts responded that they had got the proper position and placement. The rest 3 (42.9%) of them (1 (33.3%)) of the officials and 2 (50%) of the experts) asserted that they didn't get the proper position/ placement and benefits. From which it is possible to conclude that officials got the advantages due to their experience may be through their good personal relationship with the decision makers or perhaps they have completed before the structural adjustment of the offices.

mechanisms applied to gather information? And which factors were considered in prioritizing needs?

#### 4.3.A: Identification of Training and Development Needs.

No	Items	Respondents		Responses					Mean	$\chi^2$	P-Value
				AT	UT	STS	RT	NT			
				N	N	N	N	N			
				5	4	3	2	1			
1	My office conducted human resource training and development needs assessment since 1995 E.C	Officials	N	-	20	14	20	2	2.93	3.630	0.458
		Experts	N	2	32	33	29	8	2.91		
		Total	N	2	52	47	49	10	2.92		
		%		1.3	32.5	29.4	30.6	6.3			
2	Each individual identifies his/her own training and development needs.	Officials	N	-	1	15	34	6	2.20	0.528	0.913
		Experts	N	-	1	24	68	11	2.14		
		Total	N	-	2	39	102	17	2.16		
		%		-	1.3	24.4	63.8	10.6			
3	Immediate supervisors identify the training and development needs of each individual.	Officials	N	-	5	10	22	19	2.02	1.814	0.612
		Experts	N	-	11	27	38	28	2.20		
		Total	N	-	16	37	60	47	2.14		
		%		-	10.0	23.1	37.5	29.4			
4	The HRTD department/unit identify the training and development needs of individuals and the office.	Officials	N	1	6	6	28	15	2.11	8.200	0.005
		Experts	N	-	15	24	50	15	2.38		
		Total	N	1	21	30	78	30	2.28		
		%		0.6	13.1	18.8	48.8	18.8			
5	Top-level managers determined training and development needs of individuals and the office	Officials	N	-	7	10	27	12	2.21	10.309	0.056
		Experts	N	2	3	34	40	25	2.20		
		Total	N	2	10	44	67	37	2.21		
		%		1.3	6.3	27.5	41.9	23.1			
6	Training and development needs had been identified through organizational analysis.	Officials	N	-	20	14	15	7	2.84	1.329	0.722
		Experts	N	-	32	35	26	11	2.85		
		Total	N	-	52	49	41	18	2.84		
		%		-	32.5	30.6	25.6	11.3			
7	Training and development needs had been identified through task analysis.	Officials	N	2	18	14	17	5	2.91	2.726	0.605
		Experts	N	8	24	32	29	11	2.89		
		Total	N	10	42	46	46	16	2.90		
		%		6.3	26.3	28.8	28.8	10.0			
8	Training and development needs have been identified through person analysis.	Officials	N	5	15	15	14	7	2.95	11.728	0.019
		Experts	N	3	23	30	45	3	2.79		
		Total	N	8	38	45	59	10	2.84		
		%		5.0	23.8	28.1	36.9	6.3			
9	The office conducted group discussions to gather information.	Officials	N	3	17	8	22	6	2.80	13.620	0.009
		Experts	N	-	16	32	43	13	2.49		
		Total	N	3	33	40	65	19	2.60		
		%		1.9	20.6	25.0	40.6	11.9			
10	Observing how individuals are performing their tasks to gather information.	Officials	N	-	13	16	20	7	2.63	0.56	0.905
		Experts	N	-	27	27	40	10	2.68		
		Total	N	-	40	43	60	17	2.66		
		%		-	25.0	26.9	37.5	10.6			
11	Conducted survey to gather information.	Officials	N	1	12	17	16	10	2.61	2.348	0.672
		Experts	N	-	27	30	31	16	2.68		
		Total	N	1	39	47	47	26	2.64		
		%		0.6	24.4	29.4	29.4	16.3			
12	Reviewed performance to gather information.	Officials	N	3	9	17	16	11	2.59	2.125	0.713
		Experts	N	-	19	26	40	19	2.50		
		Total	N	3	28	43	56	30	2.53		
		%		1.9	17.5	26.0	35.0	18.8			
13	Interviewed with supervisors and employees to gather information.	Officials	N	1	9	12	27	11	2.53	17.03	0.002
		Experts	N	-	3	16	45	40	1.83		
		Total	N	1	12	28	70	49	2.04		
		%		0.6	7.5	17.5	43.8	30.6			

AT=5= Always True

RT= 2= Rarely True

STSN = 3= Sometimes True Some times Not

UT=4= Usually True

NT= 1= Never True

Level of significance=0.05

N (Officials) = 56 N(Experts) = 104

In Table 4.3.A the mean scores are below the standard average which implies that training and development needs assessment had not been conducted or remained at low level.

As shown in Table 4.3.A in item 1, respondents were asked whether their respective offices conducted training and development needs assessment for office employees and officials since 1995 E.C. Accordingly, about 36.9 of respondents (39.3% officials and 35.6% experts) replied that training and development needs were rarely or never conducted. About 33.8% of respondents, (35.7%, 31.9% of officials and experts respectively) viewed that their offices “always or usually conducted” training and development needs assessment. On the other hand, 29.4% of respondents (25.0% officials and 31.7% experts) viewed that the offices “sometimes conducted” and “sometimes did not conduct” training and development needs assessment. The average mean was found to be 2.92 (2.93 and 2.91 for official and experts respectively), which is slightly lower than the expected (standard) average score (3.0). From this we can conclude that most of the offices of the sector didn’t conduct training and development needs assessment for their employees and managers.

As indicated in Table 4.2.A in general information part of item 4, the REB and the RCBB and other organizations designed most of the training and development programs. Perhaps these organizations conducted the programs without considering and collecting their true needs in the sector. As also indicated in Table 4.2.A majority of the short-term programs were nationally designed and conducted allover the country with similar time. The information gathered through interviews also supported this assumption. As proposed by Bratten and Gold (1994: 237) conducting training needs assessment specifies trainings. However, the trainings offered in the sector were in contrary to this assumption. There are no systematic needs assessment conducted in most of the offices of the education sector. Furthermore, they confirmed that no attention was paid to conduct needs assessment for employees. The chi-square test made (P – value of 0.458) reveals that there is no statistically significant difference among the opinions of respondents indicating their agreement on the issue of the absence of systematic needs of assessment.

As can be observed in Table 4.3.A, in items 2-5 respondents were asked to respond who identified training and development needs for the individual employees and the office.

With regard to the role of individual employees/experts in identifying their training and development needs Table 4.3.A, item 2 indicated that the overwhelming majority (74.4%) of the respondents (71.4% officials and 76.0% experts) viewed that each individual “rarely” identified his/her own training and development needs. Moreover, 24.4% of the respondents (26.8% and 23.1% of officials and experts respectively) replied that they had no clear stand about the issue. An insignificant number of respondents (1.3%) viewed that each individual “usually identify” his/her training and development needs. The average score found to be is 2.16, (2.20, for officials 2.14 for experts), which is less than the standard average (3.0) indicates that individuals didn’t identify their own training and development needs.

The chi-square test of the level of significance with P – value of 0.613 is greater than 0.05 level of significance, which indicates that there is no statistically significance difference in the distribution of responses that majority of the respondents confirmed that individuals didn’t identify his/her own training and development needs. From the data obtained, it can be concluded that in most of the offices of the education sector, individuals didn’t identify their own training and development needs. The data gathered through interviews with training and development experts also reveals that individuals didn’t identify their own needs in their respective organizations. As stated by Saiyadain (1999: 184-185), one of the sources of information for individual training and development needs are interviews with supervisors and other employees, that individuals had identified their own training needs, however, there was no such experience identification of their needs. According to the interviewees, however, individuals identified their own training needs personally and attend various long-term or short-term programs privately. As a result, individuals attended correspondence courses and other development programs by their own initiatives and expenses. In rare cases their offices provided fees and sponsorship for them. The information gathered through document analysis also supported the above idea that after individuals had made great efforts to develop themselves privately affirmative actions were taken by few of their offices to cover their expenses and sponsor them to attend in higher education institutions.

With regard to the role of immediate supervisors/managers in identifying the training and development needs of each individual employee, Table 4.3.A item 3 depicts the following. The Majority (66.9%) of respondents (73.2 % of officials and 63.4% of experts) indicated that immediate supervisors/ managers “rarely or never” identified training and development needs of individuals. About 10% of the respondents (8.9% of officials and 10.6% of experts) responded positively. While 23.1% of the respondents (17.9% officials and 26.0% of experts) viewed that they were not sure of the issue. The average calculated score is 2.14, which is less than the expected average (3.0), which indicated that immediate supervisors/managers didn’t identify the training needs of individuals. The chi-square test of the level of significance ( $p$ -value = 0.612) shows that there is no statistically significant difference between the two groups of responses implies that majority of the respondents agreed that managers didn’t identify the training needs of individual employees. Therefore, it is possible to conclude that in the various education sector offices, immediate supervisors didn’t identify the training and development needs of individual subordinates/employees.

Table 4.3.A item 4 shows the role of human resource training and development department/unit of the office in identifying the training and development needs of individuals and the office. Accordingly, about 67.6% of the respondents (76.8% of officials and 48.1% of experts) replied that rarely human resource training and development department/unit or never identified the training and development needs of individuals and the office. While 13.7% of the respondents of 12.5% officials and 14.4% of experts responded that it usually or always identified the training and development needs of individuals and the office. About 18.8% of the respondents (10.7% officials and 23.1% experts) commented nothing.

The average mean value calculated for both groups was 2.28 which was less than the standard (3.0) shows that the majority of the respondents believed that human resource training and development departments had not identified the training and development needs of individuals. The chi-square test with  $P$ -value of 0.005 shows there was statistically significant difference among the responses of the two groups of respondents which indicated that majority of the respondents agreed that the human resource training and development (units didn’t identify the training and development needs of

individuals).Based on the above information, it is possible to conclude that in most offices of the education sector of SNNPRS human resource training and development department/units mostly didn't identify the training and development needs of individuals and the office. According to the information gathered through interviews, usually the HRTD department/unit didn't identify the training needs of individuals and the organization. Main emphasis was given to pre-service teacher training other than this.

Table 4.3.A of item 5 indicated the role of top-level managers in determining training and development needs of individuals and the organization in a systematic way. About 65.0% of the respondents (69.6% of officials and 62.5% of experts) replied that top-level management at all levels rarely or never identified training and development needs of individual employees and the office. While 27.5% of the respondents (17.9% officials and 32.7% experts) prefer to comment nothing. Hence, very insignificant (7.6%) respondents replied that they determined training and development needs for individuals and the organization. The average mean value (2.21) of the responses is less than the standard (expected) mean indicated that the majority of the respondents agreed that top-level management at all levels did not identify the training and development needs of individuals and the organization.

The chi-square test ( $P\text{-value}=0.056$ ) reveals that there is statistically significant difference between the two groups of responses implies that there was no systematic effort of done top-level managers in determining the training and development needs of individuals. So, it is possible to conclude that top-level managers made insufficient efforts to identify training and development needs of individuals and the organization systematically in contrast to the suggestion to Monappa and Saiyadain (1999: 182). Perhaps there were many factors like paying less attention, concentration on routine works, negligence, personal attitudes towards the importance of the issue, shortage of budget and expectation from above limited their efforts.

As it is shown in Table 4.3.A, items 6-8 the techniques used to identify training and development needs are clearly indicated. Concerning the identification of needs through organizational analysis Table 4.3.A item 6 shows that about 36.9% of the respondents

(39.3% officials and 35.6% experts) confirmed that organizational analysis was rarely or never conducted. Slightly more than a quarter (32.5%) of the respondents (35.7% officials and 30.8% experts) confirmed that their respective offices 'usually' conducted organizational analysis to identify training and development needs. On the other hand, 30.6% of the respondents (25.0% officials and 33.7% experts) replied that their offices sometimes conducted and sometimes not conducted organizational analysis. The average score was found to be 2.84, which is slightly less than the standard average mean (3), confirms that the majority of the respondents agreed that organizational analysis has not been conducted in their respective offices to identify training needs.

The chi-square test, computation with a P-value of 0.722 (which is greater than 0.05 level of significance) shows that there is no significant statistical difference among the opinions of respondents implies that the respondents agreed that organization analysis had been conducted in their respective offices in the identification of training needs.

Therefore, from the above information it is possible to conclude that there was no adequate effort made in conducting organizational analysis in the identification of training and development needs. The result of this item is in contradiction with the efforts made during the preparation of the strategic plans of the sector and that of the respective offices. However, during the preparation of the strategic plans, the main focus was on the analysis of internal and external environments of their respective organization and the sector. Mathis and Jackson (1997: 291) stated that organizational analysis is one of the ways to diagnose training needs. However, in the education sector offices of SNNPRS it was not deliberately done for training and development purposes.

As it was observed in the Table 4.3.A item 7, with regard to the practice of task analysis, the majority (38.8%) of the respondents (39.3% officials and 38.5% experts) viewed that their offices rarely or never conducted task analysis for training and development needs assessment. While slightly greater than a quarter (26.3%) confirmed that their respective offices usually conducted an analysis of individual tasks/jobs performed by each worker in the organization. While 28.8% respondents (25.0% officials and 30.8% experts) had no clear ideas about the issue raised. The average mean value of the two groups of responses is

(2.90) slightly less than the standard mean value (3.0), which implies that their respective offices didn't conduct any task/job analysis to identify the training needs of the employees. The chi-square test of significance (with P-value of 0.605) shows that there is no statistically significant difference between the responses of the two groups that majority of respondents confirmed that their respective offices never conducted task analysis in assessing training and development needs.

Therefore, based on the information obtained from the above data it is possible to conclude that some of the offices of the sector did not conduct analysis of the tasks/jobs performed by individuals to assess training and development needs in refute to the ideas suggested by Gomez-Mejia, Balkin and Cardy (1995: 297) Getachew (1998:21-22) and Getahun (1990:22). The information collected through interviews also reveals that there was no major effort done in analyzing tasks performed by individuals to conduct training and development needs assessment. They attributed the factors with the lack of interest and knowledge.

As it is observed in Table 4.3.A item 8, with regard to the identification of training and development needs through person/individual analysis, the majority (43.2%) of the respondents (37.5% officials and 46.2% experts) confirmed that their offices rarely or never analyzed individuals to conduct training and needs assessment. While slightly greater than a quarter (28.8%) of the respondents (35.7% officials and 25.0% experts) viewed that their office usually conducted individual/person analysis. Slightly greater than a quarter (28.1%) of the respondents viewed they were not sure. The average score found to be is 2.84, which is less than the standard score (3.00). The chi-square test at P-value is 0.019 shows that there is statistically significant differences between the two groups of responses, which implies that some officials, 35.7% of them responded positively while only 25.0% of experts agreed that their offices usually or always conducted individual or person analysis. Therefore, it is possible to conclude that almost no satisfactory effort was done in using the technique of person/individuals analysis in identifying training and development needs in different way to the ideas proposed by Heneman and Others (1996: 391) and Getachew (1998:4).

With regard to the mechanisms used to gather information in conducting training and development needs assessment, Table 4.3.A, items 9-13, indicated as follow.

As it is shown in Table 4.3.A, item 9, majority (about 52.5%) of the respondents (50.0% officials and 53.8% experts) viewed that their offices rarely or never conducted group discussion as a mechanism to gather information. While 22.5% of the respondents replied that usually or always the office conducted group discussions. On the other hand, a quarter (25.0%) of the respondents (14.3% officials, and 30.8% experts) viewed that the office sometimes used and sometimes did not use group discussion as a mechanism.

The average score was found to be 2.60, which is less than the standard scoring (3.00) that majority of the respondents confirmed their disagreement that their offices conducted group discussion as a mechanism to gather in information. The chi-square test of significance with P-value of 0.009 shows that there is statistically significant difference between the opinions of the two groups of responses, which implies that about 35.8% of the officials and only 15.0% of the experts agreed that their offices conducted group discussion as a mechanism to gather information in conducting training and development needs assessment. However, from the above data it is possible to conclude that the effort of the offices in conducting group discussion as a mechanism to gather information in undertaking training and development needs assessment is low which is in contrast to the recommendations of Monappa and Saiyadain (1999: 184-185) and MCB (2005:129-30).

As it is shown in Table 4.3.A, item 10 reveals that observing how individuals were performing their tasks as a mechanism to gather information in conducting training and development needs assessment, accordingly, majority (48.1%) of the respondents (48.2% officials and 48.1% experts) viewed it was rarely or never used as a mechanism. Hence, slightly greater than a quarter (26.9%) of the respondents (28.6% officials and 26.0% experts) responded that sometimes it was used and sometimes not used as a mechanism. About quarter (25.0%) of the respondents (23.2% officials and 26.3% experts) replied that they were not sure. The average score is 2.66, which is less than the standard score (3.0). This implies that the practices used by the offices in observing how individuals are performing their tasks as a mechanism to gather information in conducting training and

development needs assessment was low in contrast to the sources of information proposed by Manappa and Saiyadain (1999: 184-185) and Getachew (1998:22). The chi-square test (P-value = 0.905) shows there is no statistically significant difference of responses between the two groups indicating that the respective offices didn't use the practice of observing how individuals are performing their tasks as a mechanism to gather information in condition training and development needs.

As it was observed in Table 4.3.A, item 11 indicated that the offices as a mechanism to gather information in identifying training and development needs used how often conducting survey. About 45.7% respondents (46.5% officials and 45.2% of experts) viewed it was rarely conducted. Similarly, about 29.4% of the respondents (30.4% officials and 28.8% experts) comment nothing. About a quarter (25%) of the respondents (23.2% officials and 26.0% experts) replied that surveys were usually/always conducted to collect information.

The average score was found to be 2.53, which is less than the standard average (3.00). This indicated in contrast to the ideas suggested by Mathis and Jackson (1997: 292) that the efforts of conducting survey as mechanisms used to gather information in training and development needs assessment were low. The chi-square test (P-value = 0.672) shows that there is no statistically significant difference between the two groups of responses indicating that both groups of respondents indicating that their respective offices didn't use conducting survey as a mechanism to gather information in training and development needs assessment.

It can be observed in table 4.3.1, item 12 reported that the offices used how often reviewing performance, as a mechanism to gather information in training and development needs assessment. Hence, the majority (53.8%) of the respondents (48.2% officials and 56.8% experts) viewed it was rarely or never used. Slightly less than a quarter (26.9) of the respondents (30.4% officials and 25.0% experts) was not willing to respond. Accordingly, (19.3%) of the respondents (21.5% officials and 18.2% experts) viewed as their respective offices used reviewing performance as a mechanism to gather information. The average score is found to be 2.53, which is less than the average score (3.0). The chi-square test. (P-value = 0.713) indicated that there is no statistically significant difference between the

distributions of responses of the two groups. Therefore, it was concluded that in collecting/gathering information for training and development needs assessment, the practice of reviewing performance as a mechanism is at low level which is in opposite to that of Monappa and Saiyadain (1999: 184-185) and MCB (2005:129-30).

Table 4.3.A, item 13 depicts that how often their offices used interviews with supervisors and employees to gather information in conducting training and development needs assessment. Accordingly, the majority (74.4%) of the respondents (60.7% officials and 81.8% experts) viewed that it was rarely or never used interviews as a mechanism to conduct training and development needs assessment for employees, while 17.5% of the respondents (21.4% officials and 15.4% experts) replied that it was sometimes used and sometimes not. About 8.1% of the respondents (17.9% officials and 2.90% experts) viewed it was used as a mechanism. The average score was found to be 2.04, which is less than the standard score (3.0) implies that majority of the respondents disagreed that their offices didn't use interviews with employees and supervisors, as a mechanism to conduct training and development needs assessment.

The chi-square test of significance at  $p$  – value is 0.002, which is less than 0.05 level of significance, shows that there is statistically significant difference among the responses indicating the offices didn't use interviews as a mechanism in conducting training and development needs assessment. However, it is possible to conclude that offices used interviews as a mechanism in gathering information for training and development needs assessment at almost lower scale even most of them didn't used it in contrast to the ideas of Monappa and Saiyadain and Getachew.

After training and development needs had been identified they have to be prioritized. As it was observed in Table 4.3.B, items 1-7 focused on the factors that their offices considered in prioritizing the needs.

**Table 4.3. B. Prioritizing Training and Development Needs**

No	Items	Respondents		Responses					Mean	$\chi^2$	P-Value
				AT	UT	S/TSN	RT	NT			
				5	4	3	2	1			
1	The availability of training facilities was considered in prioritizing needs	Official	N	6	31	9	7	3	3.54	3.145	0.534
		Experts	N	8	43	21	19	13	3.31		
		Total	N	14	74	30	26	16	3.21		
		%		8.8	46.3	18.8	16.5	10.0			
2	The availability of training institutions was considered as a factor in prioritizing needs	Official	N	7	7	12	25	5	2.75	6.447	0.168
		Experts	N	5	13	27	56	3	2.63		
		Total	N	12	20	39	81	8	2.67		
		%		7.5	12.5	24.4	50.6	5.0			
3	The availability of budget was considered as a factor in prioritizing needs	Official	N	5	27	8	13	3	3.32	4.323	0.364
		Experts	N	3	62	12	24	3	3.37		
		Total	N	8	89	20	37	6	3.35		
		%		5.0	55.6	12.5	23.1	3.8			
4	The availability of trainers was considered as a factor in prioritizing needs	Official	N	-	20	23	10	3	3.07	3.929	0.20
		Experts	N	3	42	27	28	4	3.12		
		Total	N	3	62	50	38	7	3.10		
		%		1.9	38.8	31.3	23.8	4.4			
5	The trainees capability and level of motivation was considered as a factor	Official	N	1	10	16	22	7	2.57	2.249	0.690
		Experts	N	3	27	29	37	8	2.81		
		Total	N	4	37	45	59	15	2.73		
		%		2.5	23.1	28.1	36.9	9.4			
6	The importance and urgency of needs was considered	Official	N	1	33	7	10	5	3.27	5.596	0.231
		Experts	N	-	53	27	16	8	3.20		
		Total	N	1	86	34	26	13	3.23		
		%		0.6	53.8	21.3	16.3	8.1			
7	The cost effectiveness of the organization was considered	Official	N	3	23	16	8	6	3.16	4.543	0.337
		Experts	N	5	48	29	19	3	3.32		
		Total	N	8	71	45	27	9	3.26		
		%		5.0	44.4	28.1	16.9	5.6			

AT=5= Always True                      RT= 2= Rarely True                      S/TSN = 3= Sometimes True/Sometimes Not  
 UT=4= Usually True                      NT= 1= Never True  
 Level of significance=0.05    N (officials) = 56    N (experts) = 104

As it is shown in Table 4.3.B, item 1 indicated how often their offices considered the availability of training facilities in prioritizing needs. On the other hand, 26.3% respondents (17.9% officials and 30.8% experts) viewed it was never conducted. Accordingly, about 55.1% of respondents (66.1% officials and 49.0% experts) viewed that their respective offices considered the availability of facilities in prioritizing needs. About 18.8% of the respondents commented nothing.

The average score was found to be 3.3 (3.54 for officials, and 3.31 for experts), which is greater than the standard mean (3.0), that majority of the total respondents agreed that their offices considered the availability of training facilities in prioritizing needs. The chi-square test (p-value=0.534) is greater than 0.05 level of significance, shows that there was no statistically significant difference among the responses of the two groups, indicating that the various offices considered the availability of facilities in prioritizing needs. Even though training and development needs were not identified in a systematic way, however.

based on the data it is possible to conclude that the availability of training facilities was considered in the sector in prioritizing training and development needs similarly with the suggestion of Reid and Barrington (1999: 321) and MCB (2005:129-30).

As it is observed in Table 4.3.B, item 2 with regard to considering the availability of training institutions in prioritizing needs. An overwhelming majority (55.6%) of respondents (53.5% officials and 56.7% experts) viewed that it was rarely or never considered, 20.0% of the respondents (25.0% officials and 17.3% experts) replied that it was considered. Slightly less than a quarter (24.4 %) of the respondents (21.4 % officials and 26.0% experts) viewed they were not sure.

The average mean was found to be 2.67, which is less than the standard mean (3.0) indicating that majority of the respondents disagreed that their offices did consider the availability of training institutions as a factor in prioritizing needs. The chi-square test of significance with p-value of 0.168 shows that there was no statistically significant difference among the responses of the two groups indicating that majority of the respondents disagreed that their offices did consider the availability of training institution as a factor in prioritizing needs. According to the observed data, it is possible to conclude that the offices did not give great concern for considering the availability of training institutions as a factor for prioritizing needs in contrast to the factors considered by Monappa and Saiyadin.

As it is shown in Table 4.3.B in item 3, with regard to considering the availability of budget as a factor in prioritizing needs, an overwhelming majority (about 60.6%) of the respondents (57.1% officials and 62.5% experts) confirmed that their respective offices usually considered the availability of budget as a factor in prioritizing needs. While about 12.5% of the respondents (14.3% officials and 11.5% experts) viewed they were not sure. Slightly less than a quarter (23.1) of the respondents (23.2% officials and 23.1% experts) replied that it was rarely or never considered. The average mean score is 3.35, which is greater than the average standard score (3.0). It shows that the existence of relatively positive effort in considering the availability of budget as a factor in prioritizing needs.

The difference in the distribution of the responses data was found to be not statistically significant as the chi-square test P-value of 0.364 is greater than 0.05 level of significance indicating that both the officials and experts confirmed that their offices considered the availability of budget in prioritizing needs. Therefore, it was concluded that there is a positive effort in considering the availability of budget in prioritizing training needs. The information gathered through interviews with training and development experts confirmed that great emphasis was given towards the availability of budget in prioritizing needs. The economical use of this scarce resource was the main concern in the sector.

As it is observed in Table 4.3.B in item 4, in considering the availability of trainers as a factor in prioritizing needs, the majority (40.7%) of the respondent (35.7% officials and 43.3% experts) confirmed that it was considered, while greater than a quarter (31.3%) of the respondents (41.1% officials and 26.0% experts) commented nothing. Slightly less than a quarter (about 23.8%) of the respondents (23.3% officials and 30.7% experts) viewed it was rarely or never considered. The average score was found to be 3.10 (3.07 for officials and 3.12 for experts), which is slightly greater than the standard score (3.0), which implies there is almost a positive response to the item. The chi-square test of significant (p – value = 0.204) shows there is no statistically significant difference among the distribution of responses of the two groups indicating that both group of respondents agreed that their offices considered the availability of trainers in prioritizing needs. .

As it is observed in Table 4.3.B, item 5 respondents were further asked to respond whether their respective offices considered trainees capability and level of motivation as a factor in prioritizing needs. Accordingly, about 46.3% of the respondents (51.8% officials and 43.3% experts) asserted that it was rarely/ never considered. Slightly more than a quarter 28.1% of the respondents (28.6% officials and 27.9% experts) reported nothing; while about 25.6% of the respondents (19.7% officials and 28.9% experts) replied that it was usually or always considered. The average value of scores was found to be 2.73, which is less than the standard average score (3.00). This implies that there is a negative response for the item. The chi-square test of P-value 0.690 reveals that there is no significant difference in the distribution of responses of the two groups. The above information suggested that trainees' capability and level of motivation was not considered as a factor in

prioritizing needs. However, according to the information gathered through interviews, it was rarely considered in some of their respective offices. This information suggests that there was low attention given to trainees' capability and level of motivation in prioritizing needs in refute to the ideas recommended by Monappa and Saiyadin and Getahun.

As it was observed in Table 4.3.B, item 6 indicates how often their respective offices considered the importance and urgency of needs as a factor in prioritizing needs. Moreover, an overwhelming majority (54.4%) of the respondents (58.9% officials 51.0% experts) asserted that their respective offices usually considered the urgency of needs as a factor in prioritizing needs. About 24.4% of the respondents replied that it was rarely or never considered. While about 21.3% of the respondents replied it was sometimes considered or sometimes not. The average calculated mean score is 3.23, which is greater than the standard mean score (3.0). This implies that some times the importance and urgency of the needs was considered as a factor in prioritizing needs. The chi-square test of P-value, 0.231 indicated that there is no significant difference among the responses of the two groups of responses.

As it was depicted in Table 4.3.B, item 7 reports how often the cost effectiveness of the organization was considered as a factor in prioritizing needs. While relatively majority (49.4%) of the respondents (46.5% officials and 50.0% experts) viewed it as usually considered. A little greater than a quarter (28.1% experts) of the respondents (28.6% officials and 27.9% experts) asserted that it was sometimes considered and sometimes not. About 22.5% of the respondents viewed that their respective offices rarely or never considered the cost effectiveness of the organization as a factor in prioritizing needs.

The chi-square test ( $P$  -- value = 0.337) shows that there is no statistically significant variation in the distribution of the two groups of responses indicating that the offices considered the cost --effectiveness of the organization in prioritizing needs. Even though there is no systematic training and development needs assessment in the most of the offices of the sector, in prioritizing the needs they considered the cost-effectiveness of the organization as a factor.

#### **4.4. Objectives and Focuses of Training and Development Programs**

As it had been discussed in the review of the related literature, any training and development program should be systematically planned and any organization should have its own human resource training and development plan. In many organizations employees played important roles in designing and development of TDP. Hence, these programs should be planned with certain objectives to achieve desired results. Accordingly, after the identification of training needs, objectives of the programs would be clearly and precisely set to indicate the expected outcomes of a training and development program and should be prepared before the program being launched. The objectives of the programs also should focus with the purpose to improve the process, techniques and quality of work/production, reduce cost of production, and try to overcome performance deficiencies in employees. With this regard, respondents were required to respond towards these issues indicated in table, 4.4.

With regard to this part, respondents' opinions to various question items were measured at a five-point scale (1= strongly disagree; 2= disagree; 3= undecided 4= agree and 5= strongly disagree) as indicated for Table 4.4, 4.5, 4.6 and 4.7 respectively. The question items were analyzed by calculating the percentile and the mean scores. The mean score value were interpreted with the above five point scales. The chi-square test was employed to compare the mean scores of the two groups of respondent, the officials and the experts.

As it is shown in Table 4.4 item 1, about 36.0% of the respondents (51.8% of the officials and 27.9% of the experts) agreed, on the contrary, about 35.7% of the respondents (21.4% of the officials and 43.2% of the experts) disagreed; while 21.9% of the respondents (12.5% of the officials and 26.9% of the experts) were not sure; that their respective offices prepared training and development program plans. The average mean score found to be is 2.89 that both the officials and experts disagreed (with mean scores 3.27 and 2.68 respectively) that their offices prepared training and development plans for their supervisory and non-supervisory employees. The chi-square test of P-value (0.007) shows that there is statistically significant difference between the two groups of responses indicating that the officials agreed their respective offices prepared training and

development program plans to their employees, however, majority of the experts confirmed their disagreement.

**Table 4.4. Training and Development Objectives and Focuses of the Programs**

No	Items	Respondents		Respondents					Mean	Z'	P-Value
				SA	A	UD	DA	SDA			
1	My office prepared training and development program plans for its supervisor employees and managers since 1995 E.C	Officials	N	3	26	15	7	5	3.27	14.186	0.007
		Experts	N	-	29	30	28	17	2.68		
		Total	N	3	55	45	35	22	2.89		
		%		1.9	34.4	28.1	21.9	13.8			
2	The training and development objective been set before preparing and implementing the program	Officials	N	2	29	12	-	5	3.48	14.795	0.005
		Experts	N	3	46	14	22	5	3.22		
		Total	N	5	75	26	22	10	3.31		
		%		3.6	54.3	18.8	15.9	7.2			
3	The objective of the training and development programs were clearly and precisely indicated the expected outcomes.	Officials	N	7	14	9	8	-	3.63	10.693	0.080
		Experts	N	2	47	13	26	2	3.23		
		Total	N	9	71	22	34	2	3.37		
		%		6.5	51.4	15.9	24.6	1.4			
4	The main focus of the program was to introduce new methods, procedures, etc.. to employees and managers	Officials	N	8	23	7	7	3	3.54	17.335	0.002
		Experts	N	7	42	36	5	-	3.57		
		Total	N	15	65	43	12	3	3.56		
		%		10.9	47.1	31.2	8.7	2.2			
5	The main focus of the programs was to improve performance of department heads and team leaders	Officials	N	1	17	11	16	3	2.94	6.331	0.176
		Experts	N	11	36	26	19	3	3.37		
		Total	N	12	53	32	35	6	3.22		
		%		8.7	38.4	23.2	25.4	4.3			
6	The main focus of the programs was to build the capability and potentials of managers (Department heads, team, leaders, section heads, etc)	Officials	N	1	23	16	5	3	3.29	15.368	0.064
		Experts	N	18	27	30	15	-	3.55		
		Total	N	19	50	46	20	3	3.46		
		%		13.8	36.2	33.3	14.5	2.2			
7	The main focus of the programs was to improve job performance of non-supervisory employees	Officials	N	1	29	8	7	3	3.38	10.653	0.051
		Experts	N	11	34	29	13	3	3.41		
		Total	N	12	63	37	20	6	3.40		
		%		8.7	45.7	26.8	14.3	4.3			

SA = 5= Strongly Agree      UD = 3= Undecided      SDA = 1= Strongly Disagree  
A= 4= Agree                      DA=2= Disagree  
Level of significance=0.05    N (Officials) = 56    N (experts) = 104

From the above information, it is possible to conclude that officials considered all the training and development programs delivered by the various organizations were planned by their offices. However, the information gathered through interviews and document analysis proved that such practice was limited to the upper structures of the sector, the zone and the REB level. Moreover, these limited practices mainly focused to provide short-term trainings such as seminars and workshops, and it was confirmed that there were no long-term training and development program plans prepared at any office of the sector to develop or upgrade the employees.

Objectives are statements, which stated intended outcomes of training and development programs and should be prepared before the program launched. As it can be seen in Table

4.4, item 2 majority (57.9%) of the respondents, 64.4% of the officials and 54.4% of the experts respectively agreed that in the training and development programs they have attended, objectives had been set before preparing and implementing the program. Conversely, slightly less than a quarter (23.1%) of the respondents (10.4% of the officials and 30.0% of the experts) expressed their disagreement. Majority of the officials and the experts agreed at mean scores of 3.48 and 3.22 respectively. However, the chi-square test (P-value= 0.005) indicated that there is statistically significant difference between the two groups of responses indicating the training and development program objectives had been set before preparing and implementing the programs.

As it was discussed in Table 4.2.A, most of the training and development programs provided in the sector, while their objectives were set by themselves and the role of the others was adapting the materials with their local situations. Therefore, the officials considered this assumption into consideration. However, it was concluded that experts due to shortage of training materials could not get access to know about the objectives during or before the training. This indicated that in some of the programs objectives of the programs were not presented to trainees in a systematic way.

As it is observed in Table 4.4, in item 3 with regard to the clarity of and precision of the training and development program objectives in indicating the expected outcomes, the majority (57.9%) of the respondents (64.6% of the officials and 57.9% of the experts) confirmed their agreement. However, about 26.0% of the respondents (16.7% of the officials and 31.1% of the experts) expressed their disagreement. The officials at a mean score 3.63, while experts with 3.23 mean score agreed that the training and development objectives clearly and precisely indicated the expected outcomes of the program. The chi-square test (P-value= 0.080) shows that there is no statistically significant difference between the two group of responses indicating that the TD objectives clearly and precisely indicated the expected outcomes of the program. Even though, the majority of the officials and the experts agreed on the precision and clarity of training and development objectives to indicate the expected outcomes of the programs, this difference shows that majority of the officials may be underestimated the importance of setting clear and precise objectives to indicate the expected outcomes of the training or may widely use the traditional way of

training. The information gathered through interviews also supported the above idea that emphasis was given to the methodology and contents rather than objectives.

Concerning the focus of the training and development programs delivered in the sector those who had attended the programs expressed their opinions in items 5-7.

In Table 4.4 item 4 at mean scores of 3.54 and 3.57 officials and experts agreed that the main focus of the programs was to introduce new methods, procedures, etc. to employee and managers. The chi-square test ( $P\text{-value} = 0.02$ ) shows that there is a significant difference between the two groups of responses. When comparing the mean scores of the two groups of responses it seems on the same direction and almost no difference between them, however, 40% of the experts were not sure about the issue, may be they didn't attend most of the seminars or workshops. On the other hand, officials dominated most of the training programs. It seems that most of the experts could not get access on the variety of workshops or they were limited on certain trainings such as the civil service reform programs conducted around their environs. The officials especially the office heads mostly attended educational programs and human resource training and development experts during the interviews asserted their opinions that most of the training programs conducted in the sector. Therefore, the experts didn't know about these trainings.

Table 4.4, item 5 indicated the responses whether the main focus of the training and development programs were to improve the performance of department heads and team leaders. Accordingly, the majority of the respondents, officials with mean score of 2.94, and experts with mean score 3.37 agreed that the main focus of the training and development programs was to improve the performance of department heads. The chi-square test ( $P\text{-value} = 0.176$ ) indicated that there is no statistically significant difference between the two groups of responses indicating that the main focus of the training and development programs was to improve the performance of department heads.

As it was observed in Table 4.4, item 6 indicated that majority (51.4%) of the respondents (50% of the officials and 52.1% of the experts) agreed; while about 16.2% of the respondents (16.7% of the officials and 16.0% of the experts) disagreed; 32.4% of the respondents (33.3% of the officials and 31.9% of the experts) agreed that the main focus of

the training programs was to build the capability and potentials of managers (office heads, department heads, team leader). Officials and experts with mean score of 3.29 and 3.55 respectively agreed that the main focus of the training programs was to build the capability and potentials of managers, office heads and department heads and team leaders. The chi-square test ( $p$ -value= 0.064) indicated there is no statistically significant difference between the two groups of responses indicating that the main focus of the TDP was to build the capability and potentials of managers. While investigating the programs offered one of the main focuses of the programs was to build the capability and potentials of managers (office heads, department heads, and team leaders).

Table 4.4 of item 7 depicts the responses whether the main focus of the program was to improve the job performance of non-supervisory employees. Accordingly, an overwhelming majority (54.4%) of the respondents (62.5% of the officials and 50.0% of the experts) confirmed that the main focus of the programs was to improve the job performance of non-supervisory employees. Conversely, about 18.8% of the respondents (20.9% of the officials and 17.7% of the experts) disagreed that the main focus of the programs was to improve the job performance of non-supervisory employees. On the other hand, slightly greater than a quarter (26.8%) of the respondents (16.7% of officials and 32.2% of experts) commented nothing. The average score of responses was found to be 3.40 (3.38 for officials and 3.41 for experts) which is greater than the standard average mean (3.00), indicated that both group of respondents were fairly agreed that the main focus of the programs was to improve the job performance of non-supervisory employees. The chi-square test ( $P$ -value= 0.051) of the level of significance is greater than 0.05 level of significance shows there is statistically significant difference among the two groups of responses indicating that one of the focus of the TDP was improve the job performance of non-supervisory employees. Even though the majority of the officials agreed on the issue, the experts claimed that there was no adequate effort done to improve the job performance of non-supervisory employees.

#### **4.5. Selection of Trainees, Trainers and Contents**

In the process of training and development, implementation involves the selection of the content of the program, the selection of trainees, and qualified trainers, methods and facilities.

For such purposes, the existence of clear selection criteria is an important aspect in human resource training and development practices. Therefore, the study tries to assess the existence of the selection criteria for trainees and trainers, how training opportunities were offered to individuals, how trainers selected and who played a role in the selection of contents. With regard to the criteria of selection of contents and facilities of training no emphasis was given in the study because most of the contents (curriculum) of the programs were designed at federal or regional level while at the lower structure of the sector the main emphasis is given for conducting the program. The selection of facilities especially halls or classrooms was not included in this part of the study because of the fact that it depends upon the existing conditions of the locality. Therefore, the study tries to deal with the selection of trainers and contents as it was indicated above. So table 4.5 prepared for such purpose.

As it is shown in Table 4.5, item 1 respondents were asked to assert their opinions that their respective offices have clear and transparent criteria for selecting appropriate individual trainees. The majority of the respondents disagreed with a mean score of 2.67 (2.68 for officials and 2.66 for experts) that their respective offices had clear and transparent criteria for selecting appropriate individual trainees.

Information obtained through interviews with training and development experts confirmed that there were no set criteria for non-teacher employee and manager trainees for short or long term training programs. Conventional method of selection was used towards the type of training, that sometimes they used the on-the-job training selection criteria set for teacher trainees or used the criteria set by those who organized the trainings. The chi-square test ( $P\text{-value} = 0.803$ ) show that there is no statistically significant differences between the two group of responses, which implies that both groups agreed on the absence of clear and transparent selection criteria for selecting trainees in the office.

**Table 4.5: Selection of Trainees, Trainers and Contents**

No.	Items	Respondents		Respondents					Mean	$\chi^2$	P-Value
				SA	A	UD	DA	SDA			
1	My office has clear and transparent training and development selection criteria for selecting individual trainees	Officials	N	1	16	13	16	10	2.68	1.631	0.803
		Experts	N	5	24	27	27	21	2.66		
		Total	N	6	40	40	43	31	2.67		
		%		3.8	25.0	25.0	26.9	19.4			
2	The selection criteria of trainees were well communicated to all members of the office	Officials	N	1	9	16	22	8	2.52	0.752	0.945
		Experts	N	3	16	29	45	11	2.57		
		Total	N	4	25	45	67	19	2.55		
		%		2.5	15.6	21.8	41.9	11.9			
3	Training and development opportunities are usually offered to individuals as incentives	Officials	N	1	7	10	27	11	2.29	6.450	0.168
		Experts	N	5	16	32	32	19	2.58		
		Total	N	9	23	42	59	30	2.48		
		%		3.8	14.4	26.3	36.9	18.8			
4	Training and development opportunities are usually offered to appropriate individuals by concerning organizational goals	Officials	N	5	20	17	7	7	3.16	34.582	0.000
		Experts	N	-	37	6	42	19	2.59		
		Total	N	5	57	23	49	26	2.79		
		%		3.1	35.6	14.4	30.6	16.3			
5	Training and development opportunities are usually offered to individuals who had good personal relationships with their immediate supervisors	Officials	N	1	2	10	20	23	1.89	78.217	0.000
		Experts	N	11	43	40	5	5	3.48		
		Total	N	12	45	53	25	28	2.98		
		%		7.5	28.1	33.1	15.6	17.5			
6	Training and development opportunities are usually offered to individuals who have good personal relationships with the top-level managers.	Officials	N	1	3	18	24	10	2.30	69.825	0.000
		Experts	N	13	59	24	5	3	3.71		
		Total	N	14	62	42	29	13	3.22		
		%		8.8	38.8	26.3	18.1	8.1			
7	My office has clear and convincing and transparent criteria for selecting appropriate trainers.	Officials	N	1	28	17	9	1	3.4	15.477	0.004
		Experts	N	-	22	32	48	2	2.71		
		Total	N	1	50	49	57	3	2.93		
		%		0.6	31.3	30.6	35.6	1.9			
8	The selection criteria were well communicated to the candidates (trainers)	Officials	N	2	7	18	22	7	2.55	17.817	0.001
		Experts	N	-	16	61	24	3	2.87		
		Total	N	2	23	79	46	10	2.76		
		%		1.3	14.4	49.4	28.8	6.3			
9	Appropriate trainers were selected after applying and competing with others.	Officials	N	-	3	16	30	7	2.27	19.384	0.001
		Experts	N	3	24	43	29	5	2.91		
		Total	N	3	27	59	59	12	2.69		
		%		1.9	16.9	36.9	36.9	7.5			
10	Trainers were selected on the good will of top level managers	Officials	N	3	13	29	6	5	3.05	6.655	0.155
		Experts	N	11	36	48	4	5	3.46		
		Total	N	14	49	77	10	10	3.29		
		%		8.8	30.6	48.1	6.3	6.3			
11	Trainers were selected through their personal relationships with the training and development managers.	Officials	N	3	14	29	5	5	3.09	8.477	0.076
		Experts	N	9	31	47	16	1	3.30		
		Total	N	12	45	76	21	6	3.23		
		%		7.5	28.1	47.5	13.1	3.8			
12	Trainees through their representatives participated in the selection of contents.	Officials	N	1	3	20	25	7	2.39	6.721	0.151
		Experts	N	2	-	48	43	11	2.41		
		Total	N	3	3	68	68	18	2.41		
		%		1.9	1.9	42.5	42.5	11.3			
13	The office (training coordinators) selected the contents of the training programs	Officials	N	3	31	13	6	3	3.45	11.013	0.026
		Experts	N	2	46	40	16	-	3.33		
		Total	N	5	77	53	22	3	3.37		
		%		3.1	48.1	33.1	13.8	1.9			
14	The trainers selected the contents of the training program	Officials	N	1	14	15	23	3	2.77	2.620	0.623
		Experts	N	5	21	37	37	4	2.87		
		Total	N	6	35	52	60	7	2.83		
		%		3.8	21.9	32.5	37.5	4.4			

SA = 5= Strongly Agree      UD = 3= Undecided      SDA = 1= Strongly Disagree  
A= 4= Agree      DA=2= Disagree      N (Officials) = 56      N (experts) = 104  
Level of significance=0.05

As it was observed in item 2 of Table 4.5, respondents were further required to assert their opinions whether the selection criteria were well communicated to all members of their offices. An overwhelming majority (53.8%) of the respondents (53.6% of officials and 53.9% of the experts) disagreed that the selection criteria were well communicated to all members of their respective offices. However, few (18.1%) of the respondents (17.9% of the officials and 18.3% of the experts) agreed that the selection criteria were well communicated to all members of their respective offices. Slightly greater than a quarter (28.1%) of the respondents (28.6% of the officials and 27.9% of the experts) viewed that they were not sure about the issue. The average mean score of responses found to be is 2.55 (2.52 for the officials and 2.57 for the experts), which is less than the standard average score, indicated that both respondents disagreed that the selection criteria were communicated to all members of their offices. The chi-square test, (P-value= 0.945) shows that there is no statistically significant difference between the responses, both the officials and the experts agreed upon that the selection criteria were not well communicated to all members of their respective offices.

Table 4.5, item 3-8 indicated how training and development opportunities were usually offered to individuals in their respective offices.

As it is observed in item 3, majority (55.7%) of the respondents (67.8% of the officials and 49.1% of the experts) disagreed that training and development opportunities were offered to individuals as incentives by their respective offices. About 18.2% of the respondents (17.3% of the officials and 20.2% of the experts) agreed that their respective offices offered training and development opportunities were offered to individuals as incentives by their respective offices. While slightly greater than a quarter (26.3%) of the respondents (17.9% of the officials and 30.8% of the experts) were not sure of the issue.

The average mean score of respondents is found to be 2.48 (2.29 for the officials and 2.58 for the experts, is less than the standard mean (3.0), indicated that both group of respondents disagreed that training and development opportunities were offered to individuals as incentives by their respective offices. The chi-square test (P-value= 0.168) reports that there is no statistically significance difference between the two groups of

responses reported that both the officials and the experts disagreed that training and development opportunities had not been offered to employees as incentives.

Item 4 also indicated that about 46.9% of the respondents (25.0% of the officials and 48.7% of the experts) disagreed that training and development opportunities were usually offered to appropriate individuals by considering organizational goals, while, about 38.7% of the respondents (44.6% of the officials and 35.6% of the experts) agreed that training and development opportunities were usually offered to appropriate individuals by considering organizational goals. While about 14.4% of the respondents (30.4% of the officials and 5.8% of the experts) were not sure about the issue.

The average score was found to be 2.79, which is less than the standard score (3.0), indicated that the officials agreed with a mean score of 3.16 while the experts disagreed with a mean score of 2.19. Majority of the total respondents disagreed that training and development opportunities were usually offered to individuals by considering organizational goals. The chi-square test  $P\text{-value} = 0.000$  shows that there is statistically significant difference between the two groups of responses. The majority of the officials almost responded positively towards the issue because some of them played certain roles in the selection process. As it was investigated from interviews, in most cases training and development opportunities were provided to individuals by considering organizational goals. However, there were problems towards the issue such as selecting few individual employees who had no direct contact with the job. From the above information, it is possible to conclude that some times training opportunities were not offered to appropriate individuals by considering organizational goals. Immediate supervisors such as department heads and team leaders perhaps did not want to blame themselves for their actions. However, training and development experts slightly indicate the existence of such problem in their offices. Therefore, it is possible to conclude that sometimes training and development opportunities offered to individuals who have good personal relationships with immediate supervisors.

As it was indicated in Table 4.5, item 5 reported that whether training and development opportunities were usually offered to individuals who have good personal relationship with their supervisors. Slightly majority (34.2%) of the respondents (74.6% of the officials and

9.6% of the experts) disagreed that training and development opportunities were usually offered to individuals who had personal relationship with their immediate supervisors. On the contrary, about 34.1% of the respondents (4.8% of the officials and 51.9% of the experts) agreed that training and development opportunities were usually offered to individuals who had good personal relationship with their immediate supervisors. Hence, about 31.7% of the respondents were not sure about the issues.

The average mean score found to be is 2.88, which is slightly less than the standard average scores (3.00), indicated majority of the respondents disagreed on the issue. However, if we see separately the officials fairly agreed with a mean score of 3.48 and the experts disagreed with a mean score of 1.89. The Chi-square test (P-value= 0.000) also confirms that there is a significant difference between the two groups of responses that implies that the officials believed that training opportunities were usually offered to individuals who had good personal relationship with their immediate supervisors while the experts disagreed on such idea based on the information obtained from the data in some cases immediate supervisors had played a role in offering training opportunities to individuals who had good personal relationship.

With regard to the role of top-level managers in offering training and development opportunities, item 6 reports that about 47.6% of the respondents (7.2% of the officials and majority (79.2%) of the experts) agreed that training and development opportunities were usually offered to individuals who have good personal relationship with top-level managers. Conversely, about 26.2% of the respondents (60.0% of the officials and 7.7% of the experts) disagreed that training and development opportunities were usually offered to individuals who have good personal relationship with top-level managers. The remaining 26.3% of the respondents (32.1% of the officials and 23.1% of the experts) did not respond negatively or positively.

The average mean score found to be is 3.22, which is greater than the average standard mean, implies that majority of the respondents agreed that training and development opportunities were usually offered to individuals who have good personal relations with top-level managers (office heads, vice-heads, and department heads). However, chi-square test (P-value= 0.000) shows there is statistically significant difference among the two group

of responses that the officials disagreed with a mean scores 2.30 while the experts agreed with a mean scores 3.71 that training and development opportunities were usually offered to individuals who have good personal relationships with top-level managers. The interview with training and development experts revealed that with regard to short-term and long-term trainings organized by other offices sometimes good personal relationships with top-level managers is a factor to provide opportunities in some of the offices of the sector. Based on the above information it was deduced that some times training and development opportunities were offered to individuals who had good personal relationship with top-level managers.

Concerning the existence of convincing and transparent criteria for selecting appropriate trainers, Table 4.5, items 7 depicts that majority (37.5%) of the respondents (17.8% of the officials and 48.0% of the experts) disagreed that their office had clear and transparent criteria for selecting appropriate trainers. About 31.9% of the respondents (51.8% of the officials and 21.2% of the experts) agreed that their respective office had convincing and transparent criteria for selecting appropriate trainers. However, slightly greater than a quarter (28.7%) of the respondents, 29.8% of the officials and 28.1% of the experts, had no clear stand about the issue. The average mean score found is 2.93, which is slightly less than the average standard mean (3.00). This indicated that majority of respondents disagreed that their respective offices have convincing and transparent criteria for selecting appropriate trainers.

However, the information in the table indicated that majority of the officials agreed with a mean score of 3.34 while majority of the experts disagreed with a mean score of 2.71. The chi-square test ( $p\text{-value} = 0.004$ ) also indicated that there is statistically significant difference between the two groups of responses indicating that officials agreed on the existence of convincing and transparent criteria for selecting the appropriate trainees while the experts opposed it. Some of the training and development experts asserted that there was a training selection criterion manual for seminars and workshops prepared by the REB in 1990 E.C. and distributed to zone education offices but in most of the trainings and development programs it was not used by their respective offices. Some WEOs also had no such manual because most of them did not organize seminars and workshops especially

designed to their employees. From the above information it was concluded that most of the offices did not have convincing or transparent criteria to select trainers.

As it is shown in item 8, respondents, were required to give their opinions whether the selection criteria were well communicated to the candidates. Majority (49.4%) of the respondents responded that they were not sure that the selection criteria were well communicated to individuals. While about 35.1% of the respondents (51.8% of the officials and 26.0% of the experts) disagreed that the selection criteria were well communicated to individual trainer. Few (about 15.7%) of the respondents (16.1% of the officials and 15.4% of the experts) agreed the selection criteria were well communicated to trainers.

The average mean was found to be is 2.76, which is less than the average standard mean (3.0), reported that majority of the respondents disagreed that the selection criteria were well communicated to trainers. This implies that in most of the offices the selection criteria were not well communicated to individuals. The chi-square test (P-value= 001) show a statistical difference among the two groups of responses that the officials fairly agreed with a mean score of 2.55 while experts disagreed with a mean of 2.87 which exists slight variations within each group of responses as it was checked with the above item. However, it is possible to conclude that the selection criteria were not well communicated to individual trainer in most of the offices of the sector.

A table 4.5 item 9 depicts the response whether appropriate trainers were selected after applying and competing with others. Majority (41.4%) of the respondents (majority (61.1%) of the officials and 32.7% of the experts) disagreed that trainers were selected after applying and competing with others. Accordingly, 18.8% of the respondents (5.4% of the officials and 26.0% of the experts) agreed trainers were selected after applying and competing with others. While about 36.9% of the respondents (21.6% of the officials and majority of (41.3%) of the experts) were not sure about the issue.

The average mean score calculated found to be is 2.69 (2.27 for officials and 2.99 for experts) is less than the standard average score (3.0), which indicated that majority of the respondents disagreed that appropriate trainers were selected after applying and competing with others. The chi-square test (P-value= 0.001) reported there is statistically significant

difference among the responses of the two groups. That officials with mean score of 2.27 disagreed while experts disagreed with mean scores of 2.91 that trainers were selected after applying and competing with others. When comparing the mean scores they fall below the minimum standard (3.0) therefore, it is possible to conclude that in some cases trainers were selected through personal and other relationship without applying and competing with others.

Table 4.5 items 10 reported whether the selection of trainers was on the good will of top level managers. Relatively majority (48.1%) of the respondents (majority (51.8%) of the officials and 46.2% of the experts) were not sure that trainers were selected on the good will of top-level managers. About 39.4% of the respondents (28.6% of officials and 45.2% of experts) agreed that trainers were selected on the good will of top-level managers. On the contrary, few (12.6%) of the respondents (19.6% of the officials and 8.6% of the experts) disagreed that trainers were selected on the good will of respondents. The average mean score was found to be 3.29 which is greater than the standard score (3.0). Which indicated that the officials with mean score 3.05 and the experts at mean score 3.42 agreed that trainers were some times selected by the good will of top level managers. The chi-square test (P-value 0.155) which indicated there is no statistically significant difference between the two groups of responses reported that trainers were selected by the good will of top-level managers. From the above finding we can conclude that in some of the offices in the sector, some times trainers were selected by the good will of top level managers.

As it is depicted in Table 4.5 item 11 respondents were further requested to identify their opinions whether trainers were selected through their personal relationships with the training and development managers/ experts. Relatively majority (47.5%) of the total respondents (more than half of the officials and 45.2% of the experts) were not sure that trainers were selected through their personal relationship with training and development managers/experts. About 35.6% of the respondents agreed that trainers were selected through their personal relationships with the training and development managers/ experts. In contrast, a few (16.9%) of the respondents (17.8% of the officials and 16.4% of the experts) disagreed that trainers were selected through their personal relationships with the training and development managers/experts.

The average mean was found to be 3.23 (3.09 for officials and 3.30 for experts) is greater than the standard mean (3.00) which reported that majority of the respondents disagreed that trainers were selected through their personal relationship with training and development managers/ experts. The chi-square test 0.076 indicated there is no statistically significant difference among the responses of the two groups of respondents indicating that trainers were selected through their personal relationship with training and development managers or experts. From the above information we can conclude that in most cases trainers were selected through their personal relationships with training and development managers or experts.

As it was shown earlier in Table 4.2.B most of the training and development programs were designed and organized by the REB and RCBB and most of which were initially designed by the federal ministries and later adopted and localized according to the existing current situations in the region. Most of the contents of the programs took the local situations. However, for these similar programs and others designed at the various levels of the sector the study emphasized on the issue who selected the contents of the training and development programs rather than who designed the curriculum and what criteria used for selection.

Table 4.5 items 12-14 indicated that at office level who selected the training and development program contents which were offered since 1995 E.C.

Accordingly, item 12 reported that majority (53.8%) of the respondents (majority (57.1%) of the officials and 41.9% of the experts) disagreed that trainees were participated in the selection of contents. 42.5% of the respondents (35.7% the officials and 46.2% of the experts) were not sure that trainees were participated in the selection of contents. While very few (about 3.8%) of the respondents agreed that trainers participated in the selection of contents. The average mean found to be is 2.41 (2.39 for officials and 2.41 for the experts), which reports that majority of respondents disagreed that trainees were participated in the selection of contents.

The chi-square test (P-value= 0.151) is greater than the 0.05 level of significance which reported that there is no statistically significant differences among the two groups of

responses implies that trainers didn't participate in the selection of the training programs. Based on the above information we can conclude that usually trainees did not participate in the selection of the contents of the training and development programs.

Table 4.5 items 13 depicted the opinion of respondents whether their respective offices (training coordinators/experts) selected the contents of the training and development programs. Accordingly majority (51.2%) of the respondents (60.8% of the officials and 46.1% of the experts) agreed that the office (training coordinators) selected the contents of the training and development programs. Relatively the second majorities (33.1%) of the respondents (23.2% of the officials and 38.5% of the experts) were not sure that the office/training coordinators/selected the contents of the training and development programs. In the contrary, few (15.7%) of the respondents disagreed that the office training coordinators) selected the contents.

The average mean found to be is 3.37 indicated that majority of the respondents agreed that the office (training coordinators) selected the contents of the programs. The chi-square test ( $P\text{-value}=0.026$ ) shows that there is statistically significance difference among the responses of the two groups. That both the officials and the experts agreed with mean scores 3.45 and 3.33 respectively that official and experts agreed that their offices (training coordinators) selected the contents of the training programs. According to the interviews most of the time the training coordinators didn't play significant role in the selection of the training programs because the contents were selected by the federal ministries such as MOE and MCB. Like wise the same contents with a certain degree of adaptation towards the local situations will be used in the training and development programs conducted at regional, zonal and woreda level. For civil service reform programs the CB offices at the various levels select the contents. However, since 1998 E.C. the ZED and WEO to a certain extent select the contents of the training and development programs. With regard to other professional programs their respective offices selected the contents. Therefore, it is possible to conclude that some times the office/training coordinators/ selected the contents depending on the nature of the programs.

Table 4.5, item 14 also depicted the responses whether the trainers selected the contents of the training and development programs or not. Relatively majority (41.9%) of the

respondents (46.5% of the officials and 39.4% of the experts) disagreed that trainers selected the contents of the training and development programs. However, about a quarter (25.7%) of the respondents (26.8% of the officials and 25.0% the experts) agreed that trainers select the contents of the training and development programs. On the other hand, about 21.9% of the respondents (25.0 of the officials and 20.2% of the experts) replied that they were not sure. The average mean score found to be is 2.83, which indicated that majority of the total respondents fairly agreed that trainers did not select the contents of the programs.

The Chi-square test (P-value= 0.263) shows there is no statistically significant difference among responses indicating that the trainers didn't select the contents of the training programs. Therefore, depending on the above information it is possible to conclude that trainers didn't select the contents of the programs but played a role in sequencing them during the delivery of the program.

#### **4.6. Delivery Methods of Training and Development Programs**

As it was previously mentioned in the review of the related literature, training and development methods are the means by which the designed programs are put into effect. Each training and development method has its own features. Training and development can take place either on-the-job or off the job and can be delivered through a variety of techniques. Training and development activities should start when new employees join the organization regardless of their past experience due to organizations have their own unique internal environment. Therefore, in this part of the study, an attempt was made to investigate whether induction/orientations programs were conducted in the office, what type of delivery system existed and what were the methods used in the training and development programs offered in the sector.

Table 4.6.A, items 1-8 reports the information towards the delivery of orientation/induction programs in the various offices of the sector.

As it was observed in Table 4.6.A, in item 1, respondents were requested to respond whether their respective offices arranged or prepared orientation/induction programs to the new recruited employees and for existing employees who hold new positions. An

overwhelming majority (61.4%) of the respondents (62.5%) of the officials and (65.5%) of the experts) disagreed that orientation/induction programs were organized to the new recruits and existing employees who hold new positions. About a quarter (25.0%) of the respondents (23.2% the officials and 26.0% of the experts) agreed that orientation/induction programs were organized. However, few (13.1%) of the respondents (14.3% of the officials and 12.5% of the experts) were not sure about the issue. The average score calculated found to be is 2.53 (2.41 for officials and 2.60 for experts), which is less than the average standard mean (3.0), reports that majority of the respondents disagreed that orientation/induction programs were arranged to new recruits and new job holders.

**Table 4.6A. Induction or Orientation Programs**

No	Items	Respondents		Respondents					Mean	$\chi^2$	P-Value
				SA	A	UD	DA	SDA			
			5	4	3	2	1				
1	Induction/ orientation/ programs were formally arranged to new recruit employees and existing employees who hold new positions towards their job	Official	N	1	12	8	23	12	2.41	7.006	0.136
		experts	N	3	24	13	56	8	2.60		
		Total	N	4	36	21	79	20	2.53		
		%		2.5	22.5	13.1	49.4	12.5			
2	Formal orientation programs were arranged to new employees with their immediate supervisors and other members of the office	Official	N	3	21	3	18	11	2.77	9.9191	0.042
		experts	N	5	35	21	35	8	2.94		
		Total	N	8	56	24	53	19	2.80		
		%		5.0	35.0	15.0	33.1	11.9			
3	Classroom lectures were used as a method of orientation	Official	N	-	10	7	29	10	2.30	2.774	0.596
		experts	N	2	20	12	59	11	2.45		
		Total	N	2	30	19	88	21	2.40		
		%		1.3	18.8	11.9	55.0	13.1			
4	Communicating through written directives was used as a method of orientation	Official	N	2	29	12	8	5	3.27	7.586	0.108
		experts	N	3	42	16	36	7	2.80		
		Total	N	5	71	28	44	12	3.08		
		%		3.1	44.4	17.5	27.5	7.5			
5	Sending individuals to other offices or institutes was used as a method of orientation	Official	N	-	10	22	14	10	2.57	12.046	0.017
		experts	N	3	24	24	45	8	2.70		
		Total	N	3	34	46	59	18	2.66		
		%		1.9	21.3	28.8	36.9	11.3			
6	Supervisors/senior persons in each section in the office are co-operative in giving work guides on challenging jobs	Official	N	-	36	10	5	5	3.38	12.761	0.005
		experts	N	-	44	12	28	20	2.77		
		Total	N	-	80	22	33	25	2.98		
		%		-	50.0	13.8	20.6	15.6			
7	The cooperativeness of supervisors or senior persons in giving work guides was because of the institutional culture and norm of the office	Official	N	1	30	15	9	5	3.16	9.216	0.111
		experts	N	3	32	31	30	8	2.86		
		Total	N	4	62	46	39	13	2.97		
		%		2.5	38.8	28.8	24.4	8.1			
8	The cooperativeness of supervisors or senior persons in giving work guides was because of their good personality	Official	N	-	4	28	19	5	2.55	1.226	0.747
		experts	N	-	9	51	39	5	2.62		
		Total	N	-	13	79	58	10	2.59		
		%		-	8.1	49.4	36.3	6.3			
9	The management gave much attention to manpower training to improve performance of employees	Official	N	-	10	2	35	9	2.23	22.060	0.060
		experts	N	-	3	24	49	28	2.02		
		Total	N	-	13	26	84	37	2.09		
		%		-	8.1	16.3	52.5	23.1			

SA = 5= Strongly Agree      UD = 3= Undecided      SDA = 1= Strongly Disagree      N(officials) = 56      N(experts) = 104  
A= 4= Agree      DA=2= Disagree  
Level of significance=0.05

The chi-square test ( $P$ -value= 0.136) is greater than 0.05 level of significance which implies that there is no statistically significant difference among the two groups of responses indicating that no formal induction orientation programs were organized. From the above data it is possible to deduce that there was no any formal induction/orientation program organized to new recruit employees or for those new job holders due to transfer or promotion in contrast to the suggestion of Prasad and Bannaraje (1985: 104-105).

As it is seen in Table 4.6.A, item 2, relatively majority (45.0%) of the respondents (51.7% of the officials and 41.4% of the experts) disagreed that their respective offices arranged orientation programs. On the other hand about 40% of the respondents (42.9% of the officials and 38.5% the experts) agreed that orientation programs were arranged. However, few (15%) of the respondents (5.4% of the officials and 20.2% of the experts) were not sure about the issue. The average mean calculated is 2.88 (2.77 for officials and 2.94 for experts) which is less than the expected average mean (3.0), which implies that majority of respondents disagreed that their respective offices arranged formal orientation programs for new employees towards their immediate supervisors and all other members of the office. The chi-square test ( $P$ -value= 0.042) which confirm there is statistically significant difference among the responses of the two groups implies that majority of the officials agreed that their offices arranged orientation programs, but the experts disagreed with such assumptions. Most of the time orientation with their immediate supervisors (team leaders or department heads) would be done but regarding to orientation with the other members of the office, individuals by themselves through their social relation or work relations accomplished it. So, it can be concluded that orientation programs had not been arranged to new employees with other members of the office.

As it is observed in Table 4.6.A, in item 3, regarding to their respective offices utilization of lectures as methods of orientation (induction) to the new recruit employees and for other employees who hold new positions, an overwhelming majority (68.1%) of the respondents (majority of officials 69.7% and also majority of experts (67.3%)) disagreed that their respective offices used lectures as methods of orientation to new employees and existing employees who hold new positions (jobs). While about 20.1% of the respondents agreed that their respective offices used lectures as method of orientation (induction). However,

descriptions, certain manuals and directives were given to new employees. However, it was not widely used in the sector as a whole due to shortage of duplicated materials.

Table 4.6.A item 5 reported that relatively majority of the respondents (majority of the officials (42.9%) and majority of the experts (51.0%) disagreed that their respective organizations used sending individuals to other offices as a method of orientation (induction) to new employees and others who hold new positions/jobs. Whereas slightly less than a quarter (23.2%) of the respondents (17.9% of the officials and 26.0% of the experts agreed that their offices sending individuals to other offices as a method of orientation (induction) while more than a quarter (28.8%) of the respondents (39.3% of the officials and 23.1% of the experts were not sure about the issue.

The average score found to be is 2.66 (2.57 for officials and 2.70 for experts) which is less than the average expected score (3.0) implies that majority of the respondents disagreed that sending individuals to similar institutions (offices) was used as a method of orientation (induction) to new employees and for other employees who were promoted or transferred to new (other) positions/jobs. The chi-square test (P-value= 0.017) there is statistically significant difference between the two groups of responses indicating that the officials expressed that individuals had not been send to other institutions as method of inductions but the experts agreed partially on the application of such technique in their offices. From the above information it was deduced that sending individuals to other similar institutes was not used as a method of orientation.

As it is shown in Table 4.6.A, item 6 indicated the opinion of respondents whether supervisors and senior persons in each section were cooperative in giving work guides on challenging jobs to others. Accordingly, majority (50%) of the respondents (64.3% of the officials and 42.3% of the experts) believed supervisors and/or senior persons in their sections were cooperative in giving work guides on challenging jobs. Conversely, about 36.2% of the respondents (17.8% of the officials and 46.1% of the experts) expressed their disagreement. Few (about 13.8%) of the respondents (17.9% of the officials and 11.6% of the experts) did not comment it. The average mean of respondents is 2.98 (3.38 for officials and 2.77 for experts) which is slightly less than the standard average mean (3.0). indicated that the officials agreed at mean score of 3.38 while the expert disagreed at mean score

cooperativeness in giving work guides on challenging jobs did not adequately (widely) used as an institutional culture but was seen as boss-subordinate relationship.

As it was indicated in table 4.6.1, item 8, with regards to the attribution of good personality of supervisors' and senior persons' cooperativeness in giving work guides for challenging jobs majority (49.4%) of the respondents (50% of the officials and 49% of the experts were not sure about the issue. While about 42.6% of the respondents (42.9% officials and 42.3% experts) confirmed their disagreement. Very few (8.1%) of the respondents (7.1% of the officials and 8.7% of the experts) expressed their agreement.

The average mean score was found to be is 2.59 (2.55 for officials and 2.62 for experts) which is less than the average standard mean (3.0) indicated that majority of the respondents disagreed that supervisors or senior persons in each section were cooperative in giving work guides on challenging jobs due to their personality.

The chi-square test ( $P\text{-value} = 0.747$ ) confirmed that there is no statistically significant difference among the responses of the two groups implies that the cooperativeness of supervisors/senior persons to give work guides did not attributed to their good personality. The findings of the above information revealed that those supervisors and senior persons' (section heads, team leaders and other experienced employees) cooperativeness in giving work guides for challenging jobs rarely attributed to their good personality.

As it is depicted in Table 4.6.A, in item 9 respondents asserted their opinions towards the attention paid by their management to manpower training to improve poor performance of employees. Accordingly, an overwhelming majority (75.6%) of the respondents (78.6% of officials and 74.0% of the experts) did not believe that their management gave much attention to manpower training to improve the poor performance of employees. Very few (8.1%) of the respondents (17.9% of the officials and 2.9% of the experts) agreed that their management gave much attention to manpower training to improve the poor performance of employees. While few (16.3%) of the respondents (3.6% of the officials and 23.1% of the experts) respond nothing.

The average mean found to be 2.09 (2.23 for officials and 2.02 for experts) is less than the average standard mean (3.00) which indicated that majority of the respondents disagreed

that their management gave much attention to manpower training to improve poor performance of employees.

The Chi-square test (P-value= 0.060) which confirms that there is no statistically significant difference among the distribution of responses of the two groups implies that management did not give much attention to manpower training to improve the poor performance of employees. Based on information obtained from the above data the management did not give much attention to manpower training to improve poor performance of employees. As compared with the existence of performance problems of employees adequate efforts were not made against it.

**Table 4.6.B. Techniques and ways of TDPs**

No	Items	Respondents		Respondents					Mean	$\chi^2$	P-Value
				SA	A	UD	DA	SDA			
				5	4	3	2	1			
1	Scholarship abroad is used as a technique of HRTD by the office	Officials	N	-	4	20	15	17	2.20	6.862	0.076
		Experts	N	-	7	29	49	19	2.23		
		Total	N	-	11	49	64	36	2.22		
		%	-	6.9	30.6	40.0	22.5				
2	In-service program for employees was used as a technique of TD by the office	Officials	N	-	17	3	30	6	2.55	14.523	0.200
		Experts	N	-	19	27	53	3	2.61		
		Total	N	-	36	30	83	9	2.51		
		%	-	22.8	19.0	52.5	5.7				
3	Learning formal education in higher education is used as a technique of TD by the office	Officials	N	-	10	8	35	3	2.45	10.752	0.013
		Experts	N	-	37	24	41	2	2.92		
		Total	N	-	47	32	76	5	2.76		
		%	-	29.4	20.0	47.5	3.1				
4	Coaching technique is most often used in the office as method of TD	Officials	N	1	44	6	4	-	3.76	31.570	0.00
		Experts	N	-	37	25	37	3	2.94		
		Total	N	1	81	31	41	3	3.23		
		%	0.6	51.6	19.7	26.1	1.9				
5	Mentoring technique is most often used in the office as a method of TD	Officials	N	-	29	15	6	6	3.23	5.374	0.251
		Experts	N	3	50	37	10	4	3.37		
		Total	N	3	79	52	16	10	3.31		
		%	1.9	49.4	32.5	10.0	6.3				
6	Job-rotation technique is most often used by the office as method of TD	Officials	N	-	6	13	29	8	2.30	2.852	0.415
		Experts	N	-	19	28	48	9	2.55		
		Total	N	-	25	41	77	17	2.46		
		%	-	15.6	25.6	48.1	10.6				
7	Sharing ideas among employees used as a technique of TD in the office	Officials	N	2	37	6	5	6	3.43	10.110	0.039
		Experts	N	4	43	21	23	13	3.02		
		Total	N	6	80	27	28	19	3.16		
		%	3.8	50.0	16.9	17.5	11.9				
8	Case study method was used during TD programs	Officials	N	-	22	3	19	4	2.90	13.654	0.003
		Experts	N	-	21	24	42	3	2.70		
		Total	N	-	43	27	61	7	2.77		
		%	-	31.2	19.6	44.2	5.1				
9	Lecture method was used during the TD programs	Officials	N	-	35	1	11	1	3.46	17.905	0.081
		Experts	N	3	6	19	5	3	3.61		
		Total	N	3	41	20	16	4	3.56		
		%	2.2	68.8	14.5	11.6	2.9				
10	Management games method was used during TD programs	Officials	N	-	13	13	18	4	2.73	10.081	0.182
		Experts	N	-	21	10	56	3	2.54		
		Total	N	-	34	23	74	7	2.61		
		%	-	24.6	16.7	53.6	5.1				
11	Role playing method was used during the TD programs	Officials	N	2	3	11	15	17	2.13	42.215	0.080
		Experts	N	-	40	7	43	-	2.97		
		Total	N	2	43	18	58	17	2.38		
		%	1.4	31.2	13.0	42.0	12.3				
12	Conference method was used during the TD programs	Officials	N	4	32	4	8	-	3.67	10.338	0.076
		Experts	N	13	65	10	2	-	3.99		
		Total	N	17	97	14	10	-	3.88		
		%	12.3	70.3	10.1	7.2	-				
13	Computer-based training method was used during the TD programs	Officials	N	5	20	1	15	15	2.73	3.270	0.514
		Experts	N	11	29	5	37	21	2.77		
		Total	N	16	49	6	52	36	2.73		
		%	10.1	30.8	3.8	32.7	22.6				
14	The delivery methods of TD used were convenient	Officials	N	-	37	2	6	3	3.52	11.404	0.022
		Experts	N	1	50	20	17	2	3.34		
		Total	N	1	87	22	23	5	3.41		
		%	0.7	63.0	15.9	16.7	3.6				

SA = 5= Strongly Agree

A= 4= Agree

Level of significance=0.05

UD = 3= Undecided

DA=2= Disagree

SDA = 1= Strongly Disagree

N(officials) = 56 N(experts) = 104

Table 4.6.B, items 1-13 indicated what off- the-job training and development methods were used in the sector. Accordingly, item 1 reported the responses whether their respective offices and the main office (REB) used scholarship abroad as the off-the-job methods of training. Majority, (62.5%) of the respondents (57.2% of the officials and 65.4% of the experts) disagreed that their respective offices used scholarship as off-the-job training and development method. About 30.6% of the respondents (35.7%) of the officials and 27.9% of the experts were not sure about it, very few (6.9%) of the respondents believed that their respective offices used scholarship abroad as the off-the-job training and development method. The average mean was found to be 2.22 (2.20 for officials and 2.23 for experts) is less than the average standard mean, which implies majority of the respondents disagreed that their respective offices (the main office) used scholarship abroad as off-the-job training and development method.

The chi-square test (P-value= 0.076) indicated there is no statistically significant difference among the two groups of responses, implies that scholarship abroad had not been used a method of training in the sector. Based on the information obtained from the above data, the document analysis and interviews, scholarship abroad is not as one of the main off-the-job training and development methods widely used because it is costly and the programs were out of the responsibility of the sector offices, which is under the authority of the RCBB and MOE. Like other sector offices scholarship opportunities, education sector employees can get the chance through competition. However, in the selection process education sector office heads had a great influence in offering the opportunity.

Table 4.6.B, item 2, also depicts that whether in-service programs were used as a off-the-job training and development techniques in their respective offices to train and develop employees and officials. Majority (58.2%) of the respondents (64.3% of the officials and 54.9% of the experts) disagreed that their offices used in-service training programs as off-the job training and development technique. About 22.8% of the respondents (30.4% of the officials and 18.6%the experts) believed that their offices used in-service training program for training individual employees and managers. While about 19.0% of the respondents replied “no response”. The average mean score found to be is 2.59 (2.55 for officials and 2.61 for experts) which is less than the standard mean score (3.0) indicated that majority of

education in higher institutions had not been mainly practiced their offices. From the above information we can conclude that attending formal education in higher education was rarely used as off-the-job training and development technique. The interview with the experts also revealed that there is no organized, systematic and adequate effort done to train and develop non-teacher employees on such technique. Those offices that had funding organization used the opportunity better than others. The information collected through document analysis reveals the same fact that various offices sponsored individuals to learn in higher education institutes when they applied after having their access to the colleges/universities.

As it was depicted in Table 4.6.B, in item 4-7 respondents were asked which of on-the-job training, and development techniques were most often applicable in their respective offices. Accordingly item 4 indicated the responses towards coaching technique. An overwhelming majority of the respondents (81.8% of the officials and 36.3% of the experts) agreed that coaching technique was the most often applicable in their offices. However, about 28.0% of the respondents (7.3% of the officials and 39.2% of the experts) expressed their disagreement. While about 19.7% of the respondents (10.9% of the officials and 24.5% of the experts) were not sure about the issue. The average mean score found to be is 3.23 (3.76 for officials and 2.94 for experts), that officials agreed at the mean score of 3.76 while majority of the experts disagreed with the mean score 2.94. The average mean score shows that majority of the respondents agreed with a mean score of 3.23 that coaching technique was the most often applicable on-the-job training and development method in their respective offices. The chi-square test ( $P\text{-value} = 0.000$ ) indicated that there is statistically significant difference between the responses of the two groups indicating that officials argued on that their offices used coaching as one of the methods of training but the experts refused it accept such explanation. According to the information observed in the above data, coaching techniques is the most often applicable on-the-job training and development method, not systematically applied as a method in line with ideas Suggested by Graham (1989: 23) but as one of the process of work. Most often it was used as the boss-subordinate work relationship because in some cases the subordinates were more experienced than their bosses.

As it was observed in Table 4.6.B, in item 5 respondents indicated their opinions with regards to the mentoring technique of on-the job training and development. Accordingly, majority (51.3%) of the respondents (51.8% of the officials and 51.0% of the experts) agreed that mentoring technique was the most applicable technique of on-the-job training and development method in their respective offices. However, few (16.3%) of the respondents disagreed. While about 32.5% of the respondents (26.8% of the official, and 35.6% of the experts) were not sure about it. The average mean score found to be is 3.31 (3.20 for officials and 3.37 for experts) which is greater than the average standard score (3.0), reported majority of the respondents agreed that mentoring technique was one of the techniques used as on-the-job training and development method in their respective offices. The chi-square test ( $P$ -value= 0.251) shows that there is no statistically significant difference among the two groups of responses indicating that mentoring is one of the applicable on-the-job training and development method. From the above information it is possible to conclude as proposed by Bhattan and Washington (2003: 212-13) and Gomez-Moija, Balkin and Cardy (1995: 341), that mentoring was one of the applicable on-the-job training and development methods in their respective offices. However, it is mainly depended on the willingness of individuals and through their personal relationship.

In Table 4.6.B, in item 6 respondents were asked to respond whether job-rotation technique of on-the-job training and development was one of the most applicable in their office. Accordingly, an overwhelming majority of the respondents (66.1% of the officials and 54.9% of the experts) expressed their disagreement. Few (15.6%) of the respondents (10.7% of the officials and 18.3% of the experts) agreed that job-rotation technique was most applicable in their offices. However, about a quarter (25.6%) of the respondents (23.2% of the officials and 26.9% of the experts) were not sure about it. The average score to be found is 2.46 (2.30 for officials and 2.55 for the experts) which indicated that majority of the respondents disagreed that job-rotation was the most applicable techniques used in their offices. The chi-square test ( $P$ -value= 0.415) reported there is no statistically significant difference among the two group of responses implies that job rotation method had not been in their respective offices as a training or development method. From the above data it was observed that job-rotation technique was not widely used. The interviews also confirmed that this technique was not widely used by their offices, due to the new

adjustment programs and the result oriented appraisal system which enabled employees and managers to concentrate towards their specifically job rather than job-rotation.

As it was observed in Table 4.6.B, in item 7 respondents also indicated their opinions whether sharing ideas among employees was a technique of on-the-job training most often applicable in their offices. Accordingly, majority (53.7%) of the respondents (69.7% of the officials and 45.1% of the experts) believed it was one of the most applicable method. On the contrary, a little more than a quarter (29.4%) of the respondents (19.6% of the officials and 34.6% of the experts) expressed their disagreement. However, few (16.9%) of the respondents (10.7% of the officials and 20.2% of the experts) replied no response. The average mean was found to be is 3.16 (3.43 for officials and 3.02 for experts), is greater than the standard average mean (3.0), reported that majority of the respondents agreed that sharing ideas among employees was a technique of on-the-job training and development which was most often applicable in their offices. The chi-square test (P-value= 0.039) indicated that there is statistically significant difference among the two group of responses implies that according to majority of the officials sharing ideas with employees was one of the most often applicable method of training however, experts opposed this idea. Based on the above information it is possible to deduce that sharing ideas was one of the most often applicable techniques of on-the-job training and development methods in the sector.

With regard the methods used in the training and development programs offered since 1995 E.C. in Table 4.6.B, item 8, respondents asserted their opinions relating to the question.

Accordingly in Table 4.6.B, item 8 concerning case study method, about 31.2% of the respondents (45.8% officials and 23.3% experts) agreed that in the training and development programs which they had attended case study method was used. While about 19.6% of the respondents (6.3 of the officials and 26.7% of the experts) replied that they were not sure. On the other hand, of the respondents (48% of officials 50% of experts) expressed their disagreement. The average mean score obtained through calculation is 2.77 (2.90 for officials and 2.70 for experts), which is greater than the standard mean (3.0), reported that majority of the respondents disagreed that case study method was not widely used. The chi-square test of the level of significance (P-value= 0.003) indicated that there is statistically significant difference between the two groups of responses implies that to a

training had not been used during the program. However, this idea is supported by majority of the officials and less than 50% of the experts. Based on the above information it was concluded that management game method of training was not used in most of the training and development programs due to characteristics of the trainings.

As it was shown in item 11 of Table 4.6.B, it was asked whether role playing method was used during the training programs. An overwhelming (50.7%) of the respondents (55.2% of the officials and 47.8% of the experts) disagreed that role play method of training and development was used. About 40.2% of the respondents agreed that role play method of training was used. The remaining of the respondents of the officials and of the experts were not sure about issue. The average mean score found to be is 2.76 (2.45 for officials and 2.97 for experts), which is less than the average standard mean (3.0), indicated that majority of the respondents disagreed that role play method of training and development used during the programs conducted. The chi-square test of significance (P-value 0.060) shows that there is no statistically significant difference between the two groups of responses indicating that role playing had not been applied during the TDPs delivered. However, from the above information it is possible to conclude that role play method of training was not adequately used during the training and development programs conducted since 1995 E.C.

Regarding to the application of conference method of training Table 4.6.B, in item 12 depicts that an overwhelming majority (86.6%) of the respondents (75.0% of the officials and 86.6% of the experts) agreed that conference method of training was used in most of the training and development programs. Conversely, very few (7.2%) of the respondents (16.7% of the officials and 2.2% of the experts) expressed their disagreement. However, about 10.1% of the respondents (8.3% of the officials and 11.1% of the experts) were not sure about the issue. The average mean score found to be is 3.88, (3.67 for officials and 3.99 for experts) is greater than the average standard mean, which indicated that majority of the respondents agreed that conference method of training and development method was used during the programs delivered. The chi-square test (P-value= 0.076) shows that there is no statistically significance difference between the two groups of responses indicating the application of conference method of training during the programs. Based on the above information it was concluded that conference method of training was widely used during the programs delivered.

#### **4.7. The Practice of Evaluating Training and Development Programs**

As it had been discussed in the review of the related literature evaluating training and development programs is one of the crucial issues in HRTD. Now a days, experts and officials attended a number of training and development programs designed or arranged for education sector employees and officials by their own offices or other organizations. However, regardless of who designed/arranged the programs, evaluating the benefits of trainings is an important aspect. So organizations evaluated the training and development programs they had delivered from the very beginning towards its effects on the trainees. Based on such assumptions respondents were requested to indicate their opinions towards the practices of their respective offices.

One of the important issues in the process of implementing and evaluating the training and development programs in keeping the records of the programs. Concerning this in Table 4.7 item 1, about 35.6% of the respondents (26.8% of the officials and 40.4% of the experts) disagreed that their respective offices kept records of all training and development programs. While the remaining 35.6% (35.7% of the officials and 35.6% of the experts) commented nothing and about 28.8% of the respondents (37.5% of the officials and 24.0% of the experts) confirmed their agreement to the issue. The average calculated mean of the item is 2.90 (the officials agreed with mean score of 3.07 while the experts disagreed with mean score of 2.81). which indicated that majority of the respondents disagreed that the office kept all records of all training and development programs. The chi-square test ( $P\text{-value} = 0.008$ ) confirms the existence of statistically significant difference between the two group of response. However, through interviews with the training experts and the document analysis it was discovered that most of the offices had no well organized system of keeping records of all trainings, seminars, workshops, conferences etc. in contrast to the ideas suggested by Gomez-Mejia, Balkin and Cardy (1995: 297-298).

As it is shown in Table 4.7, in item 5 respondents were also required to respond whether evaluation was practiced during the end of the programs. accordingly, about 41.3% of the respondents (50.1% of the officials and 36.6% of the experts) did not accept that the practice of evaluating training and development programs were conducted during the end of the program. However, about 34.1% of the respondents (29.2% of the officials and 36.7% of the experts) were not sure, while 26.4% of the respondents (20.8% of the officials and 26.7% of the experts) responded positively. Where as, the average mean score calculated is 2.79 (2.65 for officials and 2.87 for experts), shows that majority of the respondents did not believe that evaluation of training programs conducted during the end of the course of the program. The chi-square test (P-value =0.479) confirms that both groups agreed that evaluations had not been conducted during the end of the course of the programs.

From the interviews with the training experts it was discovered that rarely feedbacks were collected through formats. From the above information it would be fair to conclude that most of the time there was no practice of evaluation training and development programs at the end of the programs to collect feedbacks.

With regard to the availability of formal assessment format in their offices or during the programs, to collect feedbacks from individual trainees, in item 6, majority (48.6%) of the respondents (52.1% of the officials and 46.6% of the experts) expressed their disagreement towards the existence of formal assessment format in their office or during the training programs. While 29.7% of the respondents (22.1% of the officials and 33.3% of the experts), confirmed the existence of formal assessment format in their offices. While about 21.7% of the respondents (25% of the officials and 20% of the experts) prefer to comment nothing. Furthermore, the average mean of the respondents is 2.73 (2.56 for the officials and 2.82 for experts) revealed that majority of the respondents agreed that in most of the offices of the sector there was no formal assessment format to collect feedbacks of the trainings. The chi-square test (P-value= 0.046) shows that there is slightly significant differences among the two group of responses. Hence, the information obtained from interviews confirmed that there was an assessment format in some of their offices, however, most of the time they didn't use it to evaluate the programs.

As it is observed in table 4.7, in items 7-11, respondents were required to indicate their opinions on how training and development programs of the office evaluated.

With regard to the existence of the practice of each department/section or team/ in conducting group discussion with individuals after having completed a training program, (Table 4.7, item 7 reported the following. Majority (50.7%) of the respondents (70.8% of the officials and 40.0% of the experts) expressed their disagreement that each department/section or team/conducted discussions with individuals having completed a training program. About 31.9% of the respondents (18.8% of the officials and 38.1% of the experts) did not agreed and comment nothing. While about 17.4% of the respondents (10.4% of the officials and 21.1% of the experts) confirmed that each department conducted group discussions with individuals having completed training. Furthermore, the average mean score calculated 2.62 (2.31 for officials and 2.78 for experts) indicated majority of the respondents disagreed that each department (sector or team) conducted group discussions with individuals having completed training programs. The chi-square test (P-value= 0.004) indicated there is a significant difference between the two group of responses. However, interviews with training experts confirmed that such practice was not adopted in their respective offices.

Concerning to the evaluation of training and development programs in terms of reaction changes, Table 4.7 item 8 reported that majority (45%) of the respondents (53.6% of the officials and 40.3% of the experts) disagreed that training and development programs were evaluated in terms of reaction changes. While 35.0% of the respondents (26.8% of the officials and 39.4% of the experts) responded nothing, on the other hand the remaining 20% of the respondents (19.7% of the officials and 20.2% of the experts) confirmed the existence of such practice. The calculated average mean is 2.53 (2.55 for officials and 2.51 for experts) indicated that majority of the respondents disagreed that training and development programs were evaluated in terms of reaction changes in the office. The chi-square test (P-value= 0.000) indicated that there is statistically significant difference between the responses of the two groups. Majority of the officials responded negativity towards the issue because they knew that their offices didn't evaluate the training and development programs in terms of reaction changes.

As it was indicated in Table 4.7, items 9-11 majority of the respondents both the officials and experts with mean scores 2.67, 2.70, 2.58 respectively confirmed their disagreement that training and development programs had been evaluated in terms of changes in work behavior and to prove the achievements of learning objectives and their office had a scheme to evaluate the outcomes of TDP.

#### **4.8. Major Problems/Constraints to Prepare and Implement HRTDP**

As it had been mentioned in chapter two, many organizations would face major constraints (problems) to undertake HRTDP. Among these are the attitudes of managers, financial, material and human resource problems and others. In this part of the study respondents were asked to identify the major constraints/problems faced by their respective offices to prepare and implement effective and efficient HRTDP for its employees.

As it is observed in Table 4.8 respondents were required to indicate the major constraints faced by their respective offices to prepare and implement training and development programs to employees. Majority of the respondents indicated their response. According to the responses the percentages of 15 problems (factors) or constraints were ranked corresponding to the percentage of both group of response in the table. Accordingly, some of the basic constraints include low attention paid by top-level management towards the importance of upgrading employees through long-term training (85.7%), absence of TDNA practices (82.1%), low attention paid to the importance of on-the-job training (78.6%), attitude of managers towards the importance of professional development of non-teacher employees(76.8%), lack of adequate budget (71.1%), absence of transparent and clear long-term training and development directives to upgrade individuals (67.9%), lack of attention towards induction programs(67.9%), and low attention paid by managers to development their subordinates on their jobs (67.9%), were ranked from 1<sup>st</sup> to 8<sup>th</sup> in ascending order (except items 3, 6 and 12 which had similar ranks)of the main constraints to prepare and implement TDPs, based on the response of the officials.

**Table 4.8: Major Problems/Constraints for Preparing and Implementing TDPs**

No	Item	Responses						D(r1-r2)	D <sup>2</sup>
		Officials (56)			Experts (104)				
		N	%	Rank	N	%	Rank		
1	Lack of adequate budget	40	71.1	5	86	82.7	3.5	1.5	2.25
2	Absence of transparent and clear short-term training and development directives (guidelines)	36	64.3	10	84	80.8	5.5	-4.5	20.25
3	Absence of transparent and clear long-term training and development directives to upgrade individuals	38	67.9	7	92	88.5	1	6	36.0
4	Low attention paid by top level management towards the importance of upgrading individual employees through long-term training	48	85.7	1	87	83.7	2	-1	1.0
5	Attitude of managers towards the importance of professional development of non-teacher employees	43	76.8	4	84	80.8	5.5	-1.5	2.25
6	Lack of attention towards the importance of induction/orientation programs to new recruits and new position holders	38	67.9	7	86	82.7	3.5	3.5	12.25
7	Low attention paid to the importance of on-the-job training other than short-term off-the-job training	44	78.6	3	78	75.0	8	-5	25.0
8	Absence of technical and managerial capability in conducting training and development programs	23	41.1	15	67	64.4	10	5	25.0
9	Absence of refresher training and development courses	37	66.1	9	65	62.5	11	-2	4.0
10	Absence of training and development needs assessment practices	46	82.1	2	79	76.0	7	-5	25.0
11	Shortage of training facilities	30	53.6	11.5	54	52.0	14	-2.5	6.25
12	Low attention paid by managers (heads, team leaders) to develop their subordinates on their job	38	67.9	7	74	71.2	9	-2	4.0
13	Absence of systematic human resource planning and utilization in the office	29	51.8	13	57	54.81	13	0	0
14	Absence of clear and transparent human resource training plan	30	53.6	11.5	64	61.5	12	-0.5	0.25
15	Abdicating responsibility of development to staff	28	50.0	14	37	35.6	15	1	1.00

rs ( Spearman's rank Order correlation coefficient ) = 0.701 ED<sup>2</sup> = 164.5 level of significance = 0.05 (2-tailed)

While absence of transparent and clear short-term training and development directives (88.5%), low attention paid by top-level management towards the importance of upgrading individual employees through long-term training (83.7%), lack of adequate budget (87.7%), lack of attention to arrange induction program (82.7%), absence of transparent and clear short-term training and development directives (80.8%), attitudes of managers towards the importance of professional development of non-teacher employees (80.0%), absence of TDNA (76.0%) and low attention paid to the importance of on-the-job training (75.0%), were ranked from 1<sup>st</sup> to 8<sup>th</sup> in ascending order (except item 1 and 6 and items 2 and 5 which had similar ranks) of the main constraints to prepare and implement TDPs based on the responses of the experts.

The two groups of responses ranking order also had differences except item 13. The Spearman's rank of order correlation coefficient test ( $r_s=0.701$ ) of the item revealed that there is a strong and positive correlation between the ranking of the two group of responses. Some of the problems were similar to the problem cited by Mathis and Jackson (1997:326) in the review of the related literature.

**Table 4.9: Problems Observed in the TDPs Delivered in SNNPRS Education Sector**

No	Item	Responses						D= $r_1-r_2$	D <sup>2</sup>
		Officials (48)			Experts (90)				
		No	%	R	N	%	R		
1	Low attention paid by top-level management	24	42.9	10.5	48	53.3	5	5.5	30.25
2	Lack of adequate budget	29	51.8	5	47	52.2	7	-2	4
3	Shortage of qualified trainers	18	32.1	16	21	23.3	23	-7	49
4	Allocation of insufficient time for trainings	30	53.6	3	45	50.0	10	7	49
5	Inadequate preparation	24	42.9	10.5	12	13.3	31.5	21	441
6	Absence of training and development institutes	12	21.4	24	6	6.7	34	10	100
7	Inadequacy or absence of training and development needs assessment	29	51.8	5	52	57.8	4	1	1
8	Shortages (lack) of training facilities	18	32.1	16	17	18.9	26.5	-9.5	90.25
9	Inadequacy of professional development courses	7	12.5	30	13	14.4	29.5	0.5	0.25
10	Inadequacy of professional courses	7	12.5	30	13	14.4	29.5	0.5	0.25
11	Lack of technical and managerial capability in conducting training and development programs	6	10.7	32	46	51.1	9	23	529
12	Problems of keeping records of all training and development programs	10	17.9	25	29	32.2	19	6	36
13	Keeping training programs secretive	3	5.4	33.5	12	13.3	31.5	2	4
14	Absence of evaluation of training programs	32	57.1	1.5	67	74.4	1	0.5	0.25
15	Absence of evaluation of development programs	14	25	20.5	23	25.6	21	-0.5	2.5
16	Shortage of trainings of trainers and development programs	24	42.9	10.5	31	34.4	18	-7.5	56.25
17	Lack of participatory approach in designing training programs	16	28.6	18.0	39	43.3	12.5	5.5	30.25
18	Absence of planning long-term training programs	14	25.0	20.5	28	31.1	20	0.5	0.25
19	Selection of inappropriate trainees	19	33.9	14	47	52.2	7	7	49
20	Selection of inappropriate facilities	8	14.3	27	17	18.9	26.5	0.5	0.25
21	Delay of calls for training	13	23.3	23	21	23.3	23	0	0
22	Imbalance between payments and current costs	18	32.1	16	36	40.0	16	0	0
23	Irrelevance of contents	3	5.4	33.5	9	10.0	33	0.5	0.25
24	Repetition of the same program	14	25.0	20.5	37	41.1	15	5.5	30.25
25	Shortage of training materials	24	42.9	10.5	39	43.3	12.5	-2	4
26	Low understand and efforts of trained individuals to train others	26	46.4	8	47	52.2	7	5.5	30.25
27	Absence of an organized system which force individuals to reuse the training materials the as institutional property to train others	32	57.1	1.5	53	58.9	3	-2	4
28	Turn over of trained individuals from office and to other position	29	51.8	5	59	65.6	2	-7	49
29	Frequent civil service structural adjustments affects individuals to use their training on their job	14	25	20.5	41	45.6	11	7	49
30	Abdicating responsibility for development to staff	21	37.5	13	32	35.6	17	21	441
31	Shortage of training and development Aids	7	12.5	30	16	17.8	28	10	100
32	Problem of selecting appropriate time and environment	8	14.3	27	21	23.3	23	1	1
33	Large class size	27	48.2	7	38	42.2	14	-9.5	90.25
34	Low attention of participants to attend in house cost training and development programs	8	14.3	27	20	22.2	25	0.5	0.25

$r_s$  (Spearman's rank Order correlation coefficient) = 0.740 ED<sup>2</sup> = 1497.75 level of significance = 0.05 (2-tailed)

As it was observed in Table 4.9 respondents were required to indicate the problems observed towards the TDPs delivered in the SNNPRS education sector. Based on the

responses obtained the percentages of 34 factors or problems were ranked corresponding to the percentage of both group of responses in table 4.9. Accordingly, absence of evaluation of training programs (57.1%), absence of an organized system which forced individuals to reuse the training materials as institutional property to train others (57.1%), allocation of insufficient time for trainings (53.6%), lack of adequate budget (51.8%), inadequacy or absence of training and development needs assessment (51.8%), turn over of trained individuals from office and to other positions (51.8%), large class size (48.2) and low understanding and efforts of trained individuals to train others (46.4%), low attention paid by top-level management (42.9), inadequate evaluation (42.9) and absence of training programs (42.9) were ranked from 1<sup>st</sup> to 11<sup>th</sup> in ascending order \*except items 14 and 27; 2,7 and 28; items 1,5 and 25 of some of the major problems observed towards the TDPs delivered based on the responses of the officials.

On the other hand, absence of training program (74.4%), turn over of trained individuals from office and to other positions (65.6%), absence of an organized system which forced individuals to reuse the training materials as institutional property to train others (58.9%), inadequacy or absence of training and development needs assessment practices (57.8%), low attention paid by top-level management (53.3%), lack of adequate trainees (52.2%), selection of in appropriate tartness (52.2%), low understanding and efforts of trained individuals to train others (52.2%), lack of technical and managerial capability in conducting TDPs (51.1%) allocation of insufficient time for trainings (50.0%) and frequent civil service structural adjustment (45.6%) were ranked from 1<sup>st</sup> to 11<sup>th</sup> in ascending order (except items 29 and 26 which had equal ranks) of some of the major problems observed towards the TDPs delivered based on the responses of the experts.

The ranking order of the two groups of responses also had variations except items 21 and 22. Therefore, Spearman's Rank order correlation coefficient test was employed to test whether there is correlation between the ranking of the two groups. Spearman's rank of correlation coefficient was found to be 0.740, which indicated that there is strong and positive correlation in the ranking of the two groups at 0.05 level of significance. Low attention paid by top-level management, lack of adequate budget, allocation of insufficient time for training, inadequacy or absence of TDNA, absence of evaluation of training programs, low understanding and efforts of trained individuals to train others, absence of organized system which force individuals were among the first eleven serious problems observed towards the TDPs delivered as indicated by

the two groups. Some of these problems were in line with the problem cited by Mathis and Jackson (1997:326), Getahun (1990:6-9) and Getachew (1998:16-20).

#### 4.9. Possible Suggestions Forwarded by Respondents

Providing certain recommendations (suggestions) for the problems observed towards HRTDPs is a crucial issue. Therefore, it is important to gather first hand information from the respondents. So, based on such assumption the respondents provided the following suggestions.

**Table 4.10 Possible Suggestion of Respondents**

		Responses						D(r <sub>1</sub> -r <sub>2</sub> )	D <sup>2</sup>
		Officials (56)			Experts(104)				
		N	%	R	N	%	R		
1	Emphasis should be given to employee training and development	50	89.3	3	86	82.7	3	0	0
2	Training policy should be formulated	46	82.1	5	85	81.7	4	1	1
3	The offices should have clear and transparent selection criteria for selecting trainers and trainees.	54	96.4	1	96	92.3	1	0	0
4	Allocating sufficient budget for training programs	52	92.9	2	87	83.7	2	0	0
5	Needs assessment should be conducted	48	85.7	4	84	80.8	5	1	1
6	Training of trainees should be arranged at regional level	44	78.3	6	80	75.5	6	0	0
	<b>Total</b>							<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>

rs = Spearman's rank order correlation =0.943 ED<sup>2</sup>=2 n=6 level of significance = 0.05 (2-tailed)

As it was observed in Table 4.10 respondent, were required to suggest some possible recommendations towards the TDPs in the sector. Based on the responses obtained the percentages of 6 major assumptions were ranked corresponding to the percentages of both group of responses in Table 4.10. Accordingly, the offices should have clear and transparent selection criteria for selecting trainers and trainees (96.4%), allocating sufficient budget for training programs (92.9%) emphasis should be given to employee training and development (89.3%), needs assessment should be conducted (85.7%) training policy should be formulated (82.1%), and trainings of trainers should be arranged at regional level (78.3%) were ranked from 1<sup>st</sup> to 6<sup>th</sup> according to the responses of the officials.

On the other hand, the suggestions, the offices should have clear and transparent selection criteria for trainers and trainees (92.3), allocating sufficient budget for training programs (82.7%), emphasis should be given to employee training and development (83.7%), training policy should be formulated (81.7%), needs assessment should be conducted (80.0%) and training of trainers should be arranged at regional level (75.5%) ranked from 1<sup>st</sup> to 6<sup>th</sup> according to the responses of the experts.

The ranking order of the two groups has similarities in items 3, 4, 1 and 6 which ranked 1<sup>st</sup>, 2<sup>nd</sup>, 3<sup>rd</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup>. On the other hand there were variations in ranks towards items 2, and 5. Spearman's rank order correlation coefficient test was employed to test whether there is correlation between the ranking of the two groups. Spearman's rank order correlation coefficient was found to be 0.943 which indicated that there is very strong and positive correlation in the ranking of the two groups at 0.05 level of significance. The offices should have clear and transparent selection criteria for selecting trainers and trainees, allocating sufficient budget for training programs, emphasis should be given to employee training and development, training policy needs assessment should be conducted, training policy should be formulated, and trainings of trainers should be arranged at regional level were recommended by both group of respondents towards the TDPs offered in the education sector of SNNPRS. There were similar with the recommendations forwarded by Getachew (2005:22) and Getahun (2005:22-23).

## CHAPTER FIVE

### SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter deals with the major findings, conclusion and recommendations forwarded based on the findings.

#### 5.1 Summary

The main purpose of this study is to assess the HRTD practices that have been carried out in the education sector offices of SNNPRS in training and developing their administrative/managerial employees. It also attempted to find out those factors that have been negatively affecting such practices, there by, suggest possible solutions /recommendations on how to provide effective and efficient HRTDP in the education sector of SNNPRS. To this effect, the study had attempted to provide answers to the following basic questions.

1. How often are training and development needs assessed in the offices of the education sector of SNNPRS?
2. What were the objectives and focus areas of training and development programs?
3. What were the selection criteria for trainees, trainers and contents?
4. What methods and ways of human resource training and delivery system have been used in the different offices of SNNPRS education sector?
5. How were human resource training and development programs evaluated in the offices of SNNPRS?
6. What were the challenges or problems encountered in implementing effective and efficient human resource training and development programs?

The study had employed descriptive survey method and it was conducted in 34 offices (REB, ZEDs, WEOs and TAEOs) of the education sector of SNNPRS. The instruments used were questionnaires, interview and documentary analysis. Experts and officials, who had three years and above services in their respective offices responded to the questionnaire, whereas the interviews were conducted with training experts of the above mentioned offices. The questionnaire covered the responses of fifty-six officials and one

hundred and four experts of REB, ZEDs, WEOs and TAEOs. Similarly the interview covered eighteen training experts from REB, ZEDs, WEOs and TAEOs.

In addition to the questionnaires and interview documentary analysis was used as a secondary source for the study. The raw data secured through questionnaire using SPSS, were analyzed and interpreted using percentages, weighted mean, spearman's rank order correlation coefficients and statistical test, such as chi-square. According to the results of data presentation and analysis, the major findings of the study are presented as follow.

1. Regarding personal characteristics of the respondents, it was found that majority (98.8%) of the officials and 97.1% of the experts were males revealing that the participation of females in these positions in the sector was low. Most of the officials and experts have adequate qualification in relation to the required jobs. However, the existence of diploma and TTI graduates in the sector indicated that there is a need for upgrading them in the future. Majority of the respondents (78.2%) were in the age range 3-5 years in their current positions. However, most of them had long- years experience (greater than 11 years) of total service years in the sector.
2. Concerning conditions under which training and development programs were carried out it was found out that all of the respondents confirmed that short-term training or development programs were provided in the sector. About 86.9% of the respondents (76.8% of the officials and 92.3% of the experts replied that their office didn't provide any long-term programs). Long-term programs were rarely provided to employees when training opportunities were given as quotas by the MOE (AAU –EdPM), RCBB, and when teacher candidates were insufficient. Moreover, there was no any long-term on-the-job training or development program provided in the sector.
3. Regarding organizing designing training programs it was found out that majority (53.6%) of those who attend training and development programs (64.9% of the officials and 47.8% of experts) participated in the programs organized by REB. The second, third and fourth, majority of respondents attended the programs organized by RCBB, ZCBB, WCBB, ZED and WEO.

4. Concerning types of programs delivered, it was found out that, of those who attend short term training programs about 4.3% of them (10.4% of the officials and 1.1% of the experts) joined Educational study tour abroad. While there was no any one who attended formal education program abroad. Whereas attending formal education through distance education or learning in higher education found at a lower level. Relatively emphasis is given to short-term programs such as seminars, workshops and conferences.
5. Regarding contents of the programs delivered it was found out that the contents of civil service reform programs (Result oriented appraisal system, business process reengineering, service delivery) ranked first, followed by gender and HIV/AIDS education, with 71.4% officials and 81.73% of the experts participation respectively. Civic and ethical education ranked a third group followed by reform on the quality of education. Main emphasis was given to civil service reform program contents than others and no emphasis was given to technical skill development.
6. Concerning the inclusion of HRTD plans with strategic plans, it was discovered that the offices' HRTD plans were not included in the strategic plans.
7. With regard the status of the practice of training and development needs assessment it was found that most of the offices of the sector didn't conduct training and development needs assessment. That there was no systematic needs assessment conducted in most of the offices of the education sector.
8. Regarding the practice of HRTD plans, it was found that according to majority of the respondents their respective offices prepared short-term training and development plans for their supervisory and non-supervisory employees. However, there were no long-term training and development program plans prepared at any office of the sector to develop or upgrade the employees.
9. Concerning objectives of the HRTDP delivered, it was found out that majority (57.9) of the respondents, 64.4% of the officials and 54.4% of the experts respectively confirmed that in the training and development programs, they have attended; objectives had been set before the preparation and implementation of the program. However, in some of the programs objectives were not presented to trainees in a systematic way.

10. Regarding focus of training and development programs it was found out that majority of the officials and 40% of the experts believed that the main focus of the programs was to introduce new methods, procedures, etc. to employees and managers. Majority of the respondents also asserted that the main focus of the training and development programs was to improve the performance of department heads, to build the capability and potentials of managers and improve the job performance of non-supervisory employees but there was no adequate effort done, to improve the job performance of non-supervisory employees.
11. With regard to the selection of trainees, trainers and contents it was found out that majority of the respondents agreed on the absence of clear and transparent selection criteria for selecting trainees and trainers. However, training and development opportunities offered to individuals who have good personal relationships with immediate supervisors and top-level managers. In most of the offices of the sector the findings also indicated that appropriate trainers were not selected by applying and competing with others.
12. Regarding the arrangement of orientation programs the findings of the study revealed that an overwhelming majority (61.0 %) of the respondents, confirmed that there was no any formal induction /orientation program organized to new recruit employees or for those new job/position holders. To a certain extent offices used written directives as a method of orientation. In some offices of the sector job descriptions, certain manuals and directives were given to new employees as a method of orientation. However, it was not widely used.
13. Concerning the cooperativeness of individuals to give work guides on challenging jobs, the findings also revealed that supervisors or senior persons didn't show their cooperativeness. There was no strong organized system in the sector to create such system and it was not widely used as an institutional culture but as a boss – subordinate relationship.
14. Concerning the practices of off-the-job training and development it was discovered in the findings that scholarship abroad had not been used. Majority of the respondents confirmed that in-service training and development is rarely used as off –the- job

training and development technique. Administrative/managerial employees were allowed to compete in the absence of sufficient teachers candidates in the training opportunities quotas offered and if MOE provided opportunities in the field of educational planning and management. The findings of this study also revealed that attending formal education in higher education institutes rarely used as off – the – job training and development technique. There is no organized, systematic and adequate effort done to train and develop non- teacher employees on such technique.

15. With regard to on-the-job training and development techniques employed it was found that coaching technique was the most often applicable on – the- job training and development method, however, it did not systematically applied as a method but as one of the work relationship. Most of the respondents confirmed that mentoring was one of the applicable on-the- job training and development methods in their respective offices. However, it was mainly depended on the willingness of individuals and determined through their personal relationship. Majority of the respondents also confirmed that job rotation technique was not widely used by their offices due to the new structural adjustment programs and the result-oriented appraisal system, which enabled employees and managers to concentrate towards their own job. On the other hand, sharing ideas was one of the most often applicable techniques of on-the-job training and development method in the sector.
16. Concerning the methods of presentation in which the programs delivered were, it was found out that in most of the programs case study method was not used widely. Management game, role-playing and computer based methods of training also had not been used. Most of the respondents also confirmed that lecture and conference methods were mostly used.
17. Concerning keeping records of TDP and the practice of evaluating the TDP delivered; it was found that most of the offices had no well organized system of keeping records of all training and development programs delivered and majority of the respondents also confirmed that there were no systematic practices of evaluating the training and development programs conducted in most of the offices of the sector.

18. Regarding the constraints to arrange and implement TDP, the findings of the study also revealed that among the major constraints /problems/in the sector to prepare and implement training and development programs some of them were; low attention paid by top-level management towards the importance of upgrading individual employees through long-term training, absence of clear and transparent long-term training and development directives to up-grade individuals, attitudes of managers towards the importance of professional development for non-teaching employees, lack of adequate budget, absence of training and development needs assessment experience, lack of attention towards the importance of education/orientation programs to new recruits and job/position holders and low the attention paid to on-the-job training other than short-term off-the-job.
19. Concerning the major problems observed during the TDP delivered it was found out that majority of the total respondents believed that the following were some of the observed problems during the training and development programs delivered absence of evaluation of training programs, turn over of trained individuals from office and other positions, absence of an organized system which force individuals to reuse training materials as institutional property to train others, absence (inadequacy) of training and development needs assessment, lack (shortage) of adequate budget, allocation of insufficient time for trainings, low initiative ness/effort of trained individuals to train others, low attention paid by top-level management for on-the-job training and long-term training in the sector, selection of inappropriate trainees, and large class size and absence of clear and transparent TDP directives.
20. Concerning the possible suggestions of the respondents it was found out that 78.3-96.4% of the officials and 75.5-92.3% of the experts recommended the offices should have clear and transparent selection criteria for selecting trainers and trainees, allocating sufficient budget for training programs, emphasis should be given to employee training and development, training policy needs assessment should be conducted, training policy should be formulated, and trainings of trainers should be arranged at regional level as solutions towards the problems of preparing and implementing TDPs.

## 5.2. Conclusions

The following conclusions were drawn based on the findings of the research and the review of the related literature.

Training and development programs had been organized for the sector without conducting systematic training and development needs assessment. Furthermore, in prioritizing needs low attention was given to trainers' capability and level of motivation. Moreover, in most of the sector offices, there was no practice of planning of training and development programs for educating non-supervisory employees and officials. Any offices of the sector had not prepared especially long-term training and development plans. While most of the TDP delivered had objectives that were set by the TDP designing and organizing bodies (offices) without the participation the stakeholders. Though, these objectives didn't realize the objective realities of the various offices.

In some of the programs, objectives hadn't been presented to trainees in a systematic way and main concern was given to methods and contents rather than objectives. The main focus of the programs were to introduce new methods, procedures, directives, etc to employees and managers and experts and the performance of managers and experts but there was less emphasis given to improve the performance of non-supervising employees. There were no systemic, clear and transparent selection criteria to select trainees and trainers. In most cases trainees and trainers were selected through their personal relationship with top-level manages (officials) and training managers.

At all levels much emphasis had been given to short-term off-the-job training and development programs, such as seminars, workshops and conferences. However, no attention had been paid to arrange orientation programs, and to train officials and experts through on-the-job techniques. Also there hadn't been long-term off-the job trainings and development programs designed and delivered.

Keeping records of the training and development programs had not been organizationally adopted. There was also no practice of evaluating the training and development programs delivered at its different stages and in terms of changes towards the work behavior and reaction. The training and development programs were constrained by some factors such as

low attention paid by top level management towards long-term training and development, absence of clear and transparent directives, lack of budget, absence of training and development needs assessment. Where as some of the major problems observed during the training and development programs included; absence of evaluation practices, turnover of individuals from office, absence of organized system which force individuals to reuse the training materials as institutional property.

### **5.3 Recommendations**

Based on the findings and conclusions of the study the following recommendations are suggested.

1. The purpose of TDP is directed to fill the gap that existed what is being done and what should have been done and build the capability and potentials of individuals for better future performance. Training and development programs could meet their intended objectives if and only if they are based on a systematic training and development needs assessment. Therefore, to avoid wastages of human, material, financial and time resources and the duplication of efforts, in the education sector, training and development needs assessment has to be carried out in a systematic way. Individuals should identify their needs, different mechanisms of collecting information used by employing organizational, job (task) and person analysis.

- At regional level, the sector analysis should be conducted (including REB).
- At zone level, the zonal analysis should be done (including ZED)
- At woreda level, the woreda level (including WEO and TAE0) analysis should be carried out.

Furthermore, these efforts at the various levels should be integrated and coordinated jointly in a systematic way to have a simple and economical or cost-effective designing and implementation of training and development programs.

2. HRTD plans directed the efforts of the offices to train and develop its human resources. Conducting TDP without HRTD plan led to wastage of resources and failure to meet the objectives of the programs and organizational goals. Therefore, it is recommend that at the various offices of the sector, HRTD plans should be prepared or designed for administrative/managerial employees and be included in the strategic plans. Depending

on the manpower and the financial capacity of the various offices' long- term and short-term training and development programs should be planned. To avoid duplication and wastage the annual plans of the sector should be discussed and approved with the consent of the various office representatives.

3. To achieve the desired goals of the training and development programs objectives should be clear and precise to indicate the expected outcomes and these objectives should have presented in a systematic way to the trainees. Therefore, at the various levels of the education sector in delivering training and development programs, training objectives should be clear and precise to indicate the expected outcomes and be presented in a systematic way to the trainees, and should be based on the objective reality.
4. TDPs have different focuses to realize the intended objectives. Therefore, due to the diversified problems faced by the education sector, in designing TDPs the offices should focus to build the capability and potentials of individuals for better future performance.
5. The absence of clear and transparent selection criteria (directives) for trainees and trainers paved the way for training and top-level managers to select trainers and to offer training and development opportunities based on their personal relationships and good will. However, this hampered the morals and initiatives of others. On the other hand, such practices affected the performance of the offices to meet their goals. Therefore, it is recommended that each office should have clear and transparent criteria to select trainees and trainers that govern every body in the office irrespective of his/her status so , at sector level the REB should develop TDP directives, concerning short-term or long-term programs, with the participation and approval of ZEDs, WEOs and TAEOs with certain accountability and responsibility. The approved directives should also be disseminated to all offices and be well communicated to all members of the offices and trainers to select the appropriate trainees and trainers. Moreover, training and development opportunities should be offered to appropriate trainees in the office and appropriate trainers should be selected to provide effective and efficient TDP.
6. Participating the stakeholders in the selection of TDP contents contributed for joint actions to solve the problems that should be addressed through training. Therefore, it is

recommended that individuals through their representatives should participate in the selection of the contents because it enables them to meet their training and development needs.

7. Even though, the TDP contents delivered had certain relationship with the jobs of the trainees, however, there is a need of professional or technical TDP from the side of the employees because most of the employees didn't attend such programs. Therefore, it is recommended that professional/ technical TDP should be organized if possible at the various levels to upgrade the employees and such TDP should be conducted timely and should also focus on introducing new technologies and procedures.
8. Reliance on short- term off- the- job TD methods costs finance, material, time and labor on the other hand neglecting on- the- job system of delivery had impacts on the performance of individual employees and the organization in general. Therefore, it is recommended that the various offices of the sector should provide on- the- job TDP for their employees to reduce cost and increase their performance such activity should be institutionalized and be sustainable.
9. The absence of induction programs reduced the motivation and performance of new employees and in the education sector such; programs were neglected as methods of training. Therefore, it is recommended that induction programs should be arranged and delivered to new employees and their respective offices should institutionalize new position holders before they had started to perform their jobs and such system. It is also recommended that short formal orientation programs should be arranged with the other members of the office to create easy communication in the office.
10. It is not possible to suggest that TDP could meet their intended objectives with the absence of evaluation practices towards their significance and outcomes. Therefore, it is recommended that the various offices of the sector should have a scheme to evaluate the TDP at different stages in relation to the cause of the programs and in terms of reaction changes, work behaviors, achievements of learning objectives and outcomes or effects such system should also be institutionalized. With regard to the time frame, the offices should use the appropriate time of evaluation depend on the nature of TDPs.

11. Some of the major constraints to prepare and implement TDPs for non teacher employees and official included in general the attitudes of managers, lack of sufficient budget, absence of clear and transparent criteria for selection and absence of set directive as guidelines towards any type of TDP. Therefore, it is recommended that:
- At sector level awareness creation workshop should be organized towards the significance of TDPs for top-level managers and for those who will be appointed before they start their jobs.
  - Consensus should be reached through regional meetings towards long-term training, professional development and on-the-job training and development programs.
  - Clear and transparent selection criteria for trainers and trainees and TDP directive should be set with the consent and approval of all stakeholders (office heads).
  - Since the financing of education was decentralized each office should prepare its own HRTD plan and allocate adequate budget depend on its financial capability. To reduce the cost of TDP discussions should be held between ZED and WEOs and ZEDs and REB. To reduce their financial burdens the offices should prepared their HRTD plans and search for support from donor agencies or other sources. Training of trainers (TOT) programs should be organized and using the offices' available resources to reduce the financial costs of trainings.
  - The frequent civil service structural adjustment programs in the sector had contributed to a certain extent for wastage of trainings and to the absence of a systematic human resource planning and utilization in the office. Therefore, it was recommended that in conducting such programs the offices should have exercises systematic human resource planning and utilization.
  - To solve the problems of skilled manpower, TOT programs should be organized to build the capacity of the offices.
12. Some of the major problems observed during the TDP delivered in the sector included absence of evaluating practices, wastage of trainings due to turnover of individuals, absence of organized system to reutilize the training materials as institutional property, allocation of insufficient time for training and development programs, unwillingness of trained individuals to train others, low-attention given by top-level mangers, the selection of inappropriate trainees, large class-size, shortages of training materials,

absence of participatory approach in designing training and development programs and shortage of training of trainers programs were among the problems observed during the TDP delivered. Therefore, to alleviate these problems and provide solutions the following main points are recommended.

- The offices should adopt a systematic way to evaluate the TDP starting from preparation to the process and end of the programs.
- In most cases those who knew their transfer or promotion to other positions or offices should not participate the TDP because it would be wastage. Therefore, they must delegate others who will stay in that position to participate the program. Moreover, a system of responsibility and accountability should be established against the wastage of TDP, the selection of inappropriate trainees and trainers and unwillingness to disseminate trainings.
- Most of the individual trainees considered the training material they obtained as their personal property and did not use it for the dissemination of training and development programs. Therefore, in the sector a system should be established in using such materials as institutional property to train and develop others.
- Based on the nature of contents of TDP, the availability of financial and others resources, it is recommended that adequate time should be allocated.
- If it is possible, based on the financial and other resources capacity of the offices, to solve problems of shortages of training materials the offices should allocated sufficient budget and duplicate the copies of these materials.
- To provide efficient and affective training the offices should participate representatives of employees/officials from each unit or department in designing TDP.

## Bibliography

- Andargachew Tasfaye (1973). *The Training and Development of Manpower for the Social service in Ethiopia*. The University of Michigan. Phd Thesis.
- Armstrong, Michael (2001). *A Handbook of Human Resource Management Practice* (8<sup>th</sup> ed.). London: Kogan Page Limited.
- Armstrong, Pat and Dawson Chris (1985). *People in Organization*. London: Elm Publications.
- Aswathappa, K. (2002). *Human Resource and Personal Management* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). New Delhi: Tata McGraw Hill Pub. Ltd.
- Bhatta, Gambhir and Sally Washington (2003) "Hand Up. Mentoring in the New Zealand Public Service" *Public Personnel Management*. Vol. 32, No. 2, pp. 211-227.
- Bratten, Jonhn and Jeffery Gold (1999). *Human Resource Management: Theory and Practice* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Hampshire: Macmillan.
- Campagna, Francesco (1998). "Program Implementation and Monitoring" in Procopenko Joseph (ed.). *Management Development: A Guide for the profession*. Geneva: International Labour office.
- Cartwright, Roger et al (1993). *Managing People. A Competence Approach to Supervisory Management*. Oxford: Black Well Publishers.
- Chandan, J.S. (1995). *Management: Theory and Practice*. New Delhi: Vikas Publishing House.
- Clark, Andre (2000). *Organizations, Competition and the Business Environment*. New York: Prentice Hall.
- Crocker, Olga. L. (1986). *Experimental Exercises in Canadian Personnel Administration*. Toronto: Methuen.
- Davar, Rustoms S. (1994). *Personnel Management and Industrial Relations* (10<sup>th</sup> ed.). Bombay: Vikas Publishing House Pvt. Ltd.
- Flippo, Edwin B. (1984). *Personnel Management* (6<sup>th</sup> ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- French, Wendell L. (1987). *The Personnel Management Process: Human Resource Administration and Development*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co.

- Getachew Minas (1998). "Human Resource Management in the Ethiopian Public Sector" in Senait Seyoum and Alemayehu Seyoum (ed.) *Human Resource Development in Ethiopia: Proceedings of the Seventh Annual Conference on the Ethiopian Economy*. Addis Ababa: AAU Press.
- Getahun Hailu (1990). "Identification of training Needs in industry Especially Training for productivity" *Proceedings of the Seminar on Manpower Development for Industry*. Addis Ababa: Addis Ababa University- Ministry of Industry Cooperation Programmer pp.1-23 (Unpublished)
- Glueck, William F. and T. Milkovich (1982). *Personnel: A Diagnostic Approach* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). Plano Business Publications, INC.
- Gomez-Mejia, Louis R., David B. Balkin and Robert L. Cardy (1995). *Managing Human Resources*. Englewood Cliff: Prentice Hall.
- Graham, H.T. (1984). *Human Resource Management* (4<sup>th</sup> ed.). Plymouth: McDonald and Evans Ltd.
- Griffin, Ricky W. (2000). *Fundamentals of Management: Core Concepts and Applications*. Chennai: All India Publishers and Distributors Regd.
- Gross, David (1996). *Principles of Human Resource Management*. London: Mackays of Chatham PLC.
- Haileselassie Woldegerima (1999). *Human Resource Management: Modules*. AAU (unpublished).
- Harris, David M. and Randy L. DeSimone (1994). *Human Resource Development*. Fort Worth: Dryden Press.
- Harrison, Rosemarry (2000). *Employee Development* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). London: the Cromewell Press.
- Heneman, Herbert, Donald P. Schwab, John A. Fossum and Lee D. Dyer (1996). *Personnel/Human Resource Management* (4<sup>th</sup> ed.). New Delhi: Universal Book Stall.
- Holt, David H. (1993). *Management: Principles and Practices*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Ivancevcih, John M. and William F. Glueck (1989). *Human Resource Management* (4<sup>th</sup> ed.) Boston: Richard D. Irwin, Inc.

- Kefyalew Alemu (1990) "Needs Assessment". *Proceedings of the Seminar on Manpower Development for Industry*. Addis Ababa: Addis Ababa University- Ministry of Industry Cooperation Programmer pp.1-23 (unpublished)
- Kenney, John, Eugene Donnelly and Margaret Reid (1983). *Manpower Training and Development: An Introduction* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). London: George Harap and Co. Ltd.
- Kerrigan John E. and Jeff S. Luke (1987). *Management Training Strategies for Developing Countries. Studies in Development Management*. Colorado: Lynne Rienner Publishers.
- Kirkpatrick, Donald L. (2000). *Evaluating Training Programs: The Standard Handbook of Training Design and Delivery*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Lin, Carol Y.Y. (1997). "Human Resource Management in Taiwan: A Future Perspectives" *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*. Vol. 8, No. 2, pp. 29-42.
- Mabey, Christopher, Graeme Salamn and John Storey (1998). *Strategic Human Resource Management: A Reader*. London: SAGE Publication Ltd.
- Mamoria, B.C. and Pareek, V. (1980). *Personnel Management*. Bombay: Himalya Publishing House.
- Mathis, Robert. L. and John H. Jackson (1997). *Human Resource Management* (8<sup>th</sup> ed.); Minneapolis: West Publishing Co.
- MCB (2005). Training Need Assessment in selected Rural Woredas. Addis Ababa (Unpublished)
- Megginson. Leon C. (1981). *Personnel Management: A Human Resource Approach*. Homewood: Richard D. Irwin, Inc.
- Melaku Dires (2004). "The Practice and Problems of Human Resource Training and Development in Some Federal Ministries in Ethiopia." A.A.U: MA Thesis (Unpublished).
- Milkovich. George T. and John W. Bourdea (1991). *Human Resource Management* (6<sup>th</sup> ed.). Boston: Richard D. Irwin, Inc.
- Mitchell, Terence B. (1982). *People in Organizations. An Introduction to Organizational Behavior* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

- Mitchell, Terence R. (1982). *People in Organizations: An Introduction to Organizational Behavior* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed). New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.
- Monappa, Arun and Mirza Saiyadain (1999). *Personnel Management* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). New Delhi: Tata McGraw-Hill Publishing Company.
- Mondy, R.W. et al (1999). *Human Resource Management* (7<sup>th</sup> ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Newell, Helen and Harry Scarbrough (2002). *Human Resource Management in Context*. New York: PALGRAVE.
- PHRDP Office (1996). *Education Sector Review: Ethiopia Social Sector Studies, Synthesis and Summary*. Addis Ababa: Commercial Printing Enterprise.
- Pinnington, Ashley and Tony Edwards (2000). *Introduction to Human Resource Management*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Prasad, Lallan and Bannerjee (1985). *Management of Human Resources*. New Delhi: Sterling Publishers Private Limited.
- Ramasamy, T. (2003). *Principles of Management* (5<sup>th</sup> ed.). Mumbai: Himalya Publishing House.
- Rao, P. Subba and VS.P. Rao (2000). *Personnel Human Resource Management*. Delhi: Konank Publishers Pvt Ltd.
- Reid, Margerate A. and Harry Barrington (1997). *Training Interventions: Managing Employee Development*. London: Institute of Personnel and Development.
- Rothwell, Williams J. and H.C. Kazanas (1998). *Mastering the Instructional Design Process: A systematic Approach*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Rudrabasavaraj, M.N. (1979). *Dynamic Personnel Administration: Management of Human Resources* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Bombay: Himalayan Publishers.
- Rue, Leslie W. and Lolyd I. Byars (1992). *Management: Skills and Application* (6<sup>th</sup> ed.) Homewood, Irwin.
- Saiyadain Mirza S. (1999). *Human Resource Management*. New Delhi: Tata McGraw-Hill Publishing Company Ltd.
- Schermerhorn, Jhon R. (1993). *Management for Producing* (4<sup>th</sup> ed.). New York: John Wiley and Sons Inc.
- Silberman, Mel (1990). *Active Training: A Book of Techniques, Designs, Case Example, and Tips*. New York: Lexington Books.

- Simon Woldemecacl (1990). "Demography and manpower planning" *Proceedings of the Seminar on Manpower Development for Industry*. Addis Ababa: Addis Ababa University- Ministry of Industry Cooperation Programmer pp.1-34 (unpublished)
- SNNPREB (2006). *Education Sector Annual Performance Report* (Unpublished).
- SNNPREB (2006). *Education Sector Strategic Plan* (Unpublished).
- SNNPREB (2006). *Personnel Statistics: 1999 Ethiopian Fiscal Year* (Unpublished).
- SNNPRSC (1995). *Constitution of Southern Nations, Nationalities and Peoples Regional State*. Addis Ababa: Brihanena Selam Printing Press.
- Stoner, James A.F. and R. Edward Freeman (1998). *Management* (6<sup>th</sup> ed). New Delhi: Prentice Hall of India Pvt. Ltd.
- Storey, J. and K. Session (1993). *Managing Human Resource and Industrial Relations*. London: Biddless Ltd.
- TGE (1992). "A Proclamation to Provide for the Establishment of National/ Regional Self-Governments". *Negarit Gazeta*, Proclamation No 7/1992. Addis Ababa: Berhanena Selam Printing Press.
- TGE (1994). *Education and Training Policy*. Addis Ababa: St. George Printing Press.
- Tracey, William R. (1984). *Designing Training and Development Systems*. New York: Amacom.
- Turell, M. (1980). *Training Analysis: A Guide to Recognizing Training Needs*. London: Pitman Press.
- Werther, W. B. et al (1985). *Canadian Personnel Management and Human Resources* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). New York: McGraw-Hills Ryerson Ltd.
- Wills, Mike (1993). *Managing the Training Process: Putting the Basics in to Practice*. London: McGraw-Hill Book Company.

# **APPENDIX -A**

**Addis Ababa University  
School of Graduate Studies  
College of Education**

## **Department of Educational Planning and Management**

This questionnaire is designed to assess the practices of human resource training and development (delivered to employees who work in the offices) in the education sector of SNNPRS.

### **Questionnaire to be Filled by Education Officials and Employees**

#### **/Experts/**

The objective of the study is purely academic and hence the questionnaire is prepared to secure relevant data to the study which is believed to come up with valuable recommendation for problems observed (if any). Therefore, your valuable support in responding to the questions raised is of a paramount importance to the success of the study. Thus, you are kindly requested to complete the questionnaire carefully as your genuine, frank and timely response is vital for the success of the study.

N.B. 1. There is no need to write your name.

2. Please indicated your answer by putting "✓" in the table.

3. Open-ended questions are given in writing on the space provided, if the space is not sufficient, please use the back of the paper.

4. The questionnaire only directed towards the training and development program delivered to employees and officials who work in the offices of SNNPRS education sector (REB, ZED, WEO and TAEO).

Thank you in advance for your co-operation for filling and returning this questionnaire.

## Section- I

### I. Background Information of the Respondents

1. Sex                      A. Male                                            B. Female
2. Age                      A. 18-25 years                                            B. 26-30 years                        
                                    C. 31-35 years                                            D. 36-40 years                        
                                    E. 41-45 years                                            F. 46-50 years                        
                                    F. Above 50 years

#### 3. Qualification

- A. TTI
- B. Diploma
- C. BA/BSC
- D. MA/MSC
- E. PHD
- F. If other specify \_\_\_\_\_

#### 4. Your field of specialization

- A. Management                                            B. Economics
- C. Educational planning and management
- D. Please, specify if any other \_\_\_\_\_

#### 5. Name of your organization

A. Regional Education Bureau	<input type="checkbox"/>
B. Zone Education Department	<input type="checkbox"/>
C. Woreda Education office	<input type="checkbox"/>

6. Current position                      A. Office head                                            B. Department head                        
                                    C. Team leader                                            D. Expert                      E. If other please specify \_\_\_\_\_

#### 7. Service year in the present position

- A. 1-5 years                                            B. 6-10 years                        
                                    C. 11-16 years                                            D. Above 16 years

#### 8. Total service year

- A. 1-5 years                                            B. 6-10 years                        
                                    C. 11-16 years                                            D. Above 16 years

## Section II

### Questionnaire in Relation to the Basic Questions

#### Part I General Information Regarding Training and Development Programs Conducted Since 1995 E.C.

1. Did your office provide short-term training or development programs for its employees and managers since 1995 E.C?

A. Yes

B. No

2. Did you office provide long term training programs for its employees and managers

A. Yes

B. No

3. Did you attend any short or long term training and development programs provided in the education sector?

A. Yes

B. No

4. If your answer for item 3 is "Yes" who organized or designed them?

A. REB

B. ZED

C. WEO

D. MOE

E. RCBB

F. ZCBD

G. WCBO

H. MCB

I. OTHERS

5. What kinds of program you have attended since 1995 E. C?

A. Educational study tour abroad

B. Educational study four to other offices

C. Attending distance education through correspondence

D. Attending formal education in higher institutes

E. Attending formal education abroad /scholarship/

M. A /MSC/M.ED

B.A /B.SC /B.ED

F. Short term seminars, workshops and conferences

6. What were the contents (topics) of the training and development programs given since 1995 E.C.?

a. Leadership

b. Human resource management

c. Material management

d. Change management

e. Result oriented performance appraisal

f. Business process reengineering

g. Service delivery

h. Computer training

i. Information technology

j. Supervision

k. Civics and Ethical education

l. Special needs education

m. Curriculum development

n. Educational research

o. Gender and HIV/AIDS education

p. Decentralization of administration

q. Planning

r. Teachers development

s. Reforms on the quality of education

t. Text book management

u. Adult education

7. Did the programs you have attended directly related to your job?

A. Yes

B. No

8. If you have attended and completed either formal education or distance education or scholarship, did you get the proper placement and benefits?

A. Yes

B. No

9. If your answer for question 7 is "No" what is the reason?

10. Does the strategic plan of your office incorporated employees training and development?

A. Yes

B. No

## **Part II: Training and Development Needs Assessment Practices**

**Please indicate your answer to the following statements by putting "✓" among the options**

1. = NT = Never True

2. = RT = Rarely True

3. = ST/SN = Sometime True/Sometimes Not

4. = UT = Usually True

5. = AT = Always True

No	Question item	AT (5)	UT (4)	ST/SN (3)	RT (2)	NT
	<b>Human Resource Training and Development Needs Assessment Practices</b>					
1	My office conducted human resource training and development needs assessment since 1995 E.C.					
2	Each individual in the office identified his/her own training and development needs.					
3	Immediate supervisors identified training and development needs of each individual					
4	The training department/coordinator/officer identified training and development needs of individuals and the office.					
5	Top-level managers determined training and development needs of individuals and the office.					
6	Training and development needs had been identified through analysis of the culture, structure, plan, objectives etc. of the organization					
7	Training and development needs had been identified through analysis of the tasks/job performance by each job holder.					
8	Training and development needs had been identified through analysis of the knowledge, skills, attitudes, etc., of each individual/person					

No	Question item	AT (5)	UT (4)	ST/SN (3)	RT (2)	NT
9	My office used conducting group discussion as a mechanism to gather information in conducting training and development needs assessment.(TDNA)					
10	Observing how individuals are performing their tasks as a mechanism to gather information in conducting TDNA					
11	Conducting survey as a mechanism to gather information in conducting TDNA					
12	Reviewing performance as a mechanism to gather information in conducting TDNA					
13	Interviews with supervisors and employees as a mechanism to gather information in conducting TDNA					
14	My office considered the availability of training facilities in prioritizing needs					
15	My office considered the availability of training institutions in prioritizing needs					
16	My office considered the availability of budget in prioritizing needs					
17	My office considered the availability of trainers in prioritizing needs					
18	My office considered the trainees' capability and level of motivation in prioritizing needs					
19	My office considered the importance and urgency of the need in prioritizing needs					
20	My office considered the cost effectiveness of the organization in prioritizing needs					

**Part III Objectives and Focuses of Training and Development Programs; selection of trainees, trainers and contents; delivery methods; and the practice of evaluating training and development programs**

Please, indicate your answer to the following statements by putting "✓" among the options, represented by

- 1. = SDA = Strongly Disagree
- 2. = DA = Disagree
- 3. = UD = Undecided
- 4. = A = Agree
- 5. = SA = Strongly Agree

No	Objectives and Focuses of Training and Development Programs	SA (5)	A (4)	UD (3)	DA (2)	SDA (1)
1	My office prepared training and development program plans for its non-supervisory employees and managers since 1995 E.C.					
2	The training and development objectives had been set before preparing and implementing the program.					
3	The objectives of the training and development programs were clearly and precisely indicate the expected outcomes.					
4	The main focus of the program was to introduce new methods, procedures, etc... to employees and managers					
5	The main focus of the programs was to improve performance of department heads and team leaders					
6	The main focus of the programs was to build the capability and potentials of managers (department heads, team leaders, section heads, etc					
7	The main focus of the program was to improve job performance of non-supervisory employees					
	<b>Selection of Trainees</b>					
8	My office has clear and transparent training and development selection criteria for selecting individual trainee					
9	The selection criteria were well communicated to all members of my office.					

10	In my office training and development opportunities are usually offered to individuals as incentives					
11	In my office training and development opportunities were usually offered to appropriate individuals by considering organizational goals					
12	In my office training and development opportunities are usually offered to individuals who have good personal relationship with their immediate supervisors					
13	In my office training and development opportunities were usually offered to individuals who have good personal relationship with the top-level managers					
	<b>Selection of Trainers</b>					
14	My office has clear, convincing and transparent criteria for selecting trainers.					
15	In my office the selection criteria were well communicated to the candidates.					
16	Trainers were selected after applying and competing with others.					
17	Trainers were selected on the good will of top level managers.					
18	Trainers were selected through their personal relationships with the training and development managers.					
	<b>Selection of Contents</b>					
19	Trainees through their representatives participated in the selection of the contents of the training programs.					
20	The office (training coordinators) selected the content of the training programs.					
21	The trainers selected the content of the training programs.					
	<b>Training and Development Delivery Methods</b>					
22	My office conducted orientation/induction/ programs to new employees and existing employees who hold new positions towards their job.					
23	My office arranged/ prepared formal orientation programs to new employees and existing employees with their immediate supervisors and other members of the office.					
24	My office used classroom lectures as a method of orientation to new employees and existing employees who hold new positions.					

25	My office used written directives as a method of orientation to new employees and existing employees who hold new positions.					
26	My office used sending individuals to similar institutions as a method of orientation to new employees.					
27	In my office supervisors and/or senior persons in each section are cooperative in giving work guides on challenging jobs.					
28	In my office supervisors and/or senior persons in each section are cooperative in giving work guides on challenging jobs because it is our institutional culture and norm					
29	In my office supervisors and/or senior persons in each section are cooperative in giving work guides on challenging jobs because of their good personality					
30	In my office the management gave much attention to manpower training to improve poor performance of employees					
31	Scholarship abroad is used in my office as off - the - job training and development technique.					
32	In-service program is used in my office as on the off-the-job training and development technique.					
33	Learning in higher education institution is used in my office as on the off-the-job training and development technique.					
34	Coaching technique of on-the-job training and development is most often applicable in my office.					
35	Mentoring technique of on-the-job training and development is most often applicable in my office.					
36	Job rotation technique of on-the-job training and development is most often applicable in my office.					
37	Sharing ideas among employees is a technique of on-the-job training and development which is most often applicable in my office.					
38	In the training and development program, which I had attended, case study method was used					
39	In the training and development program, which I had attended Lectures method was used during the programs.					
40	In the training and development program, which I had attended management games method was used.					

41	In the training and development program, which I had attended role playing method was used.					
42	In the management training and development program, which I had attended conference method of training method was used.					
43	In the management training and development program, which I had attended computer based method was used during the programs					
44	The delivery methods of training and development used were convenient.					
	<b>Evaluating Human Resource Training and Development Programs</b>					
45	My office kept records of all training and development programs.					
46	My office evaluated the training and development programs.					
47	My office evaluated the training and development programs after the training program.					
48	My office evaluate the training and development programs during the training programs.					
49	My office evaluate the training and development programs at the beginning of the training programs.					
50	My office has a formal assessment format to collect feedbacks from individual after the main program is completed.					
51	In my office each department /section or team/ conduct discussions with individuals after having completed a training program.					
52	In my office training and development programs of the office are evaluated in terms of reaction changes.					
53	In my office training and development programs of the office are evaluated in terms of changes in work behavior.					
54	In my office training and development programs of the office are evaluated to prove achievements of learning objectives.					
55	My office have a scheme by which the outcome or the effects of training and development program is evaluated.					

**IV. Major Problems/Constraints for Preparing and Implementing Human resource Training and Development Programs**

Indicate your response by ticking the “✓” mark in the box, it is possible to choose more than one option.

1. What were the major problems/constraints for preparing and implementing TDP?

No	Item	
1	Lack of adequate budget	<input type="checkbox"/>
2	Absence of transparent and clear short-term training and development directives (guidelines)	<input type="checkbox"/>
3	Absence of transparent and clear long-term training and development directives to upgrade individuals	<input type="checkbox"/>
4	Low attention paid by top level management towards the importance of upgrading individual employees through long-term training	<input type="checkbox"/>
5	Attitude of managers towards the importance of professional development of non-teacher employees	<input type="checkbox"/>
6	Lack of attention towards the importance of induction/orientation programs to new recruits and new position holders	<input type="checkbox"/>
7	Low attention paid to the importance of on-the-job training other than short-term off-the-job training.	<input type="checkbox"/>
8	Absence of technical and managerial capability in conducting training and development programs	<input type="checkbox"/>
9	Absence of refresher training and development courses	<input type="checkbox"/>
10	Absence of training and development needs assessment practices	<input type="checkbox"/>

11. If any other, please specify \_\_\_\_\_

2. What were the problems observed during training and development programs in SNNPRS Education Sector?

No	Item	
1	Low attention paid by top-level management	<input type="checkbox"/>
2	Lack of adequate budget	<input type="checkbox"/>
3	Shortage of qualified trainers	<input type="checkbox"/>
4	Allocation of insufficient time for trainings	<input type="checkbox"/>
5	Inadequate preparation	<input type="checkbox"/>
6	Absence of training and development institutes	<input type="checkbox"/>
7	Inadequacy or absence of training and development needs assessment	<input type="checkbox"/>
8	Shortages (lack) of training facilities	<input type="checkbox"/>
9	Inadequacy of development courses	<input type="checkbox"/>
10	Inadequacy of professional courses	<input type="checkbox"/>
11	Lack of technical and managerial capability in conducting training and development programs	<input type="checkbox"/>
12	Problems of keeping records of all training and development programs	<input type="checkbox"/>
13	Keeping training programs secretive	<input type="checkbox"/>
14	Absence of evaluation of training programs	<input type="checkbox"/>
15	Absence of evaluation of development programs	<input type="checkbox"/>
16	Shortage of trainings of trainers of development programs	<input type="checkbox"/>
17	Lack of participatory approach in designing training programs	<input type="checkbox"/>
18	Absence of planning long-term training programs	<input type="checkbox"/>
19	Selection of inappropriate trainees	<input type="checkbox"/>
20	Selection of inappropriate facilities	<input type="checkbox"/>
21	Delay of calls for training	<input type="checkbox"/>
22	Imbalance between payments and current costs	<input type="checkbox"/>
23	Irrelevance of contents	<input type="checkbox"/>
24	Repetition of the same program	<input type="checkbox"/>
25	Shortage of training materials.	<input type="checkbox"/>

26. If any others, please specify \_\_\_\_\_

4.3 What are your recommendations to solve the problems regarding to HRTD practices in the sector? \_\_\_\_\_

አዲስ አበባ ዩኒቨርሲቲ  
የድኅረ ምረቃ ትምህርት ቤት  
የሥነ ትምህርት ኮሌጅ

**የትምህርት ዕቅድና ሥራ አመራር ትምህርት ክፍል**

ይህ መጠይቅ የተዘጋጀው በደ/ብ/ብ/ሕ/ክ/መ/ትምህርት ዘርፍ የሚሰጡትን የሰው ኃይል (በቢሮ ውስጥ ለሚሰሩ የትምህርት ባለሙያዎችና ኃላፊዎች) ሥልጠናና አቅም ግንባታ ፕሮግራሞችን ለመገምገም ነው።

**በትምህርት ባለሙያዎችና ኃላፊዎች የሚሞላ መጠይቅ**

የዚህ ጥናት ዋና ዓላማ ሙሉ በሙሉ ትምህርታዊ ሲሆን መጠይቁም የተዘጋጀው ለጥናቱ አስፈላጊ የሆነ መረጃ በማሰባሰብ በተከሰቱ ችግሮች (ካለ) ላይ ጠቃሚ የሆነ የመፍትሔ ሀሳብ ለማቅረብ ነው። ስለዚህ ለቀረቡት ጥያቄዎች እርስዎ የሚሰጡት ምላሽ ለጥናቱ መሳካት ከፍተኛ የሆነ ጠቀሜታ ይኖረዋል። በመሆኑም የእርስዎ ትክክለኛ ግልጽና ያልዘገየ ምላሽ ለጥናቱ ስኬት ጠቃሚ በመሆኑ መጠይቁን በጥንቃቄ እንዲሞሉልን በትኩረትና እንጠይቃለን።

**ማሳሰቢያ**

1. ስምዎን መጻፍ አያስፈልግም
2. ለትክክለኛው መልስ በተሰጠው ሳጥን (ሰንጠረዥ) ውስጥ መርጠው የ«✓» ምልክት ያድርጉ
3. ክፍት ቦታ ላይ ለተሰጠው ጥያቄ አስፈላጊውን መልስ ይጻፉ የቦታ ዕጥረት ካጋጠመዎ ከጥያቄው በስተጀርባ ባለው ገፅ ይጠቀሙ።
4. ይህ መጠይቅ የሚያተኩረው በደ/ብ/ብ/ሕ/ክ/መ/ ትምህርት ዘርፍ በሚገኙ ጽ/ቤቶች (ክ/ት/ቢሮ፣ ዘ/ት/መ/፣ ወ/ት/ጽ/ቤት፣ ከ/አ/ት/ጽ/ቤት) ውስጥ ለሚሰሩ የትምህርት ባለሙያዎችና ኃላፊዎች የተሰጡ ስልጠናዎች ላይ ነው።

መጠይቁን በመሙላትና በመመለስ ለሚያደርጉልን ትብብር ከወዲሁ ምስጋናችንን እናቀርባለን።

**ክፍል አንድ - የመላሹ የግል መረጃ**

መስሪያ ቤቱ የሚገኝበት -----

1. ጾታ ሀ) ሴት  ለ) ወንድ

2. ዕድሜ

- ሀ) 18 - 25 ዓመት
- ለ) 26 - 30 ዓመት
- ሐ) 31 - 35 ዓመት
- መ) 36 - 40 ዓመት
- ሠ) 41 - 45 ዓመት
- ረ) 46 - 50 ዓመት
- ሰ) ከ 50 ዓመት በላይ

3. የትምህርት ደረጃ

- ሀ) ቲ.ቲ.አይ
- ለ) ዲፕሎማ
- ሐ) የባችለር ዲግሪ
- መ) ማስትሬት ዲግሪ
- ሠ) ዶክተሬት ዲግሪ
- ረ) ሌላ ከሆነ ይግለጹ -----

4. የሰለጠነበት የትምህርት ዘርፍ

- ሀ) ማኔጅመንት
- ለ) ኢኮኖሚክስ
- ሐ) የትምህርት ዕቅድና አመራር
- መ) ሌላ ከሆነ ይግለጹ -----

5. የመስሪያ ቤትዎ ስም

ሀ	ክልል ትምህርት ቢሮ	
ለ	ዞን ትምህርት መምሪያ	
ሐ	ወረዳ ትምህርት ጽ/ቤት	

6. በአሁኑ ጊዜ የሚሰሩበት የሥራ ኃላፊነት/መደብ/

- ሀ) ቢሮ /ጽ/ቤት ኃላፊ
- ለ) የመምሪያ ኃላፊ
- ሐ) የቡድን መሪ
- መ) ኤክስፐርት
- ሠ) ሌላ ካለ ይግለጹ -----

7. አሁን ባለበት የሥራ መደብ (ኃላፊነት) ያገለገሉበት የስራ ዘመን

- ሀ) 1 - 5 ዓመት
- ለ) 6 - 10 ዓመት
- ሐ) 11 - 16 ዓመት
- መ) ከ16 ዓመት በላይ

8. አጠቃላይ የአገልግሎት ዘመን

ሀ) 1 - 5 ዓመት

ሐ) 11 - 16 ዓመት

ለ) 6 - 10 ዓመት

መ) ከ16 ዓመት በላይ

ክፍል ሁለት

ጥናቱን በተመለከተ የቀረበ መጠይቅ

ምድብ አንድ: ስለተሰጡት የስልጠናና አቅም ግንባታ ፕሮግራሞች አጠቃላይ መረጃ

1. ከ1995 ዓ.ም ወዲህ መ/ቤትዎ ለሠራተኞችና ኃላፊዎች የአጫጭር ጊዜ ስልጠናዎች ወይም የአቅም ግንባታ ፕሮግራሞች ሰጥቷል ወይ?

ሀ. አዎን

ለ) አልሰጠም

2. መ/ቤትዎ ለትምህርት ባለሙያዎችና ኃላፊዎች የረጅም ጊዜ ስልጠናዎች ይሰጣል ወይ?

ሀ. አዎን

ለ) አይሰጥም

3. በትምህርት ዘርፍ በተሰጡ የረጅም ወይም የአጭር ጊዜ ስልጠናዎች ወይም የአቅም ግንባታ ፕሮግራሞች ተሳትፈው ያውቃሉ?

ሀ) አዎን

ለ) አልተሳተፍኩም

4. ለተራ ቁጥር ሶስት መልስዎ «አዎን» ከሆነ ማን አዳራጃቸው ወይም ቀረጻቸው?

ሀ) ክ/ት/ቢሮ

ሠ) ክ/አ/ግ/ቢሮ

ለ) ዞ/ት/ዴ

ረ) ዞ/አ/ግ/መ/

ሐ) ወ/ት/ጽ/ቤት

ሰ) ወ/አ/ግ/ጽ/ቤት

መ) ት/ሚ/ር

ሸ) አ/ግ/ሚ/ር

ቀ) ሌሎች ካሉ ይግለጹ \_\_\_\_\_

5. ከ1995 ዓ.ም. ጀምሮ የተከታተሏቸው ፕሮግራሞች ምን ዓይነት ናቸው?

ሀ) ትምህርታዊ ጉብኝት በውጭ ሀገር

ለ) ትምህርታዊ ጉብኝት ወደ ሌሎች መ/ቤቶች

ሐ) የርቀት ትምህርት በተልዕኮ መከታተል

መ) በከፍተኛ ትምህርት ተቋማት መደበኛ ትምህርት መከታተል::

ሠ) በውጭ ሀገር መደበኛ ትምህርት መከታተል

ማስተራት ዲግሪ

ባችለር ዲግሪ

ረ) አጫጭር ሴሚናሮች፣ ወርክሾፖች፣ ኮንፈረንሶች ወዘተ . . .

6. ከ1995 ዓ.ም ጀምሮ የተሰጡ የስልጠናና የአቅም ግንባታ ይዘቶች (ርዕሶች) ምን ምን ናቸው?

ሀ) አመራር

ለ) የሰው ኃይል አስተዳደር

- ሐ) የንብረት አስተዳደር
- መ) የሰው ጥ አመራር
- ሠ) ውጤት ተኮር የስራ አፈጻጸም ምዘና
- ረ) የአሰራር ስርዓት ማሻሻያ
- ሰ) አገልግሎት አሰጣጥ
- ሸ) የኮምፒውተር ስልጠና
- ቀ) ኢንፎርሜሽን ቴክኖሎጂ
- በ) ሱፐርቪዥን
- ተ) ስነ ምግባርና ስነ ዜጋ ትምህርት
- ቸ) የልዩ ፍላጎት ትምህርት

ኘ) ሌሎች ካሉ ይገለጹ -----

- 7. የተከታተሏቸው ስልጠናዎች ከስራዎ ጋር ቀጥተኛ ግንኙነት አላቸው?  
 ሀ) አዎን                       ለ) የላቸውም
- 8. በመደበኛ ወይም በርቀት ወይም በስኮላርሽፕ ትምህርትዎን ተከታትለውና አጠናቅቀው ከሆነ ተገቢውን ምደባና ጥቅም አግኝተዋል?  
 ሀ) አግኝቻለሁ                       ለ) አላገኘሁም
- 9. ለተራ ቁጥር 8 ምላሽዎ «አላገኘሁም» ከሆነ ምክንያቱ ምንድን ነው?

- 10. የመ/ቤትዎ ስትራቴጂክ ፕላን የመ/ቤቱን የሰራተኞችና ኃላፊዎች ስልጠናና አቅም ግንባታን አካትቷል ወይ?  
 ሀ) አዎን                       ለ) አላካተተም

**ምድብ ሁለት: - የስልጠና ፍላጎት የዳሰሳ ጥናት በተመለከተ**

ከዚህ ቀጥሎ ከተራ ቁጥር 1-20 የተቀመጡ ዐረፍተ ነገሮች አሉ። ከዐረፍተ ነገሮች ትይዩ ደግሞ አምስት አማራጮችን የያዙ ሳጥኖች አሉ ስለዚህ ለቀረቡት ዐረፍተ ነገሮች «አውነትነት» ከተጠቀሱት አማራጮች ውስጥ የራስዎን ምላሽ የ «✓» ምልክት በማድረግ ይግለጹ።

- 1. በፍፁም ትክክል አይደለም
- 2. አልፎ አልፎ
- 3. አንዳንድ ጊዜ ነው/አንዳንድ ጊዜ አይደለም
- 4. አብዛኛውን ጊዜ
- 5. ሁል ጊዜ

ተ.ቁ	የስልጠና ፍላጎት ዳሰሳ	ሁል ጊዜ (1)	አብዛኛውን ጊዜ (2)	አንዳንድ ጊዜ ነው/አንዳንድ ጊዜ አይደለም	አልፎ አልፎ	በፍጹም አውነት አይደለም
1	መስሪያ ቤቱ ከ1995 ዓ.ም ጀምሮ የመ/ቤቱን የሰው ኃይል ስልጠናና አቅም ግንባታ የስልጠና ፍላጎት ዳሰሳ (ጥናት) አድርጓል።					
2	አስፈላጊውን የስልጠናና የአቅም ግንባታ የስልጠና ፍላጎትን በተመለከተ እያንዳንዱ የመ/ቤቱ ሠራተኛ/ኃላፊ የራሱን/የራሷን የስልጠናና የአቅም ግንባታ ፍላጎቱን ይወስናል (ይለያል)።					
3	አስፈላጊውን የስልጠናና የአቅም ግንባታ የስልጠና ፍላጎትን በተመለከተ የቅርብ አለቃዬ (ኃላፊዬ) የሚያስፈልገኝን ስልጠናና አቅም ግንባታ ፍላጎቴን ይወስናል።					
4	አስፈላጊውን የስልጠናና የአቅም ግንባታ የስልጠና ፍላጎትን በተመለከተ የመ/ቤታችን ስልጠና ክፍል የእያንዳንዱን ሰራተኛ /ኃላፊና የመ/ቤቱን የስልጠና ፍላጎት ይለያል።					
5	አስፈላጊውን የስልጠናና የአቅም ግንባታ የስልጠና ፍላጎትን በተመለከተ የመ/ቤታችን የበላይ ኃላፊዎች ለእያንዳንዱ ሰራተኛም ሆነ ለመስሪያ ቤቱ የሚያስፈልገውን ስልጠና አቅም ግንባታ ፍላጎት በራሳቸው ይወስናሉ					
6	መ/ቤቱ የስልጠናና የአቅም ግንባታ የስልጠና ፍላጎት ጥናት ሲያካሂድ የመ/ቤቱን መዋቅር፣ የአሰራር ስርዓት፣ ዕቅድ፣ ዓላማ ወዘተ ግምት ውስጥ ያስገባል					
7	መ/ቤቱ የስልጠናና የአቅም ግንባታ የስልጠና ፍላጎት ጥናት ሲካሄድ በያንዳንዱ ሰራተኛ መሰራት ያለበት ስራ/ተግባርን ግምት ውስጥ ያስገባል					
8	መ/ቤቱ የስልጠናና የአቅም ግንባታ የስልጠና ፍላጎት ጥናት ሲያካሂድ የእያንዳንዱን ሠራተኛ/ኃላፊ ዕውቀት ክህሎትና ዝንባሌ ግምት ውስጥ ያስገባል።					
9	መ/ቤቱ የስልጠናና የአቅም ግንባታ የስልጠና ፍላጎት ጥናት መረጃ ለማሰባሰብ ከሠራተኞችና ከኃላፊዎች ጋር የቡድን ውይይት ይካሄዳል					
10	መ/ቤቱ የስልጠናና የአቅም ግንባታ የስልጠና ፍላጎት ጥናት መረጃ ለማሰባሰብ እያንዳንዱ ሥራውን/ተግባሩን እንዴት እንደሚያከናውን እይታ ይደረጋል።					

11	በመ/ቤቱ የስልጠናና የአቅም ግንባታ የስልጠና ፍላጎት ጥናት መረጃ ለማሰባሰብ አጠር ያለ ጥናት ይካሄዳል።					
12	በመ/ቤቱ የስልጠናና የአቅም ግንባታ የስልጠና ፍላጎት መረጃ ለማሰባሰብ የስራ አፈፃፀም ይገመገማል።					
13	በመ/ቤቱ የስልጠናና የአቅም ግንባታ የስልጠና ፍላጎት ጥናት መረጃ ለማሰባሰብ ከቅርብ የስራ ኃላፊውና ከሰራተኞች ጋር ቃለ መጠይቆች ይካሄዳሉ።					
14	በመ/ቤቱ ለስልጠናና የአቅም ግንባታ የስልጠና ፍላጎት በተመለከተ በቂ በጀት መኖሩን/መገኘቱን/ ግንዛቤ በማስገባት ነው።					
15	መ/ቤቱ ለስልጠናና የአቅም ግንባታ የስልጠና ፍላጎት ቅድሚያ የሚሰጠው አሰልጣኝ መኖሩን ግንዛቤ ውስጥ በማስገባት ነው።					
16	መ/ቤቱ ለስልጠናና የአቅም ግንባታ የስልጠና ፍላጎት ቅድሚያ የሚሰጠው የማሰልጠኛ ተቋማት መኖራቸውን ግንዛቤ ውስጥ በማስገባት ነው።					
17	መ/ቤቱ ለስልጠናና የአቅም ግንባታ የስልጠና ፍላጎት ቅድሚያ የሚሰጠው የማሰልጠኛ መሳሪያዎች መገኘታቸውን ግንዛቤ ውስጥ በማስገባት ነው።					
18	መ/ቤቱ ለስልጠናና የአቅም ግንባታ የስልጠና ፍላጎት ቅድሚያ የሚሰጠው የሰልጣኞችን ችሎታና ተነሳሽነትን ግንዛቤ ውስጥ በማስገባት ነው።					
19	መ/ቤቱ ለስልጠናና የአቅም ግንባታ የስልጠና ፍላጎት ቅድሚያ የሚሰጠው የስልጠና ፍላጎቱ ጠቀሜታና አጣጣሪነትን ግንዛቤ ውስጥ በማስገባት ነው።					
20	መ/ቤቱ ለስልጠናና የአቅም ግንባታ የስልጠና ፍላጎት ቅድሚያ የሚሰጠው ስልጠናው ለመስሪያ ቤቱ ካለው የወጪ ቅነሳ አንፃር/አዋጭነትን ግምት ውስጥ በማስገባት ነው።					

**ምድብ ሶስት:-** የተሰጡ የስልጠናና አቅም ግንባታ ፕሮግራሞች ዓላማዎችና ትኩረት፤ የሰልጣኞች፤ አሰልጣኞችና የይዘት አመራጭ፤ የስልጠናና አቅም ግንባታ አቀራረብ ዘዴዎችና የስልጠናና የአቅም ግንባታ ፕሮግራም ግምገማ።

ከዚህ ቀጥሎ ከተራ ቁጥር 21 እስከ 75 የተቀመጡ ዐረፍተ ነገሮች አሉ። ከዐረፍተ ነገሮች ትይዩ አምስት አማራጮችን የያዙ ሳጥኖች አሉ።

5 = በጣም እስማማለሁ

4 = እስማማለሁ

3 = አስተያየት የለኝም

2 = አልስማማም

1 = በፍጹም አልስማም የሚሉ ናቸው። ስለዚህ ለቀረቡት ዐረፍተ ነገሮች ከተጠቀሱት አማራጮች ውስጥ የራስዎን ምላሽ የ «✓» ምልክት በማድረግ ይግለጹ።

	የስልጠናና አቅም ግንባታ ፕሮግራሞች ዓላማዎችን ትኩረት	በጣም አስማማለሁ	አስማማለሁ	አስተያየት የለኝም	አልስማማም	በፍጹም አልስማም
1	ከ1995 ዓ.ም ጀምሮ ለመ/ቤቱ ሠራተኞችና ኃላፊዎች የተሰጡት የስልጠናና የአቅም ግንባታ ፕሮግራሞች በዕቅድ የተያዙ ነበሩ።					
2	የስልጠና ዓላማዎቹ የስልጠና ፕሮግራሙ ከመስጠቱ በፊት የተቀረጹ ነበሩ					
3	የስልጠና ዓላማዎቹ ከስልጠናው የሚጠበቀውን ውጤት በግልፅና በትክክል ይገልጻሉ					
4	የስልጠና ዓላማዎቹ ዋና ትኩረት አዳዲስ የአሰራር ዘዴዎችን መመሪያዎችን ደንቦችን ወዘተ ለሰራተኛውና ለአመራሩ ለማሳወቅ ነው።					
5	የስልጠና ዓላማዎቹ ዋና ትኩረት የዲፓርትመንት ኃላፊዎችን የቡድን መሪዎችን የስራ አፈጻጸም ለማሻሻል ነው።					
6	የስልጠና ዓላማዎቹ ዋና ትኩረት የስራ ኃላፊዎችን አቅምና ችሎታ ለማጎልበት ነው።					
7	የስልጠና ዓላማዎቹ ዋና ትኩረት የሰራተኛውን የስራ አፈጻጸም ለማሻሻል ነው።					
	<b>የሰልጣኞች አመራረጥ</b>					
8	መ/ቤቱ ግልፅ የሆነና ሁሉንም የሚያስማማ የሰልጣኞች መመልመያ መስፈርት አለው።					
9	የሰልጣኞች መመልመያ መስፈርቱን እያንዳንዱ የመስሪያ ቤቱ ሰራተኛ/ኃላፊ እንዲያውቀው ተደርጓል።					
10	በመ/ቤቱ ውስጥ አብዛኛውን ጊዜ የስልጠና ዕድሎች ከፍተኛ የስራ አፈጻጸም ላላቸው እንደ ማበረታቻ ይሰጣሉ።					
11	በመ/ቤቱ ውስጥ አብዛኛውን ጊዜ የስልጠና ዕድሎች የመ/ቤቱን ግብ በማገናዘብ ይሰጣሉ።					

12	በመ/ቤቱ ውስጥ አብዛኛውን ጊዜ የስልጠና ዕድሎች በቅርብ አለቆች በጎ ፈቃድና ከቅርብ ኃላፊዎች/አለቃዎች ጋር ጥሩ የግል ግንኙነት ላላቸው ይሰጣሉ።					
13	በመ/ቤቱ ውስጥ አብዛኛውን ጊዜ የስልጠና ዕድሎች ከመ/ቤቱ የበላይ አመራር ጋር ጥሩ ግንኙነት ላላቸው ይሰጣሉ።					
	<b>የአሰልጣኞች አመራረጥ</b>					
14	መ/ቤቱ ግልጽ የሆነና ተቀባይነት ያለው የአሰልጣኞች መመልመያ መስፈርት አለው					
15	የአሰልጣኞችን መመልመያ መስፈርት ተወዳዳሪ አሰልጣኞች እንዲያውቁት ይደረጋል።					
16	በመ/ቤታችን ውስጥ ስልጠና የሚሰጡ አሰልጣኞች የሚመረጡት አመልክተውና ተወዳድረው ነው።					
17	አሰልጣኞች በመ/ቤታችን የበላይ አመራር በጎ ፈቃድ ይመረጣሉ					
18	አሰልጣኞች ከመ/ቤታችን የስልጠና ክፍል ኃላፊ/ባለሙያ ጋር ባላቸው ግንኙነት/ቀረቤታ ይመረጣሉ።					
	<b>የስልጠና ይዘት መረጣ</b>					
19	ሰልጣኞች በተወካዮቻቸው በኩል የስልጠናውን ይዘት ይመርጣሉ።					
20	ቢሮው (የስልጠና ክፍሉ) የስልጠናውን ይዘት ይመርጣል።					
21	አሰልጣኞች የስልጠናውን ይዘት ይመርጣሉ።					
	<b>የስልጠና አሰጣጥ ዘዴዎቹ</b>					
22	መ/ቤቱ አዲስ ለተቀጠሩ ሠራተኞችና አዳዲስ መደቦች ላይ ለተመደቡ ሠራተኞች ከስራው ጋር እንዲተዋወቁ ስልጠና ይሰጣል።					
23	አዳዲስ ሠራተኞች ሲቀጠሩ ሰራተኞችን ከቅርብ ኃላፊዎቻቸው ከአጠቃላይ የመ/ቤቱ አባላት እንዲተዋወቁ የትውውቅ ፕሮግራም ይካሄዳል።					
24	መ/ቤቱ በክፍል ውስጥ ስልጠና (ሌክቸር መስጠት) ዘዴን አዲስ ተቀጣሪ ሰራተኞችን አዲስ መደብ ላይ የተመደቡ ነባር ሰራተኞችን ስለ ስራቸው ለማስተዋወቅ ይጠቀምበታል።					
25	መ/ቤቱ የጽሁፍ መመሪያዎችን የማስተላለፍ ዘዴን አዲስ ተቀጣሪ ሰራተኞችንና አዲስ መደብ ላይ የተመደቡ ነባር ሠራተኞችን ስለ ስራቸው ለማስተዋወቅ ይጠቀምበታል።					
26	መ/ቤቱ ግለሰቦችን ወደ ተመሳሳይ መ/ቤቶች የመላክ ዘዴን አዲስ ተቀጣሪ ሠራተኞችንና አዲስ መደብ ላይ የተመደቡ ነባር ሠራተኞችን ስለ ስራቸው ለማስተዋወቅ ይጠቀምበታል።					

27	በመ/ቤቱ በያንዳንዱ ክፍል ውስጥ ያሉ የቅርብ አለቆች ወይም ነባር ስራተኞች ለአስቸጋሪ ስራዎች የአሰራር መመሪያ ለመስጠት ተባባሪዎች ናቸው።					
28	በመ/ቤቱ በያንዳንዱ ክፍል ውስጥ ያሉ የቅርብ ኃላፊዎች ወይም ነባር ስራተኞች ለአስቸጋሪ ስራዎች የአሰራር መመሪያ ለመስጠት ተባባሪ የሆኑት ይህ የመ/ቤቱ ባህልና ልምድ በመሆኑ ነው።					
29	በመ/ቤቱ በያንዳንዱ ክፍል ውስጥ ያሉ የቅርብ ኃላፊዎች ወይም ነባር ስራተኞች ለአስቸጋሪ ስራዎች የአሰራር መመሪያ ለመስጠት ተባባሪ የሆኑት ጥሩ ሰነ ምግባር ስላላቸው ነው።					
30	በመ/ቤቱ ውስጥ አመራሩ ለስልጠናና አቅም ግንባታ በቂ ትኩረት የሚሰጠው የስራተኞችን ዝቅተኛ የስራ አፈፃፀም ለማሻሻል ነው።					
31	መ/ቤቱ ትምህርትን በውጭ አገር መከታተልን እንደ ከስራ ውጭ የስልጠና ዘዴ ይጠቀምበታል።					
32	መ/ቤቱ ተከታታይ ትምህርትን እንደ ከስራ ቦታ ውጭ የስልጠና ዘዴ ይጠቀምበታል።					
33	መ/ቤቱ በከፍተኛ ትምህርት መከታተልን እንደ ከስራ ቦታ ውጭ የስልጠና ዘዴ ይጠቀምበታል።					
34	መ/ቤቱ በቅርብ አለቆች/ሱፐርቫይዘሮች የሚደረግን የስራ ላይ ክትትልን እንደ ስራ ቦታ ላይ የስልጠናና የአቅም ግንባታ ዘዴ ይጠቀምበታል።					
35	መ/ቤቱ ባልደረቦች ድጋፍ እየተደረገ ስራ መማርን (መለማመድን) እንደ ስራ ቦታ ላይ የስልጠናና የአቅም ግንባታ ዘዴ ይጠቀምበታል።					
36	መ/ቤቱ ስራዎችን ማፈራረቅ /የስራ መደብ ማቀያየርን/ እንደ ስራ ቦታ ላይ የስልጠናና የአቅም ግንባታ ዘዴ አብዛኛውን ጊዜ ይጠቀምበታል።					
37	ከስራተኞች ጋር ሀሳብን መለዋወጥ እንደ በስራ ቦታ ላይ የስልጠና ስልትን አብዛኛውን ጊዜ ይጠቀምበታል።					
38	እኔ በተካፈልኩት ስልጠናና የአቅም ግንባታ ፕሮግራም የተደረጉ ተግባራትን (Case Study) የማጥናት ዘዴን ይጠቀማሉ።					
39	እኔ በተካፈልኩበት የስልጠናና የአቅም ግንባታ ፕሮግራም የክፍል ውስጥ ገለጻ (Lecture) ዘዴን ይጠቀማሉ።					
40	እኔ በተካፈልኩት ስልጠናና የአቅም ግንባታ ፕሮግራም አመራር ጨዋታ (Management Game) ዘዴን ይጠቀማሉ።					

41	እኔ በተካፈልኩበት ስልጠናና የአቅም ግንባታ ፕሮግራም ሚና ጨዋታ (Role Play) ዘዴን ይጠቀማሉ።						
42	እኔ በተካፈልኩባቸው የስልጠናና የአቅም ግንባታ ፕሮግራሞች ኮንፈረንስ (ውይይት) የስልጠና ዘዴን ይጠቀማሉ።						
43	እኔ በተካፈልኩባቸው የስልጠናና የአቅም ግንባታ ፕሮግራሞች ኮምፒውተርን መሰረት ያደረገ የስልጠና ዘዴን ይጠቀማሉ።						
44	እኔ በተካፈልኩባቸው ስልጠናና የአቅም ግንባታ ፕሮግራሞች የስልጠና አሰጣጥ ዘዴዎች ተስማሚ ነበሩ።						
	<b>የሰው ኃይል ስልጠናና አቅም ግንባታ መርሃ ግብር/ፕሮግራም ግምገማ</b>						
45	መ/ቤቴ እስካሁን የተሰጡትን የስልጠናና የአቅም ግንባታ መርሃ ግብሮች/ፕሮግራሞችን/ መረጃ አጠናቅቆ ይዟል						
46	መ/ቤቴ የሰጣቸውን የስልጠናና የአቅም ግንባታ መርሃ ግብሮች የመገምገም ልምድ አለው						
47	መ/ቤቴ ስልጠናው ሲጀመር ግምገማ ያካሂዳል						
48	መ/ቤቴ ስልጠናው በመካሄድ ላይ እያለ ግምገማ ያካሂዳል						
49	መ/ቤቴ ስልጠናው ከተጠናቀቀ በኋላ ግምገማ ያካሂዳል						
50	መ/ቤቴ ስልጠናው ከተጠናቀቀ በኋላ አስተያየቶችን ከእያንዳንዱ ስልጣኝና አሰልጣኝ የሚሰበስብበት የአስተያየት መሰብሰቢያ ቅጽ አለው።						
51	ስልጠናው ከተጠናቀቀ በኋላ እያንዳንዱ ዲፓርትመንት ወይም ቡድን ከስልጠናው ተሳታፊ ጋር ስክታተለው ስልጠና ውይይት ያካሂዳል።						
52	በመ/ቤቴ የስልጠናና /አቅም ግንባታ/ ፕሮግራሞች የሚገመገሙት ከአስከተሉት የምላሽ ተግባር ለውጥ አንጻር ነው						
53	በመ/ቤቴ የስልጠና/አቅም ግንባታ/ ፕሮግራሞች የሚገመገሙት ከአስከተሉት የስራ ባህሪ ለውጥ አንጻር ነው።						
54	በመ/ቤቴ የስልጠና/አቅም ግንባታ/ ፕሮግራሞች የሚገመገሙት የስልጠናው/የትምህርቱ ዓላማዎች መሳካታቸውን ለማረጋገጥ ነው።						
55	መስሪያ ቤቱ የስልጠናዎችንና የአቅም ግንባታ ፕሮግራሞችን ውጤት ወይም ተጽእኖ የመገምገም ዕቅድ/ልምድ/ አለው						

ክፍል አራት፡ በሰው ኃይል ስልጠናና አቅም ግንባታ ዙሪያ ያጋጠሙ ችግሮች ከዚህ በታች ለቀረቡት ጥያቄዎች ምላሽ «✓» ምልክት በማድረግ ይገለጹ ከአንድ በላይ መምረጥ ይቻላል።

4.1 በመ/ቤትዎ የስልጠናና የአቅም ግንባታ ፕሮግራምን ለማደራጀትና ለመስጠት ያጠሙ ችግሮች ምንምን ናቸው?

ተ.ቁ	አማራጮች	
1	ለስልጠናው በቂ የሆነ በጀት ያለመኖር	<input type="checkbox"/>
2	ግልጽና አስተማማኝ የሆነ የአጫጭር ጊዜ የስልጠናና የአቅም ግንባታ መመሪያዎች ያለመኖር	<input type="checkbox"/>
3	ግልጽና አስተማማኝ የሆነ የረጅም ጊዜ የስልጠናና የአቅም ግንባታ መመሪያ ያለመኖር	<input type="checkbox"/>
4	ሠራተኞችን በረጅም ጊዜ ስልጠና ፕሮግራሞች ማሳደግ ያለው ጠቀሜታን ያለው የከፍተኛ አመሩ ትኩረት ዝቅተኛ መሆን	<input type="checkbox"/>
5	ከፍተኛ አመራሩ መምህር ላልሆኑ የትምህርት ባለሙያዎች መሆን ዕድገት ጠቀሜታ ያለው አመለካከት ዝቅተኛ መሆን	<input type="checkbox"/>
6	በመ/ቤቱ አዲስ ለሚቀጠሩ ሠራተኞችም ሆነ አዳዲስ የስራ መደቦችን ለሚይዙ ባለሙያዎች/ሠራተኞች የስራ ጋር ትውውቅ ስልጠና ፕሮግራም ለመስጠት ከረት ያለመኖር	<input type="checkbox"/>
7	ከአጫጭር ከስራ ውጭ ስልጠና ይልቅ ለስራ ላይ ስልጠና የተሰጠው ትኩረት ዝቅተኛ መሆን	<input type="checkbox"/>
8	የስልጠናና አቅም ግንባታ ፕሮግራሞችን ለማካሄድ መሆን ሆነ አስተዳደራዊ ብቃት ያለመኖር	<input type="checkbox"/>
9	ለማስልጠንም ሆነ አቅም ለመገንባት የሚያስችሉ ኮርሶች ያለመኖር	<input type="checkbox"/>
10	የስልጠናና የአቅም ግንባታ የስልጠና ፍላጎት ዳሰሳ (ጥናት) ልምድ ያለመኖር	<input type="checkbox"/>

12. ሌላ ካለ ይገለጹ -----

4.2 በደ/ብ/ብ/ሕ/ክ/መ/ የትምህርት ዘርፍ በተሰጡ የስልጠናና የአቅም ግንባታ ፕሮግራሞች ዙሪያ የታዩ ችግሮች ምን ምን ናቸው?

ተ.ቁ		
1	በከፍተኛ አመራሩ የተሰጠው ትኩረት ዝቅተኛ መሆን	<input type="checkbox"/>
2	በቂ በጀት ያለመኖር	<input type="checkbox"/>
3	ብቃት ያለው አሰልጣኝ ያለመኖር	<input type="checkbox"/>
4	ለስልጠናው በቂ የሆነ ጊዜ ያለመመደብ	<input type="checkbox"/>
5	በቂ የሆነ ዝግጅት ያለማድረግ	<input type="checkbox"/>
6	የስልጠናና አቅም ግንባታ ተቋማት ያለመኖር	<input type="checkbox"/>
7	የስልጠናና አቅም ግንባታ ፍላጎት ዳሰሳ (ጥናት) በበቂ ሁኔታ ወይም ፈጽሞ ያለማካሄድ	<input type="checkbox"/>
8	ስልጠናና አስፈላጊ የሆኑ ነገሮች ያለመሟላት	<input type="checkbox"/>
9	በቂ የሆኑ የአቅም ግንባታ ኮርሶች ያለመኖር	<input type="checkbox"/>
10	በቂ የሆኑ የሙያ ኮርሶች ያለመኖር	<input type="checkbox"/>
11	የስልጠናም ሆነ የአቅም ግንባታ ፕሮግራሞችን ለማካሄድ ተክኒካዊም ሆነ አስተዳደራዊ ብቃት ያለመኖር	<input type="checkbox"/>

12	የተሰጡት የስልጠናና የአቅም ግንባታ ፕሮግራሞችን መረጃዎን አጠናቅሮ የመያዝ ችግር	<input type="checkbox"/>
13	የስልጠናና የአቅም ግንባታ ፕሮግራሞችን ሚስጥራዊ ማድረግ (መደበቅ)	<input type="checkbox"/>
14	የስልጠና ፕሮግራምን ግምገማ ያለማካሄድ	<input type="checkbox"/>
15	የአቅም ግንባታ ፕሮግራሞችን ግምገማ ያለማካሄድ	<input type="checkbox"/>
16	የአሰልጣኞች ስልጠና ፕሮግራሞች ዕጥረት	<input type="checkbox"/>
17	አሳታፊ የሆነ ስልጠናዎችን የመቅረጽ ስልት/ዘዴ ያለመኖር	<input type="checkbox"/>
18	የረጅም ጊዜ ስልጠናዎን ያለማቀድ	<input type="checkbox"/>
19	ተገቢ ያልሆኑ ሰልጣኞችን መምረጥ/መመልመል/	<input type="checkbox"/>
20	ተገቢነት የሌላቸውን የማሰልጠኛ ፋሲሊቲዎች መምረጥ	<input type="checkbox"/>
21	የስልጠና ጥሪዎች መዘግየት	<input type="checkbox"/>
22	ክፍያዎች ከወቅቱ ዋጋ ጋር ያለመመጣጠን	<input type="checkbox"/>
23	የይዘቶች ተገቢ ያለመሆን	<input type="checkbox"/>
24	የተመሳሳይ ፕሮግራሞች ድግግሞሽ	<input type="checkbox"/>
25	የስልጠና ማቴርያሎች እጥረት	<input type="checkbox"/>

26. ሌሎች ካሉ ይገለጹ -----

-----

4.3 በትምህርት ዘርፉ ለሚሰጡ የስልጠናና አቅም ግንባታ ፕሮግራሞችን በተመለከተ ለሚታዩ ችግሮች የመፍትሔ ሃሳብዎን ቢገልጹልን።

-----

-----

# APPENDIX – C

## Interview

### Interview Guide

This interview guide is prepared to direct the interviews to be conducted with the human resource training development department/section experts.

The purpose of this guide is to help the interviewer and the interviewees to focus the discussion on issues related to the research questions. So that only relevant information will be gathered.

### Questions for the Interview

1. Does your office conduct training and development programs? If so, is it based on need assessment?
2. What were the main sources of information in conducting HR training and development needs assessment?
3. When did you conduct needs assessment with regards to the stage of training and development program?
4. What techniques does your office use for conducting training and development needs assessment?
5. Does your office set objectives for HR training and development programs?
6. How does the process of setting HR training and development program objectives done? Who are involved in setting objectives?
7. How does the selection of content for a training program done? Do you sequence them before conducting to a training program? How?
8. What criteria are there in selecting appropriate trainers and trainees? Do you really apply the criteria?

9. Does your office conducted sufficient training and development programs regarding employee training and development?
10. What methods of training and development do your office uses for conducting programs?
11. What kinds of training and development programs are most frequently used? Why?
12. What were the contents (topics) of the training and development programs offered since 1995 E.C.?
13. Do you evaluate the training and development programs? How?
14. What was the main purpose of evaluation of training and development programs for your office?
15. Would you mention the major problems which affected the process of training and development programs in your office and in the education sector of SNNPRS (at regional, zonal and woreda level)?
16. What is your suggestion or comment as a solution for the problems of human resource training and development programs in the education sector of SNNPRS (at regional, zonal and woreda level)?

---

---

---

## APPENDIX - D

Sample Offices of the Study are presented below

- |                  |                         |
|------------------|-------------------------|
| 1. SNNPREB       | 5. Kembata Tembaro Zone |
| 2. Gedyo Zone    | Kembata Tembaro ZED     |
| Gedyo ZED        | Kedida Gramella WEO     |
| Kochore WEO      | Kacha Bira WEO          |
| Wonago WEO       | Angacha WEO             |
| Yirga Chefe WEO  | Dimboya WEO             |
| Bule WEO         | Durame TAE0             |
| Dilla TAE0       | 6. Silit Zone           |
| 3. Sidama Zone   | Silit ZED               |
| Sidama ZED       | Dalocha WEO             |
| Shabedino WEO    | Silit WEO               |
| Boricha WEO      | Tora WEO                |
| Dale WEO         | Worabe TAE0             |
| Dara WEO         | Azernet WEO             |
| Yirgalem TAE0    | 7. Amaro Special WEO    |
| 4. Wolayita Zone | 8. Alaba Special Woreda |
| Wolayita ZED     | Alaba WEO               |
| Damot Gale WEO   | Alaba TAE0              |
| Sodo Zuria WEO   | 9. Burji Special WEO    |
| Damot Woiyde WEO |                         |
| Kindo Koisha WEO |                         |
| Boditi TAE0      |                         |

## Appendix – E

### Training Philosophy and Policies

#### Education and Training Philosophy and Policies

1. We are committed to having a workforce prepared to meet current and future business objectives by providing our employees, at all levels, with appropriate education and training opportunities.
2. We are committed to defining clearly the minimum training requirements which are related to the job holder's role, responsibilities, and needs, including *Leadership Through Quality* and customer satisfaction.
3. All new employees will be oriented in the philosophy, ethics, values, principles, and business priorities of the company, including Total Quality Management and induction into their own organization, within three months of their employment.
4. Employees will only take up new job assignments when they have completed the minimum level of training specified for that job.
5. All newly hired or first-time people managers will successfully complete specified supervisory training within four months of appointment.
6. Managers will successfully complete functional knowledge and skills training to properly coach, inspect, and reinforce the work of their employees.

Figure 1.5 An example of a training philosophy and policies

Source: Mike Wills (1993:7)

## APPENDIX - F

### Some of the Findings of the Study

- The frequent civil service reform structural adjustments (re-structure) practices in the sector affected most of the experienced employees in shifting to other position /jobs within the office or the sector.
- It was found that few of the employees didn't attend training or development programs because of their personal problems and due to the coincidence of field works and urgent routine works with the training programs.
- The capacity building offices organized the various programs for the sector due to the merging of the education sector structure with capacity building. They dominated the role of the sector offices.
- The interview asserted that the number of short-term programs were few and not adequate to participate majority of the employees to equip them with efficient technical skills.
- The current direction of the training and development programs was mainly concentrated on such issues. The sector also paid attentions of gender and HIV/ AIDS education. About 98.8% of the officials and 94.4% of the experts also replied that the contents of the training programs had direct relationship with their jobs.
- Concerning job assignment and utilization of trained (educational upgraded) individuals, it was found that among those who attended and completed formal education since 1995 E.C. three (42.9%) of them asserted that they didn't get proper position and placement. All attributed it that the vacant positions were below their qualification, recruitments/job assignment/in their offices were performed through personal relationships and managerial problems in assigning the educational upgraded individuals in the right position.
- In the strategic plans there were a statement, which describes to build the capacity of employees: however, it was not supported by the budget.
- The REB and the RCBB and other organizations designed most of the training and development programs. These organizations conducted the programs without considering and collecting the true needs of the sector.
- Majority of the short –term programs were nationally designed and conducted allover the country with similar pace and time

- Concerning the ways and techniques used by which training and development needs were identified, it was found that majority of the respondents confirmed that individuals did not identify their own training and development needs.
- In the various sector offices immediate supervisors, the HRTD department/unit heads and top-level managers didn't identify the training and development needs of individual subordinates/employees and the office.
- There was no adequate effort made in conducting organization, tasks/jobs and person/individual analysis in the identification of training and development needs assessment of the office and the individuals.
- With regard to the mechanisms by which gathering information to assess training and development needs, it was discovered that the practice of conducting group discussion, observing how individuals are performing their tasks, using survey, reviewing performance and interviews with supervisors and non-supervisory employees remained at low level.
- Concerning the practice of considering the factors by which needs had been prioritized, it was found that even though training and development needs were not identified in a systematic way, based on the data, the availability of training facilities, budget, trainers, the importance and urgency of the needs and the cost-effectiveness of the organization were considered as factors.
- However, low attention was given to trainer's capability and level of motivation.
- Even though, majority of the officials and experts agreed on the precision and clarity of training and development objectives to indicate the expected outcomes of the programs, the training experts commented that emphasis was given to the methodology and contents rather than objectives.
- It seems that most of the experts could not get access on the variety of workshops. Moreover, the officials especially the heads mostly attended trainings conducted in the sector.
- The selection criteria were not well communicated to all members of their respective offices and trainers.
- The findings also revealed that training and development opportunities had not been offered to individuals as incentives and there were problems towards the selection of

trainees such as selecting few individual employees who had no direct contact with the job. Sometimes trainers were selected by the good will of top-level managers and through their personal relationship with training and development managers or team leaders. Majority of the respondents confirmed that trainees and trainers did not participate in the selection of the contents.

- The findings also indicated that most of the time orientation with their immediate supervisors (team leaders or department heads) would be arranged, however, it had not been arranged with other members of the office.
- To a certain extent offices used written directives as a method of orientation. In some offices of the sector job descriptions, certain manuals and directives were given to new employees as a method of orientation. However, it was not widely used.
- The findings also revealed that sending individuals to other similar institutes had not been practiced as a method of orientation.
- . Concerning the cooperativeness of individuals to give work guides on challenging jobs, the findings also revealed that supervisors or senior people didn't show their cooperativeness. Such cooperativeness was also determined by the good personality of the supervisors.
- The findings of the study also indicated that management at the various levels did not give much attention to manpower training to improve poor performance of employees.
- Some woredas/zones used the donor agencies (NGOs) to provide in service training for their employees.
- Few woredas deliberately used teachers' quota for office employees.
- Those offices that contacts with donor or had funding organization used the opportunity better than others.
- The information collected through document analysis revealed that their offices sponsored individuals to learn in higher education institutes when they applied after having their access to the colleges. However, there was no planning of it at all.

## DECLARATION

I here by declaration that this thesis is my original work and that all sources of information used for the thesis have all sources of information used for the thesis have been fully acknowledged.

Name: Mestie Mekonnen

Signature: 

Date: 26/7/2007

This Thesis has been submitted for examination with my approval as a university advisor.

Name: Tilaye Kassahun (Ph.D)

Signature: 

Date: 26/7/2007

Addis Ababa University