

Vol 5 Issue 9 June 2016

ISSN No : 2249-894X

*Monthly Multidisciplinary
Research Journal*

*Review Of
Research Journal*

Chief Editors

Ashok Yakkaldevi
A R Burla College, India

Ecaterina Patrascu
Spiru Haret University, Bucharest

Kamani Perera
Regional Centre For Strategic Studies,
Sri Lanka

Review Of Research Journal is a multidisciplinary research journal, published monthly in English, Hindi & Marathi Language. All research papers submitted to the journal will be double-blind peer reviewed referred by members of the editorial Board readers will include investigator in universities, research institutes government and industry with research interest in the general subjects.

Regional Editor

Manichander Thammishetty

Ph.d Research Scholar, Faculty of Education IASE, Osmania University, Hyderabad.

Advisory Board

Kamani Perera Regional Centre For Strategic Studies, Sri Lanka	Delia Serbescu Spiru Haret University, Bucharest, Romania	Mabel Miao Center for China and Globalization, China
Ecaterina Patrascu Spiru Haret University, Bucharest	Xiaohua Yang University of San Francisco, San Francisco	Ruth Wolf University Walla, Israel
Fabricio Moraes de Almeida Federal University of Rondonia, Brazil	Karina Xavier Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT), USA	Jie Hao University of Sydney, Australia
Anna Maria Constantinovici AL. I. Cuza University, Romania	May Hongmei Gao Kennesaw State University, USA	Pei-Shan Kao Andrea University of Essex, United Kingdom
Romona Mihaila Spiru Haret University, Romania	Marc Fetscherin Rollins College, USA	Loredana Bosca Spiru Haret University, Romania
	Liu Chen Beijing Foreign Studies University, China	Ilie Pinte Spiru Haret University, Romania
Mahdi Moharrampour Islamic Azad University buinzahra Branch, Qazvin, Iran	Nimita Khanna Director, Isara Institute of Management, New Delhi	Govind P. Shinde Bharati Vidyapeeth School of Distance Education Center, Navi Mumbai
Titus Pop PhD, Partium Christian University, Oradea, Romania	Salve R. N. Department of Sociology, Shivaji University, Kolhapur	Sonal Singh Vikram University, Ujjain
J. K. VIJAYAKUMAR King Abdullah University of Science & Technology, Saudi Arabia.	P. Malyadri Government Degree College, Tandur, A.P.	Jayashree Patil-Dake MBA Department of Badruka College Commerce and Arts Post Graduate Centre (BCCAPGC), Kachiguda, Hyderabad
George - Calin SERITAN Postdoctoral Researcher Faculty of Philosophy and Socio-Political Sciences Al. I. Cuza University, Iasi	S. D. Sindkhedkar PSGVP Mandal's Arts, Science and Commerce College, Shahada [M.S.]	Maj. Dr. S. Bakhtiar Choudhary Director, Hyderabad AP India.
REZA KAFIPOUR Shiraz University of Medical Sciences Shiraz, Iran	Anurag Misra DBS College, Kanpur	AR. SARAVANAKUMARALAGAPPA UNIVERSITY, KARAIKUDI, TN
Rajendra Shendge Director, B.C.U.D. Solapur University, Solapur	C. D. Balaji Panimalar Engineering College, Chennai	V.MAHALAKSHMI Dean, Panimalar Engineering College
	Bhavana vivek patole PhD, Elphinstone college mumbai-32	S.KANNAN Ph.D , Annamalai University
	Awadhesh Kumar Shirotriya Secretary, Play India Play (Trust), Meerut (U.P.)	Kanwar Dinesh Singh Dept.English, Government Postgraduate College , solan

More.....

Review Of Research



DIFFERENT MODELS OF EVALUATION OF TRAINING AND DEVELOPMENT OF HRM - A STUDY



Durgappa

Assistant Professor, Dept of Commerce, Government First Grade College , Shiralakoppa,
Shikaripura Tq, Shivamogga Dist, Karnataka (State),



ABSTRACT

Human resources are an organization's greatest assets because without them, everyday business functions such as managing cash flow, making business transactions, communicating through all forms of media, and dealing with customers could not be completed. Human resources and their potentiality they possess are key drivers for any organization's success. With globalization and technological advances, today's organizations are continuously changing. Thus, organizational change impacts not only the business but also its employees. In order to maximize organizational effectiveness, human potentials, individuals' capabilities, time, and talents must be managed and developed. Within banks, a major

responsibility of the top management is to develop personnel through training and development. The present study critically analyses on Evaluation of Training and Development of HRM.

KEYWORDS : Training, Development, Evaluation, HRM, Banks etc.

1.0 INTRODUCTION

Training is the process of assisting a person for enhancing his efficiency and effectiveness at work by improving and updating his professional knowledge by developing skills relevant to his work and cultivating appropriate behaviour and attitudes towards work and organization. Training could be designed either for improving present capabilities at work or for preparing a person for assuming higher responsibilities in future, which will call for additional knowledge and superiors skills. Finally, Training is the systematic modification of behaviour through learning which occurs as a result of education, instruction development and planned experience. Training is the increasing of knowledge and skill of an employee for doing a particular job Steinmetz (1996).

Training in this context, can be thought of as an organizational process of assisting people in enhancing their efficiency and effectiveness at work and cultivating appropriate behaviour and attitudes towards work and people. Training is valuable to the employee in terms of better job security and greater opportunity for advancement. A skill thus acquired by the employee through training is an asset to the organization. Employee training represents a significant expenditure for organizations. Senior management should recognize that the training function has valuable intelligence about employees' core skills. The training unit, in a successful program, understands the organizations strategic direction and can design and implement a creative way of moving people in that direction. As a result, banks have to continue to deal with two urgent challenges, first is to improve their competitive position by reducing costs and the second is to learn how to manage the impact of technological development.

1.1 Concept of Training

The term training refers to the acquisition of knowledge, skills and competencies as a result of the teaching of occupational or practical skills and knowledge that relate to specific useful competencies. The definition of training expands from training directly related to the performance of official duties to any training that improves individual and organizational performance and assists an agency in achieving its objectives and goals Hessling (1997), Scott & Spriegel (1996). Functional definition of training is the acquisition of concepts, theories, knowledge, skills and attitudes. The significance of training lies in making employees more effective and productive. It is actively and intimately connected with all personnel or managerial activities. It is an integral part of the whole management programme with all its activities functionally inter-related. Training has been seen by scholars as an aid in adjusting to work environment which is designed to increase the capacity of individual or group in contributing to the attainment of the organizational goals Van Buren, M. E., & Erskine; W. (2002).

1.2 Concept of Evaluation

Evaluation of training is an attempt to obtain on the effects of training programme and assess the value of training in the light of the information. This includes the investigation before and after training. One cannot assess the effects unless one knows the before training situation for comparison with the after training situation. The outcome of training programme seeks to depict how training was effective. The question is to know if the results are in accord to the desired outcomes or not. It also considers whether training programme was conducted or implemented according to the plan. Evaluation helps the trainer to seek if any employee needs further training to perform his/her job Nickols, F.W. (2005). Evaluation is the process of systematically collecting information and using the information to determine the effects and value of training programme. It seeks to determine the degree to which the programme has done what it was supposed to do. Evaluation ensures that T&D programmes are accountable and are meeting the needs of employees and the organization in the most cost-effective manner Beardwell I and Holden, L, (1994).

1.3 Linkages Between Training and development

Consequently training and development has become one of the most critical aspects of human resource effectiveness. No matter the way one looks at training and development, they help employees to learn how to use the resources in an approved fashion that allows the organization to reach its desired output. Training and development has grown concerned not only with helping individuals to adequately fill their positions, but also with helping whole organizations and sub- departments to grow

and develop. Every organization needs to have well trained and experienced people to perform the activities that have to be done. It is necessary to raise the skill levels and increase the versatility and adaptability of employees. Inadequate job redesigning or technological breaks through require some type of training and development efforts.

1.4 Objectives of the Study

The present study is to critically analyses the different models of evaluation of training and development in HRM in general and its relevance in particular.

1.5 Sources of Data

The secondary data collected through books, articles and news bulletins, annual reports, periodicals, journals, etc., In addition to this the study also made use of online journals and websites.

1.6 Models of Evaluation of Training and Development

This thesis standardizes the term as a model for the consistency and evaluation models included are classified into five types as follows:

- Levels of evaluation include those models with causally linked categories.
- Formative evaluation includes those models that asses a programme at the design stage or in implementation.
- Models in relation to performance evaluation cover those incorporating organizational performance appraisal or evaluation.
- Models of learning and evaluation focus on learning process and intervention.
- Compressive and systematic evaluation models are characterized by evaluating training intervention in a broader way, which integrates with phases of training and include many factors relating to the individual and organization.

Table 1: 1 List of Models for Evaluation of Training Relevant to this Study

Models	Levels of Evaluation			
	Four levels of Evaluation	Five levels of Evaluation	CIRO(context, input reaction, output)	ROI(Return On Investment)
Sources	Kirkpatrick 1994	Hamblin 1974	Warr, Bird and Rackham	Phillips 2003
Evaluation criteria/Method	1. Reaction 2. Learning 3. Behaviour 4. Results	1.Reaction 2.Learning 3.JobBehaviour 4. Organization 5. Ultimate value	1.Context 2. Input 3. Reaction 4. Outcome -Immediate outcome -Intermediate outcomes -Ultimate outcomes	1.Reaction and Satisfaction 2. Learning 3.Application and implementation 4. Business impact 5.Return on Investment

Models	Formative Evaluation			
	Testing and Review of Products	Three stage Evaluation	Four Component Process	Integrative Practice
Sources	Geis, 1987	Dick and Carey, 1996	Weston, McAlpine and Bardono, 1995	Brown and Gerhardt, 2000
Evaluation Criteria/Method	The development testing -using learners as test subjects and critics. The expert review -using experts to examine instructional materials.	1. One to one valuation -Involving individual participant for evaluating programme. 2. Small group evaluation - Getting feedback from a group of participants. 3. Field test -Real situation test of instruction programme.	Clearly defined components, simplicity of conducting evaluation on instruction. 1. Participants 2. Roles 3. Methods 4. Situations	Concept: Training subject matter and preliminary objectives. Design: Specific instructional objectives and activities. Prototype: usability and learner satisfaction to training materials. Pilot: format and delivery

1.6.1 Levels of Evaluation

It's argued by researchers and practitioners alike (Alliger and Jank, 1998) that the most influential contribution to evaluation theory and practice has come from Kirkpatrick's series of publications in his late 50's and 60's in the journal of American society for training and development. His four levels of evaluation model has been the basis for various levels of evaluation models.

1.6.2 Classic Model: Kirkpatrick's Four Levels model

Level 1. Reaction is a measure of how trainees think about the training programmes in terms of subject, content, instruction and time schedule. Reaction is normally measured by using questionnaires, which is also called a 'happy sheet'.

Level 2: Learning is to assess whether the trainees have acquired knowledge, improved skills, or changed attitudes because of training intervention.

Level 3: Behaviour is the measurement of any behaviour change of the trainee on their job as a result of training programmes. Kirkpatrick suggested a scientific and systematic approach to measure on-the-job behaviour by collecting information on pre- and post-training performance appraisal of the participants from different sources.

Level 4: Results is a measure of the impact of a training programme on the organization due to change of participant's on-the-job behaviour. However, Kirkpatrick does not offer a detailed

description on how to conduct the measurements of results. He points out that it becomes more difficult, complicated and expensive to measure the 'results' of training even though the measurement at this level is more meaningful.

Kirkpatrick (1994) suggested that evaluation should be conducted from lower level to higher ones in sequence if it is financially feasible (see figure 1.1). However, as the measurement is moved from one level to the next, it takes more time, costs more money and becomes more complicated, but is assumed to provide more valuable information than the previous level.

Some authors describe Kirkpatrick's four level of evaluation as being based on four simple questions.

- Reaction: were the participants pleased with the training programme?
- Learning: what did the participants learn in the programme?
- Behaviour: did the participants change their behaviour based on what was learned?
- Results: did the change in behaviour positively affect the organization?

Kirkpatrick's classic model is mostly used by practitioners and organizations as a result of simplicity and ability to help trainers to think about the evaluation criteria of training programmes. It has led to a large amount of work in training evaluation.

1.7 Hamblin's Five Levels Model (1974)

Hamblin (1974) described his five levels model as a supplement to the other models rather than a replacement for them. This model keeps the level 1: reaction, level 2: learning, level 3: behaviour same as Kirkpatrick's, but refines the level 4: results into organization level and ultimate value level. Hamblin is one of the first to modify Kirkpatrick's framework. Hamblin suggests the hierarchical links among his five more explicitly. However the scholar suggested that "reaction" is not always constant, but changing dynamically in the process of training. Further, Hamblin divides the last level of Kirkpatrick's into two and makes a distinction between economic and non-economic values. The concept of organizational climate is introduced which is concerned with the employees perception of how their organization should work, and to which extent to which the employees feel satisfied with their organization. Moreover, Hamblin develops an "objective-oriented strategy" in relations to each level which suggests that training assessment could be done at any intermediate level to fit different objectives, not necessary at ultimate financial level.

1.8 CIRO MODEL (Warr, Bird and Rackham 1970)

Warr et al (1970) argues that evaluation of a training programme is not an action done at the end of the programme, but should be viewed in a wider context. In other words, evaluation is a systematic process, which is well-planned before a training programme takes place and is integrated throughout the programme. Warr et al's model is one of the first to incorporate into the evaluation process in the way of context analysis.

1.8.1 Context evaluation: to collect contextual information about organizational operations and analyze business objectives in an attempt to identify the training needs.

1.8.2 Input evaluation: to collect information about possible resources such as budget, methods and delivery in order to make best choice on training procedures from the options.

1.8.3 Reaction evaluation: to gather trainees opinions about the training programme they have taken, which can be done in the way of end-of-course review, follow-up survey as well as informal conversation.

1.8.4 Outcome evaluation: to measure the outcomes of training programmes at the following three hierarchy levels;

- Immediate outcome- changes of trainees in knowledge, skills and attitudes, which can be measured immediately after the training.
- Intermediate outcomes- changes of trainees on –the-job behaviour or changes in the job performance, to which the attention should be paid to the layout of time and resources.
- Ultimate outcome- the impact of trainees departments or organizational due to the above mentioned changes, which reveals great difficulties to measure specific outcomes at ultimate level.

The complexity of the evaluation of management training is identified and emphasis is given on the immediate outcome level due to the intervening variable for the on the job behaviour change do not provide an effective method to measure the ultimate outcome – organizational level.

1.9 ROI Model (Phillips 2003)

According to Phillips the ROI evaluation is result-focused systematic process. There is a chain linkage of the above five levels, which echoes Kirkpatrick's casual interlink of his four levels of evaluation. Phillips stresses that it is difficult to determine whether the final results are produced by the HR initiative if the measurements are taken at each level. ROI is an innovation in management and evaluation which provides bottom figures and accountability for all types of training, performance improvement, human resources and technology programmes. Phillips takes the lead in developing the ROI evaluation frame work to meet the three main driving forces practitioners and training managers, clients and senior managers and evaluation researchers.

This model tries to identify the effects of a training programme, isolate them from other factors and convert data to monetary terms. Since its development in 1970s the ROI method has been introduced into a wide range of business sectors. It's arguable that the ROI model aims not only at calculating the ROI of tangible results but also at addressing The intangible benefits, which could be applied to HR initiatives with intangible outcomes, such as leadership development programme. It might be the main reason to explain why Phillips claims ROI evaluation can be applied to different settings.

1.10 Formative Evaluation Approach

Recently there have been more arguments for using different methods (Holton and Alliger 1997)traditionally formative evaluation models are instruction oriented. This model points out that, the researchers and practitioners have largely focused on evaluating training outcomes by using a summative approach, while formative evaluation is likely to be neglected. As per this study formative evaluation approach is a useful way to bridge the gap between evaluation and training design.

1.11 Geis Method Model

Geis (1987)describes formative evaluation as aiming at obtaining feedback to improve instruction materials during the development stage. It's fulfilled by mean of a cycle of testing and revision on products to be delivered. Particular feature of Geis `s formative evaluation model, is the

involvement of various stakeholders in training design and development. This helps to build commitment of managers, trainers and trainees towards programme implementation and reduce apprehension regarding evaluation. Geis model focuses on two methods, development testing and expert review which are presented below.

1.11.1 The Development testing: uses learners as test subjects and critics, which involve two strategies, the clinical method and the- teach and test- method. The trainees are expected to mirror the target population for whom the materials are being designed. The materials being evaluated is tested in either a one-to-one or small group setting.

1.8.2 Expert review uses experts for critically for examining instructional materials. The expertise is divided into eight categories: subject matter experts, designers, teachers/instructors, audience specialists, gatekeepers, sponsors, former trainees and editors.

1.12 Dick and Carey Stage Model (1996)

In their systems Approach Model for instructional Design include three phases of formative evaluation; one-to-one evaluation, small group evaluation and field tests.

1.12.1 One-to-one evaluation aims at eliminating errors in the instruction and determines whether the training programme influences the participants in the intended pattern. The criteria are the clarity, feasibility and impact on materials.

1.12.2 Small Group Evaluation verifies a step further the quality of instruction. More participants are involved at this stage and feedback on instruction materials is collected.

1.12.3 Field test is to decide whether effective changes have taken place after the first two stages.

The instructional materials, the number of learners and lecturers are setup as the real situation. The responses from learners are lecturers are collected in order to make the final revision. It should be noticed that Dick and Carey's systematic instruction design model suggests needs assessment in identifying goal. For example conduct instructional analysis, analyze learners and contexts and write performance objectives are designed: (i) to determine what skills and knowledge are required for learners, (ii) to study learners characteristics such as learners present skills, attitudes as well as to analyze the context in which they will implement their learning and the context they will apply their learning, (iii) to define specific learning objectives and the criteria for successful performance after learning are defined prior to instruction. The information from formative evaluation allows the instructors to revise these important factors.

1.13 Four Component Model (Weston et al 1995)

Weston and et al model is specialized for its simplicity of implementing and clearly defined four components. It's also flexible of the scale of evaluation according to the purpose of evaluation. For example, smaller number of participants provides more detailed information, while larger number of participants provides less detailed, but more generalized information. The four components of this model are;

1.13.1 Participants are categorized into two types, 'novice' who have no previous training and experience in a specified domain and 'experts' who have specialized knowledge about different training subjects and instructional design.

1.13.2 Roles refer to tasks that Participants are given during the evaluation, the role of an evaluator, learner, critic and the role of a reviser.

1.13.3 Methods are the tools and techniques used in the formative evaluation.

1.13.4 Situation refers to the context defined by the participants when the evaluation occurs.

1.4 Integrative Model

Brown and Gerhardt's integrated formative evaluation demonstrates scientific benefits to evaluation of training. Brown and Gerhardt (2002) argues that summative methods are "useful for establishing and assessing metrics representing the effectiveness of training", while formative methods are useful for collecting quantitative and qualitative data would suggest why the level of effectiveness does or does not meet expectations and what can be done to improve it. This model suggests that the merge of these two methods, which provides both assessment and improvement of the effectiveness of training programmed. The model consists of four stages, concept, design, prototype and pilot.

1.14.1 Concept describes the training subject matter and provides preliminary objectives of training. The focus at this stage is to align training objectives with organizational business strategy and goals as well as trainees' work environment. A proper training needs analysis in the concept evaluation.

1.14.2 Design outlines the objectives, the subject matter, structure and methods of the training, which supplements more specific instructional objectives and activities to the concept stage. Two criteria are set up at this stage:

- Task to object alignment, which ensures the effective performance by aligning the training objectives to the trained task;
- Objective to instruction alignment, which ensures the consistence between the instructional methods and the designed objectives.

1.14.3 Prototype includes some sections of training materials presented in the format to be used in the final programme. Usability and learner satisfaction are the two criteria at this stage. Usability simulates real instruction activity with designed prototype, trainer, sample trainees and critics. Learner satisfaction evaluates trainee's satisfaction to the instruction, both on instruction materials and technology.

1.14.4 Pilot includes all subject matter using intended format and delivery. It consists of two criteria; feasibility and learner engagement. Feasibility assesses the suitability of the resources required for desired training outcomes. Learner engagement refers to trainees' motivation to learn and their attention to the programme, which helps to identify the reason if desired levels of learning are not achieved.

1.15 Models in Relation to Performance Evaluation

Easterby Smith (1994) argue that evaluation of training consist of three main elements: people, systems and things. Evaluation of people and their performance usually takes the form of examination in the context of education establishments or of appraisals and performance reviews within the organizations.

Smith research only finds five cases of formal management training which used system or financial evaluation. It suggested that the reason is partially a lack of effective performance level evaluation methods. However, some efforts have been made to link evaluation to performance improvement as well as to employ the methods of performance evaluation which are relevant to management training and development.

1.16 Balanced Scorecard (Kaplan and Norton)

Kaplan and Norton (1992) introduced the balanced scorecard in 1992, a set of measures linked to organizational performance, which is described as a check-and –balance system. It involves the interpretation of the organization`s strategy into specific measurable objectives across four perspective; customers, internal business process, learning and growth and finance and aims at balancing business management.

In contrast to the traditional, financial based measurement systems, the balanced scorecard consolidates organizations focus on long term win by centralizing business strategy and vision. The other merit is that this approach is consistent with many new business initiatives such as cross –functional integration, globalization, customer- supplier partnership and continuous improvement. This approach provides a fresh thinking to assess the impact of management training on those organizations which are underpinned by diversity and paradigm change.

1.17 The 360 Degree Feedback System (Nowack, 1993)

The term “360 degree feedback” refers to the process of an employee doing a self- assessment, being rated by his/her supervisors, peers, subordinates and even customers. This model is more popular in America and widely applied in business and industries, which can be used in a wide range of HRD activities such as management development, training and organizational development evaluations, style and leadership awareness, and career development.

Now argues that the 360 degree assessment provides intensive information about employees` knowledge, skills and attitudes based on job-analysis, competencies, strategic planning, developmental theory and personality theory. Its application to management training and development is closely linked with training programmes and training needs analyses, which identify critical KSAs factor, and cited different developmental stages and thus establish as a baseline for evaluation of training and development.

CONCLUSION

Training is the process of assisting a person for enhancing his efficiency and effectiveness at work by improving and updating his professional knowledge by developing skills relevant to his work and cultivating appropriate behaviour and attitudes towards work and organization. Training could be designed either for improving present capabilities at work or for preparing a person for assuming higher responsibilities in future, which will call for additional knowledge and superiors skills. Finally, Training is the systematic modification of behaviour through learning which occurs as a result of education, instruction development and planned experience.

REFERENCE

- 1.Rolf Lynton and Udai Pareek (2000) Training for organizational transformation, Sage Publications, New Delhi.
- 2.Dasgupta A (1974) Business and Management in India, Vikas Publishing House, New Delhi
- 3.Asthana GP, Teaching methods in management development, Management & Education Training in India, VMICM, Poona.
- 4.Chhabra TN (2004) Human Resource Management: Concepts and Issues, Dhanpat Rai & Co., New Delhi
- 5.B. Bowes, Employees Development Programs Help Companies Achieve Greater Success, CMA MANAGEMENT, 2008. 13-14.

- 6.T. T. Baldwin, and J. K. Ford, Transfer of Training: A Review and Directions for Future Research, *Personnel Psychology*, 41(2), 1998.
- 7.Gopal, Effectiveness of Executive Training Programs, *The Indian Journal of Commerce*, 61(3), 2008, 143-150.
- 8.V. Nagar, Measuring Training Effectiveness, *The Indian Journal of Commerce*, 62(4), 2009, 86-90.
- 9.[5] J. Philips, *Handbook of training evaluation and measurement methods* (Butterworth- Heinemann, Oxford, 1991).
10. B. Holli, and R. Calabrese, *Communication and education Skills for dietetics professionals* Philadelphia: Lippincott, Williams & Wilkins, 1998).
11. J. Boulmetis, and P. Dutin, *The abc"s of evaluation: Timeless techniques for program and project managers* (San Francisco, Jossey-Bass, 2000).
- 12.U. F. Schalock, *Outcome Based Evaluations* (Boston, Kluwer Academic/Plenum, 1998).
13. R. A. Noe, *Employees Training and Development* (Irwin, Mc Graw – Hill, 2008).
- 14.L. M. Prasad, *Human Resource Management* (New Delhi, Sultan Chand & Sons, 2005).
- 15.R. Ramachandaran, Effectiveness of training programs of NLC – An Analysis, *Kegees Journal of Social Science*, 2(1), 2010, 119-129.
- 16.T. Saharan, Objective for Training: What Employees Perceive in Service Industry, *Kegees Journal of Social Science*, 3(1), 2011, 118-127.
- 17.A. Smith, Evaluation of Management Training -Subjectivity and the Individual, *Journal of European Industrial Training*, 14(1), 1990.
- 18.J. Hashim, Training Evaluation: Client"s Roles, *Journal of European Industrial Training*, 25(7), 2001, 374– 397.
- 19.R. P. Griffin, Means and ends: effective training evaluation, *Industrial and Commercial Training*, 42(4), 2010, 220-225.

Publish Research Article International Level Multidisciplinary Research Journal For All Subjects

Dear Sir/Mam,

We invite unpublished Research Paper, Summary of Research Project, Theses, Books and Books Review for publication, you will be pleased to know that our journals are

Associated and Indexed, India

- ★ Directory Of Research Journal Indexing
- ★ International Scientific Journal Consortium Scientific
- ★ OPEN J-GATE

Associated and Indexed, USA

- DOAJ
- EBSCO
- Crossref DOI
- Index Copernicus
- Publication Index
- Academic Journal Database
- Contemporary Research Index
- Academic Paper Database
- Digital Journals Database
- Current Index to Scholarly Journals
- Elite Scientific Journal Archive
- Directory Of Academic Resources
- Scholar Journal Index
- Recent Science Index
- Scientific Resources Database

Review Of Research Journal
258/34 Raviwar Peth Solapur-413005, Maharashtra
Contact-9595359435
E-Mail-ayisrj@yahoo.in/ayisrj2011@gmail.com
Website : www.ror.isrj.org