

PN-ABP-737
83934

TRAINING QUALITY SURVEY

AN EMPLOYERS EVALUATION OF TRAINING COURSES

FUNDED BY BOCCIM ADMINISTERED SCHOLARSHIPS

Carried out on behalf of BOCCIM by:

Tsa Badiri Consultancy, Gaborone

June 1992

TRAINING QUALITY SURVEY

AN EMPLOYERS EVALUATION OF TRAINING COURSES FUNDED
BY BOCCIM ADMINISTERED SCHOLARSHIPS

Content of Survey Report

	Page
SECTION 1: Summary of Survey findings	i
SECTION 2: Recommendations for improvement in training	1
SECTION 3: Scope and Methodology of the Survey	3
SECTION 4: Knowledge of Courses & Sponsorship	8
SECTION 5: Employer training objectives	12
SECTION 6: Evaluation of impact of training	19
SECTION 7: Overall satisfaction with training	34

Appendix: Training Quality Survey Questionnaire

TSA BADIRI CONSULTANCY

P.O. Box 731,
Gaborone

TRAINING QUALITY SURVEY

List of Tables

Table A: Distribution of Survey Sample	4
Table B: Distribution by Gender, Category & Institution	5
Table C: Distribution by Gender, Course & Institution	6
Table C1: Distribution by Employers	7
Table D: Source of Knowledge about courses	8
Table E: Nos who would be nominated without sponsorship	9
Table F1: Influence of sponsorship on participation	10
Table F2: Influence of sponsorship by course	11
Table G1: Training objectives	12
Tables G2 - G7: Training Objectives by course category	13-15
Table H1: Achievement of Training Objectives	16
Table H2: Achievement of Training Objectives by course	18
Table I1: Evaluation of performance prior to course	20
Table I2: Evaluation of performance by course	21
Table I3: Evaluation of performance after course	22
Table I4: Evaluation of performance by course	23
Table J1: Impact of training on company efficiency	25
Table J2: Impact on efficiency by course	26
Table K1: Employees receiving salary increases after course	28
Table K2: Salary increases by course and gender	29
Table K3: Additional Responsibilities	30
Table K4: Additional Responsibilities by course & gender	31
Table K5: Employees promoted partly because of training	32
Table K6: Employees promoted by course & gender	33
Table L1: Overall satisfaction with training	34
Table L2: Overall satisfaction with training by course	35
Table M1: Employers giving positive comments on training	37
Table M2: Complaints about training	38
Table N1-N2: Participation on future courses	40-41

TRAINING QUALITY SURVEY

Section 1: Summary of Survey Findings

- 1.1 The survey was designed to elicit employers views on the training courses held in Botswana where participants were sponsored, or partly sponsored, by donor funds administered by BOCCIM. The Survey was not intended to be a survey of non-BOCCIM related courses. It was carried out through a postal survey covering 541 participants representing 85% of the 634 scholarships awarded by BOCCIM during 1991. Responses were received from 306 employers (56,6%) of the sample.
- 1.2 The sample included 33 employers (27 men and six women) who attended courses themselves, and 273 employees attending courses of whom 137 were men and 136 were women.
- 1.3 The Survey covered 36 courses and reports on 17 different courses (where statistics were meaningful) in detail. Most of the employing organisations (75,8%) learnt about the courses through BOCCIM circulars, and although sponsorship was available, the majority (71,6%) said they would still have sent participants even if sponsorship was not available. However, the availability of sponsorship did have some influence on employers' decisions to nominate participants, particularly where they themselves attended courses. (See Section 4.)
- 1.4 The main training objectives were to provide new skills (50%), up-dating of skills (45%) and remedial training (38,9%). Generally, employers felt that their training objectives had been met, particularly those employers who themselves attended courses who rated the courses higher than those employers who sent employees. (See Section 5).
- 1.5 Although generally, employers training objectives were met, employers found little change in participants' performance after attending a course (See Section 6), or any significant impact on company efficiency after the training. Employers who themselves attended courses, did rate the training higher in terms of the courses resulting in an improvement in their own performance and company efficiency.
- 1.6 Computer courses were rated the lowest in leading to any improvement in performance, while financial management courses were rated higher for both employee and employer participants. The secretarial course was the highest ranked when it came to leading to improvements in performance and efficiency.
- 1.7 Despite the relatively low rating of the training courses leading to improvement in employee performance, or company, efficiency, a significant number of employees were given salary increases (31,9%) and additional responsibilities (41,4%) after attending courses. However, only seven of the 273 employees were promoted as a direct result of the training received, although a further 45 (16,5%) were promoted partly because of the training. There were no gender differences when it came to evaluation of performance, course attendance or when it came to giving salary increases, additional responsibilities or promotions.

- 1.8 Overall, employers of participants who attended the courses expressed their general satisfaction with the training (giving the training a score of 3,90 out of a possible 6), although employers participating on courses themselves were more satisfied with the training (a score of 4,88).
- 1.9 Positive comments about the courses included the feeling that they were well presented, that the topics were relevant and comprehensive, and that employees were better motivated after attending the course. On the negative side, many employers felt the course were too short, and that there should have been some form of evaluation of employees' performance on the courses.
- 1.10 The majority of employers with participants on the courses said they would send other employees on similar courses even if sponsorship was not available.
- 1.11 Although only a few respondents made recommendations and suggestions for improvements, these included slightly longer courses (12,4%), participant evaluation by institutions mounting courses (13,1%), an increase in the number of specialised courses (11,2%), mainly in financial management and marketing, and the development of courses in Setswana (4%) for junior employees.

Section 2: Recommendations for Improvement in Training

- 2.1 Although generally, employers do not perceive any significant improvement in employee performance or company efficiency as a result of their employees attendance on the courses covered by this survey, this is not unexpected, as most of the courses were very short - lasting for one or two days only. The effectiveness of the courses, therefore, should not only be measured against any changes in performance, but also whether or not employers felt attendance was worthwhile. In this regard, most of the courses run during 1991 have been rated as successful and worthwhile by employers covered in the survey.
- 2.2 By exposing employees to training in such areas as Customer Relations and Marketing and Sales skills, the courses have offered opportunities for broadening employee perspectives, and, as indicated in the positive comments, employers found the courses relevant, and employees' motivation increased after attendance.
- 2.3 Employers who attended the courses themselves were much more positive. While there may be an element of self-evaluation in their responses on improvement in performance, it is also possible that as employers they are in a much better position to implement the skills and knowledge learnt on the courses than their employees.
- 2.4 There is also an indication that the more specialised skill courses were rated higher than other, more general courses. The financial management courses, for example, and the personnel management and receptionist courses, were rated higher in terms of improved performance, efficiency and achievement of training objectives. The exception to this indication were the computer courses, but this could be as a result of deficiencies in employees attending and the presentation.
- 2.5 There are also indicators that employers would like to know more about the course content before selecting suitable employees. One of the complaints about the courses was the feeling among employees that course participants did not consist of a homogeneous group with common levels of education and experience.
- 2.6 Another comment from a number of employers was the need for the course organisers to provide feedback on employee participation, and evaluation of employees' performance. Although such evaluation is provided by some institutions on their longer courses (IDM's certificate programmes for example), most of the private training institutions do not evaluate performance. Moreover, it is understood that participant evaluation was not built into the course design.
- 2.7 Although recommended by only a few employers, course material in Setswana and training conducted in Setswana would enable employers to select lower level employees for whom training opportunities are extremely limited.

4

2.8 The following seem to be the main areas of positive improvement in training courses arising out of the survey to meet the needs of employers:

- more courses aimed specifically at small scale employers, particularly in the area of financial management, marketing and general business management (recommended by 11,2% of the respondents, and 22,6% of those making suggestions)
- development of longer courses (recommended by 12,4% of the respondents and 25,3% of those making suggestions)
- evaluation of participant performance (recommended by 13% of the respondents and 27% of those making suggestions)
- increase the number of specialised courses in financial management and marketing skills (recommended by 11,2% of respondents and 22,7% of those making suggestions)
- provide more detailed information about courses to enable employers to select suitable participants and ensure that participants on same courses are homogeneous with regard to education levels and experience (recommended by 5,9% of respondents and 12,0% of those making suggestions)
- develop courses and course material in Setswana to facilitate training at a lower level (recommended by 4% of respondents and 8% of those making suggestions)

Section 3: Scope and Methodology of Survey

- 3.1 During 1991, the Botswana Confederation of Commerce, Industry and Manpower (BOCCIM) awarded 634 scholarships to participants from 343 companies valued at over P400 000 for mainly in-country training. Most of the scholarship funds were made available through the USAID BWAST and BPED programmes, but BOCCIM also administered funds from Botswana, Austria, Canada, Cyprus, Germany, Finland, the Netherlands and Norway.
- 3.2 For in-country training, scholarships were available for training courses mounted by local institutions and private firms, covering a range of skills, and consisting of one/two day workshops to six month certificate programmes.
- 3.3 The objective of the Training Quality Survey was to assess employer satisfaction with the training courses and programmes, and to provide BOCCIM, training institutions and organisations, and donor agencies with feedback on the quality and relevance of training, and the impact it has had on company performance.
- 3.4 The Survey was carried out using a postal questionnaire, followed-up by telephone calls and personal visits. From the total of 634 scholarships awarded during 1991, a sample of 541 participants (85%) from 248 employing organisations (72%) was identified from BOCCIM's records. The sample only covered in-country training, and excluded participants whose training had not been completed, and where the sample size was too small to be valid.
- 3.5 Completed questionnaires were received from 306 respondents (56,6% of the sample) covering 36 different courses. Analysis was carried out by training category, training institution, and individual courses only where the response rate for a particular course was statistically significant in order to ensure valid comparisons. This resulted in analysis of 17 courses provided by eight training institutions and organisations.
- 3.6 The Survey included 33 employers (10,8% of the 306 respondents) who had attended training courses. Six of the employers were women, while out of the 273 employees attending courses, 136 (49,8%) were women. Thus out of the 306 responses, 142 (46,4%) related to women and 164 (53,6%) related to men.
- 3.7 Out of the 273 employees covered in the Survey, 90% of them are still employed by the company which nominated them for BOCCIM sponsorship.
- 3.8 Details of the sample and distribution of the responses are given in Tables A - C on the next pages.

4

Table A: Distribution of Survey Sample

No. of employing organisation in sample:	248	
No. of responses:	134	(54,0%)
No. of Questionnaires in sample:	541	
No. of responses:	333	(61,6%)
Completed courses:	306	(56,6%)
Did not attend/postponed:	27	(5,0%)

Distribution of completed responses by Region

Gaborone:	172	(56,2%)
Other Urban:	85	(27,8%)
Rural:	49	(16,0%)
Total:	306	

Distribution of responses by company employment size

0 - 5 employees:	10	(3,3%)
6 - 10 employees:	49	(16,0%)
11 - 20 employees:	55	(18,0%)
21 - 50 employees:	76	(24,8%)
51 - 100 employees:	50	(16,3%)
> 100 employees:	66	(21,6%)

Distribution of Participants

Employers:	33	(10,8%)
Employees:	273	(89,2%)
No. of Employees still employed:	246	(90,1%)
No. of employees resigned:	19	(7,0%)
No. of employees dismissed:	8	(3,0%)

Table B: Distribution of Sample by Category, Institution & Gender

By Category		By Institution	
Computers	9 (2,9%)	BOCCIM	7 (2,3%)
Management	120 (39,2%)	Damelin	7 (2,3%)
Marketing	115 (37,6%)	Datapoint	4 (1,3%)
Secretarial	6 (1,9%)	DPG	21 (6,9%)
Personnel	17 (5,6%)	IDM	10 (3,3%)
Varied	39 (12,7%)	MAST	93 (30,4%)
By Gender		PECG	40 (13,1%)
Male Employers	27 (8,8%)	Proman	85 (27,8%)
Female Employers	6 (2,0%)	Varied	39 (12,7%)
Male Employees	137 (44,8%)		
Female employees	136 (44,4%)		

- 3.9 Table C on page 6 analyses gender distribution by course and includes employer participants. The percentage response refers to the percentage of BOCCIM sponsored participants on the course for whom questionnaires were completed.
- 3.10 On most courses the distribution is evenly spread between male and female. However, the majority of participants on the Strategic Planning and Time and Issues courses were men, while those attending computer related courses and the secretarial course were women.

Table C: Distribution of Sample by Course & Institution

Course & Institution	Male	%	F'male	%	TOT	%
Basic Fin. M'ment DPG (61% response)	7	2,3	7	2,3	14	4,6
Customer Relations MAST (70% response)	33	10,9	35	11,4	68	22,2
Int. Fin. M'ment DPG (54% response)	4	1,3	3	1,0	7	2,3
L'ship & Team Building MAST (66% response)	13	4,2	6	2,0	19	6,2
Management Hints BOCCIM (54% response)	5	1,6	2	0,7	7	2,3
Marketing & Sales Proman (54% response)	16	5,2	11	3,6	27	8,8
Personnel Management Proman (55% response)	7	2,3	10	3,3	17	5,6
Problem Solving Proman (73% response)	7	2,3	9	2,9	16	5,2
Record Keeping PECG (36% response)	8	2,6	13	4,2	21	6,7
Strategic Planning Proman (68% response)	21	6,9	4	1,3	25	8,2
Time & Issue M'ment PECG (61% response)	9	2,9	2	0,7	11	3,6
Marketing & Sales Damelin (88% response)	4	1,3	3	1,0	7	2,3
Intro to Computers Datapoint(67% response)	1	0,3	3	1,0	4	1,3
Lotus 123 IDM (63% response)	1	0,3	4	1,3	5	1,6
Marketing & Sales IDM (71% response)	5	1,6	-	-	5	1,6
Receptionists MAST (75% response)	-	-	6	2,0	6	2,0
Customer Relations PECG (89% response)	6	2,0	2	0,7	8	2,6
Miscellaneous Varied (40% response)	17	5,6	22	7,2	39	12,8

3.11 The courses attended by sample employer participants were:

Table C1: Distribution of sample Employer participants by Course

Course & Institution	Male	%	F'male	%	TOT	%
Basic Fin. M'ment DPG	3	1,0	2	0,7	5	1,6
Customer Relations MAST	3	1,0	-	-	3	1,0
Int. Fin. M'ment DPG	2	0,7	-	-	2	0,7
Management Hints BOCCIM	2	0,7	-	-	2	0,7
Marketing & Sales Proman	3	1,0	1	0,3	4	1,3
Personnel Management Proman	1	0,3	1	0,3	2	0,7
Record Keeping PECG	2	0,7	-	-	2	0,7
Strategic Planning Proman	5	1,6	1	0,3	6	2,0
Time & Issue M'ment PECG	1	0,3	-	-	1	0,3
Marketing & Sales IDM	1	0,3	-	-	1	0,3
Varied	4	1,3	1	0,3	5	1,6
Total	27	8,8	6	2,0	33	10,8

Section 4: Knowledge of Courses and Sponsorship

4.1 The vast majority of the companies surveyed in the sample learnt about the courses available through BOCCIM's circular to members, followed by advertisements in the local media.

Table D: Source of Knowledge of Courses

Circular from BOCCIM	232	75,8%
Advert in the Press	38	12,4%
Circular from course organisers	26	8,5%
Informed by employee	14	4,6%
Other sources	17	5,6%

4.2 Employers were asked whether they would still have nominated participants had sponsorship not been available. Out of the 306 participants, 219 (71,6%) would have been nominated without sponsorship. As shown in Table E on the next page Secretarial (100%) and computer related courses (77,8%) were courses where employers were more likely to nominate participants without sponsorship than other courses. However, those employers who reported that they would not have participated in a course had sponsorship not been available, indicated that it was lack of funds rather than the nature of course which determined whether or not they would participate.

4.3 Nevertheless the availability of sponsorship did have some influence on employers' decisions to nominate participants. Respondents were asked whether the availability of sponsorship had any influence on their decision to send a participant on the courses. They were asked to assess this influence on a scale of 1 - 6, where 1 indicates no influence on the decision and a score of 6 indicates that the availability of sponsorship greatly influenced the decision to nominate a participant.

4.4 The results of this analysis are shown in Table F on page 10 where the average score for the sample as a whole was 3,26 indicating that the availability of sponsorship does have some influence on whether an employer would send an employee to participate or not. This is particularly the case when it is the employer himself or herself who attended the course. The average score for employers only was 3,64. The probable reason why sponsorship is relatively more important for employers, is because virtually all the employers in the sample fell into the very small (under 10 employees) business category, and would not be able to afford the training if sponsorship was not available.

	Number	%	Participants
Sample	219	71,6%	306
By Category			
Computers	7	77,8%	9
Management	81	67,5%	120
Marketing	87	75,6%	115
Secretarial	6	100,0%	6
Personnel	12	70,6%	17
Varied	26	66,7%	39
By Institution			
BOCCIM	4	57,1%	7
Damelin	4	57,1%	7
Datapoint	4	100,0%	4
DPG	15	71,4%	21
IDM	6	60,0%	10
MAST	75	80,6%	93
PECG	27	67,5%	40
Proman	56	65,9%	85
Various	28	71,8%	39

Note: Responses were recorded on a scale of 1 - 6 shown below

No influence
on decision

1	2	3	4	5	6
---	---	---	---	---	---

Greatly
influenced

Table F1: Extent Sponsorship influenced decision to attend course

PARTICIPANTS	Total	Employer P'pants	Employee P'pants	Average Score	Median Score
Whole sample	306	3,64	3,22	3,26	3,00
By Category					
Computers	9	-	3,44	3,44	3,00
Management	120	3,53	3,37	3,39	3,00
Marketing	115	3,60	3,07	3,11	3,00
Secretarial	6	-	3,83	3,83	4,00
Personnel	17	4,00	3,06	3,12	3,00
Varied	39	4,00	3,15	3,26	3,00
By Institution					
BOCCIM	7	2,50	4,40	3,86	4,00
Damelin	7	-	3,71	3,71	5,00
Datapoint	4	-	2,25	2,25	2,00
DPG	21	4,50	3,27	3,62	4,00
IDM	10	-	3,80	3,80	5,00
MAST	93	2,33	3,07	3,04	3,00
PECG	40	1,00	3,53	3,40	3,06
Proman	85	3,93	3,11	3,26	3,00
Various	39	4,00	3,15	3,26	3,00

4.5 Table F2 on page 11, displays the extent the availability of sponsorship influenced decisions to attend particular courses. For employers, sponsorship played a more significant role for finance courses, while for employees, sponsorship availability for courses held in Francistown (Time & Issues Management, for example) had significant influence on attendance.

Table F2: Extent sponsorship influenced decision to attend course

Course	Total	Employer P'pants	Employee P'pants	Average Score	Median Score
Time & Issue M'ment PECG (61% response) 11		-	4,91	4,91	6,00
Int. Financial M'ment DPG (54% response) 7		5,00	4,00	4,29	4,00
Lotus 123 IDM (63% response) 5		-	4,40	4,40	5,00
Management Hints BOCCIM (54% response) 7		2,50	4,40	3,86	4,00
Receptionists MAST (75% response) 6		-	3,83	3,83	4,00
Marketing & Sales Damelin(88% response) 7		-	3,71	3,71	5,00
Problem Solving Proman(73% response) 16		-	3,50	3,50	4,00
Basic Financial M'ment DPG (61% response) 14		4,25	2,90	3,29	4,00
Strategic Planning Proman(68% response) 25		3,71	3,11	3,28	3,00
Miscellaneous Varied(40% response) 39		4,00	3,15	3,26	3,00
Marketing & Sales IDM (71% response) 5		-	3,20	3,20	4,00
Marketing & Sales Proman(54% response) 27		4,14	2,85	3,19	3,00
Customer Relations MAST (70% response) 68		2,33	3,15	3,12	3,00
Personnel Management Proman(55% response) 17		4,00	3,06	3,12	3,00
Record Keeping PECG (36% response) 21		1,00	3,26	3,05	3,00
L'ship & Team Building MAST (66% response) 19		-	2,53	2,53	1,00
Intro to Computers Datapoint(67% response) 4		-	2,25	2,25	2,00
Customer Relations PECG (89% response) 8		-	2,25	2,25	3,00

Section 5: Employer Training Objectives

5.1 Employers were asked to identify the reasons for nominating participants on courses. Updating existing skills (45,1%) and training in new skills (50%) were the most frequently cited reasons, although among the employers who attended training courses, the need for remedial training (57,6%) was the most important training objective. Table G1 below analyses responses by the sample as a whole and for employers and employees separately. The numbers exceed the total sample because respondents could list more than one objective for selecting participants for training.

Table G1: Training Objectives for Selecting Participants

Sample (306)	Total	%	Employers	%	Employees	%
Employee request	32	10,5	-	-	32	11,7
Remedial training	119	38,9	19	57,6	100	36,6
Updating skills	138	45,1	11	33,3	127	46,5
New skills	153	50,0	11	33,3	142	52,0
For promotion	44	14,4	-	-	44	16,1
No objectives	1	0,3	-	-	1	0,4
Other	21	6,9	2	6,1	19	7,0

- 5.2 Tables G2 - G6 analyses training objectives by category of training and confirm that for employees remedial training is the most significant objective for attending a course. This is probably because the small business persons have entered business without any form of training, and are using the courses as an opportunity to build on their practical experience.
- 5.3 Table G5 also shows that for secretarial courses, remedial training was important. Acquisition of new skills was the most important objective for computer courses (Table G2). In the general area of management (Table G3), the most significant training objectives are up-dating skills (50%) and the acquisition of new skills (50%). This was also the case for the marketing courses (Table G4). Acquisition of new skills is the most important training objective in the area of personnel management (Table G6).

Table G2: Employer Training Objectives for Selecting Participants**Computer Related Courses**

Computers (9)	Total	%	Employer P'pants	%	Employee P'pants	%
Employee request	1	11,1	-	-	1	11,1
Remedial training	2	22,2	-	-	2	22,2
Updating skills	2	22,2	-	-	2	22,2
New skills	7	77,8	-	-	7	77,8
For promotion	3	33,3	-	-	3	33,3
No objectives	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-

Table G3: Employer Training Objectives for Selecting Participants
Management & Related Courses

Management (120)	Total	%	Employer P'pants	%	Employee P'pants	%
Employee request	11	9,2	-	-	11	11,1
Remedial training	46	38,3	13	10,8	33	27,5
Updating skills	60	50,0	9	7,5	51	42,5
New skills	60	50,0	8	6,7	52	43,3
For promotion	16	13,3	-	-	16	13,3
No objectives	1	0,8	-	-	1	0,8
Other	7	5,8	1	0,8	6	5,0

Table G4: Training Objectives for Selecting Participants**Marketing Related Courses**

Marketing (115)	Total	%	Employer P'pants	%	Employee P'pants	%
Employee request	12	10,4	-	-	1	10,4
Remedial training	51	44,4	5	4,3	46	40,0
Updating skills	50	43,5	-	-	50	43,5
New skills	54	47,0	3	2,6	51	44,3
For promotion	13	11,3	-	-	3	11,3
No objectives	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other	8	7,0	1	0,9	7	6,1

Secretarial Related CoursesTable G5: Training Objectives for Selecting Participants

Secretarial (6)	Total	%	Employer P'pants	%	Employee P'pants	%
Employee request	1	16,7	-	-	1	16,7
Remedial training	5	83,3	-	-	5	83,3
Updating skills	3	50,0	-	-	3	50,0
New skills	1	16,7	-	-	1	16,7
For promotion	3	50,0	-	-	3	50,0
No objectives	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other	3	50,0	-	-	3	50,0

Table G6: Training Objectives for Selecting Participants**Personnel related courses**

Personnel (17)	Total	%	Employer P'pants	%	Employee P'pants	%
Employee request	0	-	-	-	0	-
Remedial training	5	29,4	-	-	5	29,4
Updating skills	7	41,2	-	-	7	41,2
New skills	11	64,7	1	5,9	10	58,8
For promotion	3	17,7	-	-	3	17,7
No objectives	0	-	-	-	-	-
Other	2	11,8	-	-	3	11,8

5.4 Employers were asked the extent to which their training objectives had been met, using a scale of 1 - 6, where a score of 1 indicated that the objectives had not been met at all, and a score of 6 indicated that objectives had been totally met.

Objectives not met at all	1	2	3	4	5	6	Objectives Totally met
---------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	------------------------

5.5 The results of this evaluation are given in Table H1 on page 16, for the whole sample, by category and institution.

5.6 The table shows that generally, employers who attended courses felt that their objectives had been met more satisfactorily than was the case of their employees. The average score for employers was 4,3 compared to 3,65, with an average score of 3,72 for the sample as a whole.

5.7 Among the categories of training, courses in Personnel Management attended by employers were given the highest possible rating of 6 compared to 4,06 for employees. The training received by employees attending secretarial courses was also rated fairly highly at 4,5. The lowest rating received was an average of 3,44 for computer courses.

5.8 In a ranking by institution carrying out the training, the course run by BOCCIM itself (Management Hints) was ranked the highest, followed by courses offered by Damelin. Among employers, however, the finance courses offered by Deloitte Pim Goldby (4,5) received the highest score. The lowest ranking institution was Datapoint (2,75) for its computer courses. IDM, which also offered computer courses, was ranked higher with a score of 3,8.

Table H1: Have Company Training Objectives Been Met?

PARTICIPANTS	Total	Employer P'pant	Employee P'pant	Average Score	Median Score
Whole sample	306	4,30	3,65	3,72	4,00
By Category					
Computers	9	-	3,44	3,44	3,00
Management	120	4,59	3,44	3,60	4,00
Marketing	115	3,70	3,77	3,77	4,00
Secretarial	6	-	4,50	4,50	4,00
Personnel	17	6,00	4,06	4,18	4,00
Varied	39	4,20	3,65	3,72	4,00
By Institution					
BOCCIM	7	5,00	4,40	4,57	4,00
Damelin	7	-	4,43	4,43	4,00
Datapoint	4	-	2,75	2,75	3,00
DPG	21	4,50	3,80	4,00	4,00
IDM	10	-	3,80	3,80	4,00
MAST	93	2,33	3,79	3,74	4,00
PECG	40	4,50	2,97	3,05	3,50
Proman	85	4,53	3,71	3,88	4,00
Various	39	4,20	3,65	3,72	4,00

- 5.9 Three institutions, MAST, PE Consulting Group and Proman offered a number of short two - three day courses in the areas of marketing and management. Of these three, Proman with a score of 3,88 was rated the highest, closely followed by MAST (3,74) although employers attending MAST courses rated the organisation much lower (2,33) in terms of meeting training objectives.

- 5.10 At the level of individual courses Table H2 on the next page ranks the 17 courses analyzed separately in the survey. As noted previously, the course Management Hints run by BOCCIM achieved a highest score of 4,57 out of a possible score of 6. This was followed by a course for receptionists run by MAST (an average score of 4,50), and the Marketing and Sales course offered by Damelin (4,43). The course receiving the lowest score for achieving training objectives was Time and Issues Management run by PE Consulting (2,45).
- 5.11 The main reason given by those employers who felt training objectives had not been met was a feeling that courses were too short (24,5% of the sample). Other reasons were inadequacies on the part of employees (9,2%) and an opinion that the courses were not practical enough (9,2%).
- 5.12 Nearly a third (30,8%) of employers with participants on management course thought they were too short compared to 21,7% on marketing courses. For secretarial courses half the employers felt the courses were too short, an opinion expressed by 17,7% of participants on personnel courses. Some 10,8% of employers with participants on management courses felt they were not practical enough, as did 11,8% of those with participants on personnel courses. Only 6% of employers with participants on marketing courses thought they were too short.
- 5.13 At the level of the institution, the finance courses run by DPG were thought to be too short by 38% of employers, and the similar percentage (37,5%) felt this about courses run by PE. Half the employers with participants on the Datapoint computer course thought the course was both too short and not practical enough.

Table H2: Have Company Training Objectives been met?

Course	Total	Employer P'pant	Employee P'pant	Average Score	Median Score
Management Hints BOCCIM (54% response) 7		5,00	4,40	4,57	4,00
Receptionists MAST (75% response) 6		-	4,50	4,50	4,00
Marketing & Sales Damelin(88% response) 7		-	4,43	4,43	4,00
Personnel Management Proman(55%response) 17		6,00	4,06	4,18	4,00
Customer Relations PECG (89% response) 8		-	4,13	4,13	5,00
Basic Financial M'ment DPG (61% response) 14		4,00	4,10	4,07	4,00
Strategic Planning Proman(68% response) 25		4,57	3,83	4,04	4,00
Lotus 123 IDM (63% response) 5		-	4,00	4,00	5,00
Int. Financial M'ment DPG (54% response) 7		5,50	3,20	3,86	4,00
L'ship & Team Building MAST (66% response) 19		-	3,79	3,79	4,00
Marketing & Sales Proman(54% response) 27		4,29	3,60	3,78	4,00
Miscellaneous Varied(40% response) 39		4,20	3,65	3,72	4,00
Customer Relations MAST (70% response) 68		2,33	3,72	3,66	4,00
Marketing & Sales IDM (71% response) 5		-	3,60	3,60	3,00
Problem Solving Proman(73% response) 16		-	3,38	3,38	3,00
Record Keeping PECG (36% response) 21		4,50	2,79	2,95	3,00
Intro to Computers Datapoint(67%response) 4		-	2,75	2,75	3,00
Time & Issue M'ment PECG (61% response) 11		-	2,45	2,45	2,50

Section 6: Evaluation of Impact of Training

6.1 An attempt was made to evaluate the effectiveness of the training on participant performance by asking employers to evaluate performance prior to the training, and then whether there was any difference in performance after the course. The results of these evaluations are given in the following tables.

6.2 Table I1 on page 20 shows the employers' evaluation of performance prior to training on a scale 1 - 6, where a score of 1 indicates a poor performer, and a score of 6 indicates a very good performer.

Poor performer	1	2	3	4	5	6	Very good performer
----------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---------------------

6.3 Overall the average score was 3,65 indicating that participants sent on the courses (including employers themselves) were considered to be average performers, with the exception of participants sent on secretarial courses where the score of 2,67 was below the mid point of the scale.

6.4 In Table I2 on page 21, evaluation of performance prior to attending courses is analyzed by course. This confirms that those sent on receptionist courses were judged to be poor performers (an average score of 2,67 for participants sent on the receptionist course organised by MAST). Participants on PE's Record Keeping course with an average score of 2,86 were also judged to be below average performers prior to the course.

6.5 Table I3 on page 22 looks at changes in performance after participants had attended a course. This was measured on a scale running from -3 to +5, where -3 indicated a decrease in performance and +5 indicated significant improvement.

Decrease in performance	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	+4	+5	Very good performer
-------------------------	----	----	----	---	----	----	----	----	----	---------------------

6.6 As Table I3 shows, employers generally have perceived little improvement in performance after training. The average score for employees was only 2,17, although employers attending courses rated their improvement in performance after training higher, at an average score of 3,55.

6.7 Participants on computer courses showed the least improvement in performance with a score of 1,22. Participants on secretarial courses (who were judged to be the poorer performers prior to training) showed the most significant improvement in performance with an average score of 3,17 out of a possible 5. (Text continues on Page 24).

Table 11: Evaluation of Performance Prior to Course

PARTICIPANTS	Total	Employer P'pant	Employee P'pant	Average Score	Median Score
Whole sample	306	3,88	3,65	3,65	4,00
By Category					
Computers	9	-	4,22	4,22	5,00
Management	120	3,88	3,30	3,38	3,00
Marketing	115	3,70	3,91	3,90	4,00
Secretarial	6	-	2,67	2,67	3,00
Personnel	17	3,00	3,56	3,53	3,00
Varied	39	4,40	3,97	4,03	4,00
By Institution					
BOCCIM	7	4,50	3,60	3,86	4,00
Damelin	7	-	4,43	4,43	5,00
Datapoint	4	-	4,25	4,25	5,00
DPG	21	3,00	3,40	3,29	4,00
IDM	10	-	3,80	3,80	4,00
MAST	93	4,00	3,70	3,71	4,00
PECG	40	3,50	3,11	3,13	3,00
Proman	85	4,00	3,66	3,72	4,00
Various	39	4,40	3,97	4,03	4,00

Table I2: Evaluation of Performance prior to Course

Course	Total	Employer P'pant	Employee P'pant	Average Score	Median Score
Marketing & Sales Damelin(88% response)7		-	4,43	4,43	5,00
Intro to Computers Datapoint(67% response)4		-	4,25	4,25	5,00
Customer Relations PECG (89% response) 8		-	4,25	4,25	4,00
Miscellaneous Varied(40% response)39		-	3,97	4,03	4,00
Lotus 123 IDM (63% response) 5		-	4,20	4,20	5,00
Customer Relations MAST (70% response) 8		4,00	3,97	3,97	4,00
Problem Solving Proman(73% response)16		-	3,94	3,94	4,00
Strategic Planning Proman(68% response)25		4,57	3,61	3,88	4,00
Management Hints BOCCIM(54% response) 7		4,50	3,60	3,86	4,00
Marketing & Sales Proman(54% response)27		3,57	3,55	3,56	4,00
Personnel Management Proman(55% response)17		3,00	3,56	3,53	3,00
Basic Financial M'ment DPG (61% response) 4		3,00	3,70	3,50	4,00
Marketing & Sales IDM (71% response)15		-	3,40	3,40	4,00
L'ship & Team Building MAST (66% response)19		-	3,11	3,11	3,00
Int. Financial M'ment DPG (54% response) 7		3,00	2,80	2,86	3,00
Record Keeping PECG (36% response) 21		3,50	2,79	2,86	3,00
Time & Issue M'ment PECG (61% response) 11		-	2,82	2,82	3,00
Receptionists MAST (75% response) 6		-	2,67	2,67	3,00

Table I3: Difference in Performance After the Course

PARTICIPANTS	Total	Employer P'pant	Employee P'pant	Average Score	Median Score
Whole sample	306	3,55	2,17	2,32	3,00
By Category					
Computers	9	-	1,22	1,22	1,00
Management	120	3,41	2,15	2,33	3,00
Marketing	115	3,70	2,22	2,35	2,00
Secretarial	6	-	3,17	3,17	4,00
Personnel	17	5,00	2,13	2,29	3,00
Varied	39	3,40	2,18	2,33	2,00
By Institution					
BOCCIM	7	3,00	2,80	2,86	3,00
Damelin	7	-	1,86	1,86	2,00
Datapoint	4	-	1,50	1,50	1,00
DPG	21	3,00	2,80	2,86	3,00
IDM	10	-	1,50	1,50	2,00
MAST	93	2,67	2,41	2,42	3,00
PECG	40	4,00	1,92	2,03	2,00
Proman	85	4,00	1,97	2,33	3,00
Various	39	3,40	2,18	2,33	2,00

Table I4: Difference in Performance after Course

Course	Total	Employer P'pant	Employee P'pant	Average Score	Median Score
Customer Relations PECG (89% response)	8	-	3,38	3,38	4,00
Receptionists MAST (75% response)	6	-	3,17	3,17	4,00
Basic Financial M'ment DPG (61% response)	14	2,75	2,90	2,86	3,00
Int. Financial M'ment DPG (54% response)	7	3,50	2,60	2,86	3,00
Management Hints BOCCIM (54% response)	7	3,00	2,80	2,86	3,00
L'ship & Team Building MAST (66% response)	19	-	2,84	2,84	3,00
Strategic Planning Proman(68% response)	25	3,71	2,39	2,76	3,00
Marketing & Sales Proman(54% response)	27	4,14	1,95	2,52	3,00
Miscellaneous Varied(40% response)	39	3,40	2,18	2,33	2,00
Personnel Management Proman(55% response)	17	5,00	2,13	2,29	3,00
Customer Relations MAST (70% response)	68	2,67	2,22	2,24	2,00
Marketing & Sales IDM (71% response)	5	-	2,00	2,00	2,00
Record Keeping PECG (36% response)	21	4,00	1,68	1,90	2,00
Marketing & Sales Damelin(88% response)	7	-	1,86	1,86	2,00
Intro to Computers Datapoint(67% response)	4	-	1,50	1,50	1,00
Problem Solving Proman(73% response)	16	-	1,38	1,38	1,00
Time & Issue M'ment PECG (61% response)	11	-	1,27	1,27	0,00
Lotus 123 IDM (63% response)	5	-	1,00	1,00	0,00

- 6.8 Overall, it would appear that employers have only found modest improvements in performance following attendance on the courses.
- 6.9 The next Table I4 looks at changes in performance after training by course. The course rated highest for producing a significant improvement in performance after training was the Customer Relations course by the PE Consulting Group which employers gave an average score of 3,38 out of five for leading to improved employee performance.
- 6.10 The next highest rated course for improving employee performance were the financial management courses offered by Deloitte Pim Goldby , Basic and Intermediate Financial Management which both scored 2,86 out of a score of 5.
- 6.11 Employers participating on courses, as opposed to their employees, rated their improvement in performance after training much higher than that of employees. They were, however, rating their own performance. Nevertheless, coupled by a more positive response on the achievement of training objectives, this would seem to indicate that employers find participation on courses of more benefit for themselves than for employees. One of the possible reasons for this difference is the likelihood that employers are more able to implement the training at the place of work.
- 6.12 Courses which were evaluated particularly low in resulting in an improvement in employee performance were the two computer courses. Participants on the IDM Lotus 123 barely showed any change in performance with a score of only 1,00 out of a possible 5, and the Datapoint Introduction to Computers course was only rated at 1,5 in leading to an improvement in employee performance.
- 6.13 In contrast to the PE Customer Relations course with a score of 3,38, the MAST Customer Relations course only received a score of 2,24 for improved participant work performance after the course. Although employer participants found the Proman Personnel Management course led to improved performance (a score of 4,14), employers rated it much lower for their employee participants at only 1,95.
- 6.14 In general terms, therefore, attendance on the courses has led to only modest improvement in employee performance, although employers attending courses consider that the training they received has resulted in a significant improvement in their performance.
- 6.15 Another measure used to gauge the effectiveness of the training was to ask employers to rate the impact of training on their companies' efficiency. This was done using a similar scale to that used to measure improvement in employee performance, where a score of -3 indicated a negative impact on efficiency and a score of +5 indicated a significant positive impact on company efficiency.

Negative
impact on
efficiency

-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	+4	+5
----	----	----	---	----	----	----	----	----

Positive
impact on
efficiency

6.16 The results of this analysis is shown in Tables J1 (covering the sample by category and institutions) and J2 covering the 17 courses separately.

6.17 This confirms the relatively small change shown in employee performance. Employees were rated with an average score of 2,17 for improvement in performance after training, and when asked about the impact on the efficiency of their companies, employers gave an average score of 2,00. Again, their assessment of the impact of training they, as employers, had received, was rated higher, at 3,55.

Table J1: Impact of Training on Company Efficiency

PARTICIPANTS	Total	Employer P'pants	Employee P'pants	Average Score	Median Score
Whole sample	306	3,12	2,00	2,12	1,00
By Category					
Computers	9	-	1,44	1,44	1,00
Management	120	3,12	1,97	2,13	2,00
Marketing	115	2,80	2,15	2,21	2,00
Secretarial	6	-	2,17	2,17	2,00
Personnel	17	4,00	1,88	2,00	2,00
Varied	39	3,60	1,76	2,00	2,00
By Institution					
BOCCIM	7	2,00	2,20	2,14	2,00
Damelin	7	-	1,71	1,71	2,00
Datapoint	4	-	1,25	1,25	1,00
DPG	21	3,00	2,40	2,57	3,00
IDM	10	-	1,80	1,80	2,50
MAST	93	2,33	2,27	2,27	3,00
PECG	40	4,00	1,66	1,78	2,00
Proman	85	3,20	1,94	2,16	2,00
Various	39	3,60	1,76	2,00	2,00

Table J2: Impact of training on company efficiency

Course	Total	Employer P'pants	Employee P'pants	Average Score	Median Score
Customer Relations PECG (89% response)	8	-	3,13	3,13	4,00
Int. Financial M'ment DPG (54% response)	7	3,50	2,60	2,86	3,00
L'ship & Team Building MAST (66% response)	19	-	2,58	2,58	3,00
Strategic Planning Proman(68% response)	25	3,29	2,22	2,52	3,00
Basic Financial M'ment DPG (61% response)	14	2,75	2,30	2,43	3,00
Customer Relations MAST (70% response)	68	2,33	2,18	2,19	3,00
Receptionists MAST (75% response)	6	-	2,17	2,17	2,00
Marketing & Sales Proman(54% response)	27	-	1,85	2,15	2,00
Management Hints BOCCIM (54% response)	7	2,00	2,20	2,14	2,00
Miscellaneous Varied(40% response)	39	3,60	1,76	2,00	2,00
Personnel Management Proman(55% response)	17	4,00	1,88	2,00	2,00
Marketing & Sales IDM (71% response)	5	-	2,00	2,00	2,00
Problem Solving Proman(73% response)	16	-	1,81	1,81	2,00
Marketing & Sales Damelin(88% response)	7	-	1,71	1,71	2,00
Lotus 123 IDM (63% response)	5	-	1,60	1,60	3,00
Record Keeping PECG (36% response)	21	4,00	1,32	1,57	1,00
Intro to Computers Datapoint(67% response)	4	-	1,25	1,25	1,00
Time & Issue M'ment PECG (61% response)	11	-	1,18	1,18	0,00

- 6.18 Although the scores are also relatively low, the training participants received in marketing and secretarial courses showed a marginally greater positive impact on company efficiency than other types of courses. Once again, the evaluation of computer courses showed little impact on either employee or company performance after the training.
- 6.19 Among the institutions, Deloitte Pim Goldby's financial management courses again received higher ratings (with a score of 2,57 out of a possible 5) than other institutions. Institutions whose training had the least impact on company efficiency were Datapoint (1,25), Damelin (1,71), PE Consulting (1,78) and IDM (1,80).
- 6.20 Although overall PE Consulting Group as an institution was ranked among the lowest training institutions whose courses has had a positive impact on company efficiency, one of their courses, Customer Relations received the highest score for impact on company efficiency (3,13 out of a possible 5). The next highest scores were the two financial management programmes run by Deloitte Pim Goldby with 2,86 for Intermediate Finance Management and 2,43 for Basic Financial Management. Mast's Leadership and Team Building course also received a relatively higher score at 2,58. The lowest rated scores were Time and Issues Management (1,18) and Record Keeping by PE Consulting Group (1,57), Introduction to Computers (1,25) by Datapoint and Lotus 123 (1,60) from IDM.
- 6.21 It would appear, therefore, in general terms, with the exception of the finance courses, employers do not feel that the training received by their employees has either made a significant difference to employee performance, nor a particularly positive impact on company performance.
- 6.22 Nevertheless, as the next set of tables show, nearly a third of all employee participants attending courses (31,9%) were given a salary increase after a course, and 41,4% were given additional responsibilities. On the other hand, only seven out of the 273 employee participants attending courses (2,3%) were promoted as a direct result of attending a course, although a further 45 employee participants (16,5%) were promoted partly as a result of the training they received on one of the courses.
- 6.23 Tables K1 and K2 examine salary increases by gender, category and institution; Tables K3 - K4 relate to additional responsibilities, and Tables K5 and K6 cover promotions. The tables refer to employees only.
- 6.24 Virtually the same number of female as male participants received salary increases after attending courses (32,4% for women and 31,4% for men). Some 87 participants received salary increases as a direct result of attending a course. Of these 43 were male (49,4%) and 44 were women (50,1%). Gender, therefore does not seem to have had any effect on whether employees are rewarded after attending a course.

Table K1: Employees who received salary increases after course

	Number	%	Employees
Sample	87	31,9%	273
By Gender			
Male	43	31,4%	137
Female	44	32,4%	136
By Category			
Computers	3	33,3%	9
Management	26	25,2%	103
Marketing	35	33,3%	105
Secretarial	4	66,7%	6
Personnel	6	37,5%	13
Varied	13	38,2%	34
By Institution			
BOCCIM	3	60,0%	5
Damelin	0	00,0%	7
Datapoint	2	50,0%	4
DPG	3	20,0%	15
IDM	2	20,0%	10
MAST	33	36,7%	90
PECG	13	34,2%	38
Proman	18	25,7%	70
Various	13	38,24%	34

- 6.25 A higher percentage of persons attending personnel (38,2%) and marketing (33,3%) courses received salary increases than those attending management courses (25,2%), perhaps a reflection of the slightly higher score marketing courses gained for impact on company efficiency.
- 6.26 The percentages in the next table refer to male and female participants receiving salary increases; eg one (25%) of the four men on the Basic Financial Management course received a salary increase compared to two (40%) of the five women.

Table K2: Employees who received salary increases after course

Course & Institution	Total		Male		F'male		Total	
	M	F	No	%	No	%	No	%
Basic Fin. M'ment DPG 9	4	5	1	25,0	2	40,0	3	33,3
Customer Relations MAST 65	30	35	13	43,3	12	34,3	25	38,5
Int. Fin. M'ment DPG 5	2	3	-	-	-	-	-	-
L'ship & Team Building MAST 19	13	6	3	23,1	1	16,7	4	21,1
Management Hints BOCCIM 5	3	2	2	66,7	1	50,0	3	60,0
Marketing & Sales Proman 23	13	10	2	15,4	3	30,0	5	21,7
Personnel Management Proman 15	6	9	2	33,3	4	44,4	6	40,0
Problem Solving Proman 16	7	9	2	28,6	2	22,2	4	25,0
Record Keeping PECG 19	6	13	3	50,0	5	38,5	8	42,1
Strategic Planning Proman 19	16	3	3	18,8	-	-	3	15,8
Time & Issue M'ment PECG 10	8	2	1	12,5	-	-	1	9,1
Marketing & Sales Damelin 7	4	3	-	-	-	-	-	-
Intro to Computers Datapoint 4	1	3	1	100	1	33,3	2	50,0
Lotus 123 IDM 5	1	4	-	-	1	25,0	1	20,0
Marketing & Sales IDM 4	4	-	1	25,0	-	-	1	25,0
Receptionists MAST 6	-	6	-	-	4	66,7	4	66,7
Customer Relations PECG 8	6	2	3	50,0	1	50,0	4	50,0
Miscellaneous 34	13	21	6	46,2	7	33,3	14	38,2
Total 273	137	136	43	49,4	44	50,1	87	31,9

6.27 The next two tables look at participants who were given additional responsibilities after attending a course. Slightly more men (45,3%) than women (37,5%) were given additional responsibilities after attending a course and participants attending management and secretarial courses were more likely to have been given additional responsibilities than participants on other courses.

Table K3: Employees given additional responsibilities after course

	Number	%	Employees
Sample	113	41,4%	273
By Gender			
Male	62	45,3%	137
Female	51	37,5%	136
By Category			
Computers	3	33,3%	9
Management	44	42,7%	103
Marketing	42	40,0%	105
Secretarial	4	66,7%	6
Personnel	6	37,5%	16
Varied	14	41,1%	34
By Institution			
BOCCIM	3	60,0%	5
Damelin	2	28,6%	7
Datapoint	2	50,0%	4
DPG	7	46,7%	15
IDM	3	30,0%	10
MAST	32	35,6%	90
PECG	22	57,9%	38
Proman	28	40,0%	70
Various	14	41,2%	34

Table K4: Employees given additional responsibilities after course

Course & Institution	Total		Male		F'male		Total	
	M	F	No	%	No	%	No	%
Basic Fin. M'ment DPG 9	4	5	3	75,0	2	40,0	5	55,6
Customer Relations MAST 65	30	35	14	46,7	10	28,6	24	37,0
Int. Fin. M'ment DPG 5	2	3	2	100	-	-	2	40,0
L'ship & Team Building MAST 19	13	6	4	30,8	1	16,7	5	26,3
Management Hints BOCCIM 5	3	2	2	66,7	1	50,0	3	60,0
Marketing & Sales Proman 23	13	10	5	38,5	5	50,0	10	43,5
Personnel Management Proman 15	6	9	1	16,7	5	5,6	6	40,0
Problem Solving Proman 16	7	9	1	14,2	3	3,3	4	66,7
Record Keeping PECG 19	6	13	3	50,0	7	3,8	10	52,6
Strategic Planning Proman 19	16	3	9	56,3	13	3,3	10	52,6
Time & Issue M'ment PECG 10	8	2	4	50,0	1	50,0	5	50,0
Marketing & Sales Damelin 7	4	3	1	25,0	13	3,3	2	28,6
Intro to Computers Datapoint 4	1	3	1	100	16	6,7	2	50,0
Lotus 123 IDM 5	1	4	-	-	1	25,0	1	20,0
Marketing & Sales IDM 4	4	-	1	25,0	-	-	1	25,0
Receptionists MAST 6	-	6	-	-	4	66,7	4	66,7
Customer Relations PECG 6	6	2	5	83,3	1	50,0	6	75,0
Miscellaneous 34	13	21	6	46,0	7	33,3	13	38,2
Total 273	137	136	62	45,2	51	37,5	113	41,4

6.28 Only seven employees (five men and two women) were promoted directly as a result of attending a course. However, 45 participants (25 men and 20 women) were promoted partly because of the training received. These were spread evenly across categories as Table K5 shows. Apart from a Customer Relations course where proportionally more men than women were promoted, there are no significant gender differences on whether a participant was likely to be promoted.

Table K5: Employees promoted partly because of training

	Number	%	Employees
Sample	45	16,5%	273
By Gender			
Male	25	18,2%	137
Female	20	14,7%	136
By Category			
Computers	2	22,2%	9
Management	17	16,5%	103
Marketing	14	13,3%	105
Secretarial	3	50,0%	6
Personnel	3	18,7%	16
Varied	6	17,6%	34
By Institution			
BOCCIM	-	-	5
Damelin	-	-	7
Datapoint	1	25,0%	4
DPG	-	-	15
IDM	1	10,0%	10
MAST	16	17,8%	90
PECG	13	34,2%	38
Proman	8	11,4%	70
Various	6	17,6%	34

Table K6: Employees promoted partly because of training

Course & Institution	Total		Male		F'male		Total	
	M	F	No	%	No	%	No	%
Basic Fin. M'ment DPG 9	4	5	-	-	-	-	-	-
Customer Relations MAST 65	30	35	8	26,6	3	8,6	11	16,9
Int. Fin. M'ment DPG 5	2	3	-	-	-	-	-	-
L'ship & Team Building MAST 19	13	6	1	7,7	3	50,0	4	21,1
Management Hints BOCCIM 5	3	2	-	-	-	-	-	-
Marketing & Sales Proman 23	13	10	1	7,7	2	20,0	3	13,0
Personnel Management Proman 15	6	9	1	16,7	1	11,1	2	13,3
Problem Solving Proman 16	7	9	1	14,3	-	-	1	6,3
Record Keeping PECG 19	6	13	3	50,0	4	36,7	7	36,8
Strategic Planning Proman 19	16	3	1	6,3	-	-	1	5,3
Time & Issue M'ment PECG 10	8	2	3	37,5	-	-	3	30,0
Marketing & Sales Damelin 7	4	3	-	-	-	-	-	-
Intro to Computers Datapoint 4	1	3	1	100	-	-		25,0
Lotus 123 IDM 5	1	4	-	-	1	25,0	1	20,0
Marketing & Sales IDM 4	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Receptionists MAST 6	-	6	-	-	3	50,0	3	50,0
Customer Relations PECG 8	6	2	3	50,0	-	-	3	37,5
Miscellaneous 34	13	21	2	15,4	3	14,3	5	14,7
Total 273	137	136	25	18,2	20	14,7	45	16,5

Table L2: Overall employer satisfaction with training

Course	Total	Employer P'pants	Employee P'pants	Average Score	Median Score
Management Hints BOCCIM (54% response)	7	5,00	5,00	5,00	5,00
Receptionists MAST (75% response)	6	0,00	4,67	4,67	5,00
Customer Relations PECG (89% response)	8	0,00	4,50	4,50	5,00
Marketing & Sales Damelin(88% response)	7	0,00	4,29	4,29	4,00
Strategic Planning Proman(68% response)	25	4,57	4,00	4,16	4,00
Customer Relations MAST (70% response)	68	3,67	4,15	4,13	4,00
Personnel Management Proman(55% response)	17	6,00	3,94	4,06	4,00
Basic Financial M'ment DPG (61% response)	14	4,75	3,70	4,00	4,00
Int. Financial M'ment DPG (54% response)	7	5,50	3,40	4,00	4,00
Marketing & Sales Proman(54% response)	27	5,14	3,50	3,93	4,00
Problem Solving Proman(73% response)	16	0,00	3,81	3,81	4,00
Marketing & Sales IDM (71% response)	5	0,00	3,80	3,80	4,00
L'ship & Team Building MAST (66% response)	19	0,00	3,74	3,74	4,00
Varied(40% response)	39	5,00	3,41	3,62	4,00
Lotus 123 IDM (63% response)	5	0,00	3,40	3,40	5,00
Time & Issue M'ment PECG (61% response)	11	0,00	3,36	3,36	3,00
Record Keeping PECG (36% response)	21	5,50	2,84	3,10	3,00
Intro to Computers Datapoint(67% response)	4	0,00	2,50	2,50	3,00

Section 7: Overall employer satisfaction with training

7.1 Although, generally, employers reported that training participants had received had only marginal impact on performance and company efficiency, employers were, overall, satisfied with the training. A 6-point scale was used to measure overall satisfaction, where a score of 1 indicated no satisfaction at all, and a score of 6 indicated extreme satisfaction.

Not satisfied
waste of time

1	2	3	4	5	6
---	---	---	---	---	---

Extremely
satisfied

Table 11: Overall employer satisfaction with training

PARTICIPANTS	Total	Employer P'pants	Employee P'pants	Average Score	Median Score
Whole sample	306	4,88	3,78	3,90	4,00
By Category					
Computers	9	-	3,00	3,00	3,00
Management	120	4,88	3,63	3,81	4,00
Marketing	115	4,70	4,05	4,10	4,00
Secretarial	6	-	4,67	4,67	5,00
Personnel	17	6,00	3,94	4,06	4,00
Varied	39	5,00	3,41	3,62	4,00
By Institution					
BOCCIM	7	5,00	5,00	5,00	5,00
Damelin	7	-	4,29	4,29	4,00
Datapoint	4	-	2,50	2,50	3,00
DPG	21	5,00	3,60	4,00	4,00
IDM	10	-	3,60	3,60	4,00
MAST	93	3,67	4,10	4,09	4,00
PECG	40	5,50	3,34	3,45	4,00
Proman	85	4,93	3,80	4,00	4,00
Various	39	5,00	3,41	3,62	4,00

- 7.2 The average score for the 306 participants was 3,90. However, employers themselves who attended a course, rated their level of satisfaction higher, with an average score of 4,88 for the 33 employers in the sample attending courses. The results of this analysis are given in Tables L1 and L2.
- 7.3 Within the categories of training, the secretarial course received the highest score for overall satisfaction (4,67) followed by Marketing courses (4,10). Institutions carrying out training which received the highest scores were BOCCIM (5,00), Damelin (4,29), Mast (4,09) and Deloitte Pim Goldby (4,00). The lowest ranked institution on overall satisfaction was the PE Consulting Group at 3,45.
- 7.4 Table L2 looks at overall satisfaction by courses. Among employers, Proman's Personnel Management course was given the highest possible rating of 6,00 by employers attending the course, although it was ranked lower where the participants were employees (3,94). The BOCCIM Management Hints course with an average score of 5,00 was ranked overall the course which employers found to be most satisfactory for both employer and employee participants.
- 7.5 Other courses which were rated as being relatively satisfactory were Mast's Receptionist Course (4,67), PE's Customer Relations course (4,50) and Damelin's Marketing & Sales course (4,29). The lowest ranked courses in terms of satisfaction with the training were Datapoint's Introduction to Computers (2,50), and PE's Record Keeping (3,10).
- 7.6 Employers were asked whether there was anything they particularly liked about a course, and whether they had any specific complaints. The responses to these questions are given in Tables M1 and M2 below.
- 7.7 Nearly half the sample (44,1%) had something positive to say about the courses, while a much smaller number, 74 (24,2%) had any specific complaints. On the positive side, the management courses received the most comments (51,7% of the employers with participants on management courses were positive about the course), while the computer courses received the fewest positive comments.
- 7.8 On the negative side only 74 employers expressed negative comments with specific complaints. Of these, the personnel course received the fewest complaints, with only one of the employers expressing a problem with the course (that it was too short).
- 7.9 Analysis of comments by course has not been tabulated because the comments are spread evenly across the courses and no particular course attracted significantly more positive or negative comments than any other course.
- 7.10 Employer participants, however, tended to be more complementary about the courses they had attended than those attended by their employees. For example, six out of the 33 employer participants (18%) described the courses as being well presented and another seven (21%) felt that the topics covered were particularly relevant.

7.11 The relevance of course content, in fact, was generally seen as being the most positive aspect of the training with 57 employers (42% of the employers giving positive comments) identifying this as being a particularly positive aspect of the training.

Table M1: Employers liking something particular about course

	Number	%	Participants
Sample	135	44,1%	306
By Category			
Computers	1	11,1%	9
Management	62	51,7%	120
Marketing	51	44,4%	115
Secretarial	3	50,0%	6
Personnel	6	35,3%	17
Varied	12	30,8%	39
By Institution			
BOCCIM	3	42,7%	7
Damelin	3	42,7%	7
Datapoint	0	0,0%	4
DPG	14	66,7%	21
IDM	3	30,0%	10
MAST	47	50,5%	93
PECG	20	50,0%	40
Proman	33	38,8%	85
Various	12	30,8%	39

7.12 Below is a summary of the comments about the courses expressed as a percentage of the 135 respondents giving positive comments and of the sample as a whole.

Comment	No	%	% Sample
Well presented	15	11%	(4%)
Topic were relevant and comprehensive	57	42%	(19%)
Employee were better motivated after course	25	19%	(8%)
Sharing experience with other people	14	10%	(4%)
Other	24	18%	(8%)

Table M2: Employers with specific complaints about course

	Number	%	Participants
Sample	74	24,2%	306
By Category			
Computers	2	22,2%	9
Management	35	29,2%	120
Marketing	25	21,8%	115
Secretarial	3	50,0%	6
Personnel	1	5,9%	17
Varied	8	20,5%	39
By Institution			
BOCCIM	0	0,0%	7
Damelin	0	0,0%	7
Datapoint	1	25,0%	4
DPG	8	38,1%	21
IDM	3	30,0%	10
MAST	16	17,2%	93
PECG	13	32,5%	40
Proman	25	29,4%	85
Various	8	20,5%	39

7.13 Although only 74 respondents (24% of the sample) had complaints, the most frequent complaint cited was that the courses were considered to be too short. Other complaints included the fact that the range of education and experience of participants was too broad and this inhibited the amount of information which could be covered.

7.14 A summary of the main areas of complaint is given below expressed as a percentage of the 74 respondents who had complaints and the sample as a whole.

Comment	No	%	% Sample
Course too short	35	47%	11%
Range of participants was too broad	14	19%	4%
No feedback given on participant performance	9	12%	3%
Other	16	22%	5%

7.15 Respondents were also asked whether they had any suggestions which could improve the type of courses sponsored through BOCCIM. Two suggestions, in particular, were made (albeit by a minority of respondents), that:

- development of longer courses (recommended by 12,4% of the respondents and 25,3% of those making suggestions)
- evaluation of participant performance (recommended by 13% of the respondents and 27% of those making suggestions)

7.16 Other recommendations made by respondents were:

- more courses aimed specifically at small scale employers, particularly in the area of financial management, marketing and general business management (recommended by 11,2% of the respondents, and 22,6% of those making suggestions)
- increase the number of specialised courses in financial management and marketing skills (recommended by 11,2% of respondents and 22,7% of those making suggestions)
- provide more detailed information about courses to enable employers to select suitable participants and ensure that participants on same courses are homogeneous with regard to education levels and experience (recommended by 5,9% of respondents and 12,0% of those making suggestions)
- develop courses and course material in Setswana to facilitate training at a lower level (recommended by 4% of respondents and 8,0% of those making suggestions)

7.17 Finally, employers were asked whether they would send other employees on similar courses whether or not sponsorship was available. Responses are shown in Tables N1 and N2.

7.18 As indicated in the next tables, 90% of the respondents (277) said they would send other employers on similar courses again. The only courses where reservations were expressed were the computer courses.

Table N1: Employers who would send other employees on same course

	Number	%	Total
Sample	277	90,5%	306
By Category			
Computers	6	66,7%	9
Management	111	92,5%	120
Marketing	107	93,0%	115
Secretarial	5	83,3%	6
Personnel	14	82,4%	17
Varied	34	87,2%	39
By Institution			
BOCCIM	5	71,4%	7
Damelin	7	100,0%	7
Datapoint	2	50,0%	4
DPG	19	90,5%	21
IDM	9	90,0%	10
MAST	87	93,6%	93
PECG	37	92,5%	40
Proman	77	90,6%	85
Various	34	87,2%	39

7.19 Even if sponsorship was not available, 74% of the sample (227 respondents) said they would send other employees to similar courses; apart from the computer courses where only half the employers would be willing to send employees if sponsorship was not available.

Table N2: Employers willing to send employees without sponsorship

	Number	%	Total
Sample	227	74,2%	306
By Category			
Computers	5	55,6%	9
Management	91	75,8%	120
Marketing	87	75,7%	115
Secretarial	5	83,3%	6
Personnel	11	64,7%	17
Varied	28	71,8%	39
By Institution			
BOCCIM	5	71,4%	7
Damelin	4	57,1%	7
Datapoint	1	25,0%	4
DPG	14	66,7%	21
IDM	8	80,0%	10
MAST	76	81,7%	93
PECG	32	80,0%	40
Proman	59	69,4%	85
Various	28	71,8%	39

APPENDIX

BOTSWANA CONFEDERATION OF COMMERCE, INDUSTRY AND MANPOWER (BOCCIM)

TRAINING QUALITY SURVEY

Name of Employer:

Name of Trainee:

Course:

(Please tick boxes as applicable)

Is this employee still employed by you? Yes No

If Yes, position now held?

If No longer employed, when did employee leave?:(date)

Why did he/she leave? Resigned :

Dismissed:

Where is he/she now employed?: Don't know

Name of new employer:.....Place:.....

1. How did you learn about this course:

A. Circular from BOCCIM

B. Advert in Press

C. Circular from Course organisers

D. Informed by employee

E. Other:.....

2. What were your objectives in selecting this employee for the course?

A. Employee requested to attend

B. For remedial training to improve performance

C. To up-date employee's existing skills

D. To train employee in new skills

E. To prepare employee for promotion

F. No particular objectives

G. Other:.....

If more than one, which one was most important?:

3. Have your objectives for sending this employee on the course been met?

Not met at all

1	2	3	4	5	6
---	---	---	---	---	---

 Totally met

Not applicable: no particular objectives

4. If your objectives were not met, what do you think was the problem?

- A. Not applicable; no particular objectives
- B. Inappropriate course for employee
- C. Inadequacies on part of employee
- D. Inappropriate course for Botswana
- E. Course was not practical enough
- F. Course too short
- G. Course not relevant to our type of business
- H. Insufficient feedback on employee performance
- I. Insufficient information on course content
- J. Did not give solutions to business problems
- K. Other:.....

If more than one, which was the major problem

5. Did offer of sponsorship influence decision to nominate employee on course?

No influence on

1	2	3	4	5	6
---	---	---	---	---	---

 Greatly Influenced

6. Would you have nominated an employee on this course if sponsorship was NOT available?

Yes	No
-----	----

If NO, why not?:.....

7. After the course did you receive adequate evaluation of your employee's performance?

Yes	No
-----	----

If NO, what information would you have liked, and how would you have used this information?

.....

.....

8. How would you evaluate your employee's performance before the course?

Poor performer

1	2	3	4	5	6
---	---	---	---	---	---

 Very good performer

9. Did you see any difference in your employee's performance after course?

Decrease in performance

-3	-2	-1	No Change	+1	+2	+3	+4	+5
----	----	----	-----------	----	----	----	----	----

 Improvement in performance

If there has been a change in performance, please describe changes:

.....
.....

10. Did you increase the employee's salary because of a change in performance as a direct result of attending the course?

Yes	No
-----	----

11. Has your employee been given additional responsibilities as a result of attending the course?

Yes	No
-----	----

If YES, what additional responsibilities have you given the employee?

.....
.....

12. Has your employee been promoted since attending the course?

Yes	No
-----	----

If Yes,:
Position at time of Course Present position

Was this promotion a result of training received on the course?

Yes	No	Partly
-----	----	--------

13. Has the training your employee received had any impact on the efficiency of your company?

Negative impact on efficiency

-3	-2	-1	No Change	1	2	3	4	5
----	----	----	-----------	---	---	---	---	---

 Positive impact on efficiency

If training received by employee has had an impact on your company, please describe this impact?

.....
.....

14. Overall, how would you describe your satisfaction with the training your employee received on this course?

Not satisfied:
Waste of time

1	2	3	4	5	6
---	---	---	---	---	---

Extremely
satisfied

15. Is there anything about the course that you particularly liked?

Yes	No	Don't Know
-----	----	------------

If YES, please list.
.....
.....

16. Do you have any specific complaints about the course?

Yes	No	Don't Know
-----	----	------------

If YES, please list:.....
.....
.....

17. Would you send another of your employees on the same course again :

Yes	No
-----	----

IF YES,

Would you still send another employee on the same course if sponsorship was not available?

Yes	No
-----	----

18. Do you have any suggestions which could improve this type of course?

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

Thank you for your participation. Please return the questionnaire in the S.A.E. provided to Tsa Badiri Consultancy, P.O. Box 731, Gaborone: Tel: 314164.

Name of person completing Questionnaire:..... Tel:.....