European Journal of Business and Management
ISSN 2222-1905 (Paper) ISSN 2222-2839 (Online)
Vol.6, No.35, 2014

Assessment of Staff Training and Development Policies of University of Cape Coast

Isaac Baafi Sarbeng
Registrar's Office, University of Cape Coast, Cape Coast, Ghana
Email: isarbeng@ucc.edu.gh.

Abstract
In this technological and competitive world, the performance of every organisation depends largely on the quality of their human resource. In addition, the nature of staff development policies and programmes in the organization impact on the organisation's human resource skills and capabilities. The study assessed staff training and development policies in the University of Cape Coast in building capacity for departments. Using a cross-sectional survey, two hundred and five faculty members and 52 managers of the University were used in the study. The sampling procedure was simple random sampling technique. Data was analysed using percentages and the chi-square. The findings indicate that the training policy of University is flexible, motivating and prompts innovation. Furthermore, the policy was found to be clear, coherent and complementary. However, there was no consensus on the policy's fairness, participatory and effectiveness. Although the training policy is not perceived as fair, it has helped in the capacity building of the University and improved staff performance. It is, therefore, suggested that management of the University should provide equal opportunity and access for staff to freely decide and participate in decision making regarding the modalities for selection of staff for training and development.
Keywords: Staff Training, Development, Policies, Assessment

1. Background

According to Allan (2009), Training design and delivery are important for organisational outcomes. This implies that the nature of staff training policy of an organisation is a major determinant of the effectiveness of its training programmes. The policies largely influence the assessment of organisational and staff training needs, the selection process, the nature of training and the level of management support toward training (Armstrong, 2006; Noe, 1999; Senge, 1998; Desimone and Harris, 1998). Human resources development (HRD) policies are therefore intended to help improve the knowledge, skills and competencies of staff to perform their duties effectively and thereby increasing their overall performance (Cole, 2004; Stoner, 1995 and Griffin, 1999).

In order to enhance organisational and staff performance, the University has incorporated training and development into its strategic objectives. The main goal is to help recruit and retain a high calibre of staff for the institution (UCC DHR, 2012). The move was to build capacity for departments for effective teaching, research and community service and to remain ahead of competition.

In pursuance of the above objective, the University established a training and development section to coordinate staff training and development policies and programmes of the institution. The training and development policies of the University aim at providing advice, opportunities, facilities and sponsorship (full or partial) to enable employees to train in the critical areas of specialties and needs (UCC T&D Policy, 2011).). Through these interventions, the University has been able to develop a number of staff in and outside Ghana (DHR, 2012 and Sarbeng, 2013). However, there are mixed reaction by the staff of the University as to the fairness and participatory nature of the training policies in the selection of staff for training. The study, therefore, assessed whether staff are satisfied with the staff training and development policies in addressing their training and development needs and aspirations.

2.0 Literature review

The theory of behaviour, first demonstrated in the Hawthorne Studies (Landsberger, 1958; McCarney et al, 2007) posits that people's needs play a role in motivation. It contends that employees perform better when they believe that management is paying attention to them. This theory is opposed to the classical theory that is of the view that people are motivated solely by money (see Taneja, et al, 2011). This implies that the way to boost performance is through monetary rewards contrary to non-financial rewards. The classical theory impacted on organisations via scientific management, which focused on analysing jobs and finding more efficient ways to perform tasks (Mcleod, 1983). Though much criticised, the classical theory provided the basics for staff training and development as organisations such for more efficient means of increasing output.

Nevertheless, the position in the behavioural theory is that to when organisations talk about need, it should not focus solely on the organisational need, but the individual needs of the employees as well as that of the group. Behavioural theories provide the theoretical foundations of an employee needs including employee training and development (DuBrin, 2007). However, it should, however, be noted that the right training and

development are provided when the right policies and procedures are put in place by the organisation (Sarbeng, 2013). In the view of Serpell and Ferrada, (2007), HRM policies are directed by the logic of skills established in harmony to the necessities of business processes. According to Vakola, Soderquist and Pratascos (2007), policies provide techniques to capture and communicate the strategic vision and objectives of the institution in precise terms that can be more easily understood and requested. In view the foregoing, the University's human resource division developed the training policy to guide its human resource activities.

2.1. Models for training

Training, involves the development of the person's knowledge, skills and attitudes contribute to efficiency and productivity (Cole, 2004; Stoner, 1995; Griffin, 1999 and Reilly, 1979). Furthermore, training is often associated with increasing or maintaining the productivity of employees (Klinger and Nalbandian, 1985). According to Nadler and Wiggs (1986) training activities focus on learning the skills, knowledge, and attitudes required to perform a task or improve upon the performance of current job. Training, therefore, has the following characteristics: It brings about behavioural and/or attitudinal change; it is concerned with equipping staff to a new set of knowledge and skills; thus, aimed at increasing the potential performance of individuals.

Training is a planned and integrative learning system aimed at attitudinal or behavioural change by equipping individuals with desired knowledge and skills in order to maximize their potential performance and, thereby increasing organization productivity. Education, on the other hand, is a long-term oriented undertaking, which focuses on learning new skills, knowledge and attitudes that will equip an individual to assume a new job or to do a different task at some predetermined future time (Cole, 2004). Development is the third HRD activity which is oriented to both the person and the organization which covers broader view of knowledge and skills acquisition geared toward improving employee potential in general (Nadler and Wiggs, 1986 and Cole, 2005).

Al-Khayyat, and Elgamal (1997) in their Macro Training and Development Model (MTDM) explained HRD processes in organisations. According to them, HRD processes comprise three main sets of variables: input, process and outputs. The inputs are transformed into actions and results. The training inputs include human resource developmental objectives; long-term human resource development policies which form the umbrella under which training and development activities is executed; leadership perception of the human resources development role in the organization; organizational climate and management attitude towards the implementation of new ideas; and availability of resources - physical, human and financial. It may be deduced from their work that human resource activity should always be integrated into the broad corporate strategy. However, this should be guided by the human resource policy.

The processes involve conducting training need's assessment, which includes organisational analysis, person and task analysis (Al-Khayyat and Elgamal, 1997; Noe, 1999; Senge, 1998; Desimone and Harris, 1998). The design phase involves the creation of a training and development plan/programmes for a positive transfer of skills, knowledge and attitudes from the training situation (i.e. programme) to the job situation (i.e. on-the-job performance). The design phase also involves the selection and attainment of instructional methods and techniques to impart training.

The training evaluation and feedback are the final phase in the proposed training and development process. This phase is concerned with the investigations made to determine if the training and development activity is progressing towards the intended objectives. The training and development processes need to be executed in a participative environment involving all stakeholders in order to increase training effectiveness. This implies that stakeholder (e.g. employees, managers, shareholders) consultation is critical drafting the policy that guides training in an organisation. The paper, among other things, looked at participatory nature of the training policy of the University of Cape Coast.

Dror (1968) defines policy as "major guidelines for action directed at the future and aimed at achieving what is in the public interest." Anderson (1975) defines policy as "purposive course of action followed by an actor or set of actors in dealing with a problem of concern." Hannagan (2002) also views policy as a set of decisions of courses of action deliberately taken by an organisation or institution concerning the methods of accomplishing some purpose or goal within a specified situation.

Every policy must involve the making of decision, which must be implemented for achieving set goals within a particular period of time. A training policy sets out in writing the purpose, scope, and composition of a training program. It is useful to have a document that describes the training program from several perspectives, and made accessible to both management and employees (Cole, 2004).

Various training methods are adopted based on the need assessment. Both on-the-job out-of-job training are organised to improve staff knowledge and competencies on the job and for future performance. The on-the-job methods include coaching, mentoring and job rotation all geared towards the development of staff skills, and competences to improve staff and organisational performance.

Megginson, Banfield and Joy-Matthews (1999) and Harris (2000) define coaching as support of an informal unplanned training and development activities provided by supervisors to employees to perform on the

job. Coaching should be understood as a supplement to formal HRD programmes. It is an intervention normally delivered by supervisors or a professional coach, and it is focused on improving staff skills and competences. As a form of on-the-job training, mentoring is concerned with transmission of knowledge or passing on knowledge, insight and attitudes as well as skills by a senior person to another (Megginson and Clutterbuck, 2005). The mentor is normally an experienced professional who helps the new professional to become established. Job Rotation, on the other hand, is a formal planned HRD programme that involves assigning trainees to various jobs in different parts of the organisation with the purpose of providing trainees with a broad knowledge of the various functional areas as well as a better sense of their own career objectives and interest (Harris, 2000). Job rotation also helps to improve the job skills and satisfaction of employees, and promote team work in the organisation (Faegri et al., 2010).

Out-of-job training may normally take place at a training agency or local college and can take the form of lectures or self-study. It is used to develop more general skills and knowledge that can be used in a variety of situations. (Pettinger, 2002). Here, the employee move away from the normal or official duty and receive training in a different environment.

2.2 The conceptual framework

The first step of a training process is to identify the training policy, which prescribe the organisation's position on HRD programmes. Such policy may also comprehensively indicate the various actions to be taken to ensure not only a regular supply of skills, but also a high degree of personal motivation through development opportunities provided by the organisation. In regard to this, literature stipulates that some universities in Ghana have well defined HRD policies governing the institutions (Ghansah, 2009).

The next stage of the process is the establishment of the training institution to see to the implementation of the policy and for the success of every Training and Development programme. This is followed by need assessment, organisation of the programme and evaluation. For any training policy to be accepted, employees of an organisation it has to meet certain criteria. Several empirical works provide some key attributes for a workable HRD policy for an institution. In the view of Beechler and Bird (1992) identified, about eight dimensions of HRD policies, including participation, time horizon, formality, explicitness, scope, individualism, frame of reference, and equity. Admin (2006) opined that sound HRD policy must be capable of connecting objectives, functions, physical elements and people. Furthermore, it should be comprehensible and be future focused and action oriented. However, it should be stable and not easily manipulated or varied. Apart from these, it should not be rigid and easily adjustable to the changing environment. Moreover, it should premise on objective rather than subjective personal feelings; and ensure equity, fairness and impartiality. In addition, the policy must not be over ambitious but be attainable and realistic. To ensure its acceptability, the formulation of the policy should be all inclusive, preferably by using the bottom-up approach (http://www.citeman.com/227). Susaeta and Pin (2008) using the cultural theory suggests that workable HR policy ensure workers satisfaction and commitment. It can be observed from the submission by the different empirics that there is some consensus on the qualities that an acceptable HR policy must possess. This empirical evidence makes a case for the assessment of the UCC's HRD policy to determine how the staff perceives the policy. It must be, however, highlighted that the nature of the HRD policy influences the nature of the training programmes an organisation organises or recommends for its staff.

3.0 Methodology

The population of the study consisted 500 faculty members. Out of this, 440 were faculty members and 60 were heads of departments (DHR report, 2012). The Krejcie and Morgan (1970) sample size determination formula were used to obtain a sample size of 205 faculty members. A similar approach was employed to obtain a sample size of 52 heads of departments. The formula for determining the sample size based on the Krejcie and Morgan (1970) method is:

$$Size = \frac{X^2 NP(1-P)}{d^2(N-1) + X^2 P(1-P)}$$

Where X^2 = table value of Chi-Square at d.f. = 1 for desired confidence level of 0.05
N = population size
P = population proportion (assumed to be 0.50)
d = degree of accuracy (expressed as a proportion)

Simple random sampling method was adopted in selecting staff from both groups. This sampling method is deemed scientific, as it ensures that each member of staff was given an equal chance of being selected (Zikmund, 2003). Furthermore, since the sampling frame was known, a probability sampling was ideal. Other techniques, such as convenience and snowball are useful where the population is not known (Sunders et al, 2007). Using the lottery method, numbers of prospective participants were written on small sheets of papers, and these were folded, put in a bowl and shuffled. Folded papers were picked at random until the required sample size was

met (Sunders et al, 2007). This was to ensure that there was unbiased selection of participants.

The data used was purely primary. The research instrument used was the questionnaire. As compared to interviews, questionnaires are more objective than interviews (Milne, 1999).

Out of the 220 questionnaires distributed to faculty members, 180 were duly received. This indicates a response rate of 81.8%. For management personnel, a response rate of 25% (13) was achieved from the 52 questionnaires distributed. The probable reason for the low response to the questionnaires from management is due to their busy schedule. The 13 questionnaires received were upon the third visit to their offices. The Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) software (version 16) was used to code and process the data. The statistical method used in the data analysis were mainly descriptive such as cross-tabulation, chi-square, frequencies and percentages. The descriptive statistics were appropriate because the objective of the paper was mainly to assess the views of staff about the training policy.

4.0 Discussion of Results

The training policies of UCC were assessed on Nine (9) variables, which were: flexibility, fairness, participatory, effectiveness/efficiency, motivating, innovativeness, clarity, coherence and complementary. Both faculty members and management personnel were asked same questions to examine their views on such policies. In all 193 comprising 180 faculty members and 13 management persons responded to these questions. Due to the differences in the staff numbers of the two groups, percentages were used to examine their responses. Furthermore, Chi-square [1]test was conducted to see if there are any significant differences between the responses of the various groups. The demographic characteristics of the respondents are presented in Table1:

Table1. **Gender and age distribution of respondents**

		Faculty members		**Management**		**Total**	
		No.	**%**	**No.**	**%**	**No.**	**%**
Gender	Male	153	85	11	100	164	85
	Female	27	15	0	0	27	14
	No response	-	-	2	-	2	1
	Total	**180**	**100**	**13**	**100**	**193**	**100**
Age	20 – 30	13	7	0	0	13	6.7
	31 – 40	81	45	1	8	82	42.5
	41 – 50	56	31	8	67	64	33.2
	51 – 60	30	17	3	25	33	17.1
	No response	-	-	1	-	1	0.5
	Total	**180**	**100**	**13**	**100**	**193**	**100**

Author's computations

From Table 1, a number of the staff are in their middle ages, and this raises an HR planning concern. That is, whether the University has in place, a succession plan to replace the staff who would be retiring in the near future. With the average age of 40 years, it calls for appropriate strategy to groom, mentor and coach people who would be taking over in the next two decades. In terms of sex, it is realised that it is skewed towards male, which raises issues of biases and equity in recruitment and the need to empower women to study up to the highest level.

The second part of the discussion is on the appraisal of the UCC HR policy. Table 2 provides the results from the analysis.

Flexibility

This was to assess whether the training policy helps staff adapt to changes in and outside the University.

[1] The chi-square distribution provides a means for testing the statistical significance of contingency tables. This allows us to test for differences in two groups' distribution across categories. The logic behind the chi-square testis that of comparing the observed frequencies with the expected frequencies (Zikmund, 2003).

Table 2. **Flexibility**

	Faculty members		Management		Total	
	No.	**%**	**No.**	**%**	**No.**	**%**
Strongly Disagree	36	20.0	2	18.2	38	19.9
Disagree	21	11.7	0	0	21	11.0
Agree	89	49.4	6	54.5	95	49.7
Strongly Agree	34	18.9	3	27.3	37	19.4
Total	**180**	**100.0**	**11**	**100**	**191**	**100**

Author's computations

From Table 2, 49% of Faculty members and 55% of management agreed that the policy is fair. Furthermore, the study shows that 12% of faculty members, and none of the management disagree that the policy is fair. Moreover, 19% of faculty members and 27% of management strongly agree that the policy is fair. Also, 20% of faculty members and that of 18% of management strongly disagree that the policy is fair. In sum, 69.1% of faculty members and 54.5% of management responded that the training policy of University of Cape Coast allows flexibility, whereas, 39% of faculty members and a total of 45% of management responded that the training policy of the University of Cape Coast does not allow flexibility. It allows staff to adapt to changes in and outside.

Table 3. **Chi-square tests (Flexibility)**

	Value	**Df**	**Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)**
Pearson Chi-Square	1.731[a]	3	.630
Likelihood Ratio	2.898	3	.408
Linear-by-Linear Association	.578	1	.447
N of Valid Cases	191		

Author's computations

The results of a chi-square test conducted indicate that there are no significant differences between how management and faculty members responded to flexibility (with Sig. value of 0.630 which is greater than the 0.05 significance level)(see Michael, 2002).

Fairness

In all, 50.5% responded that the training policy of UCC is fair, and that it provides equal opportunity for all staff. In addition, 49.5% of respondents generally believe that the training policy is discriminatory.

Table 4. **Fairness**

	Faculty members		Management		Total	
	No.	**%**	**No.**	**%**	**No.**	**%**
Strongly Disagree	50	27.8	2	16.7	52	27.1
Disagree	41	22.8	2	16.7	43	22.4
Agree	67	37.2	5	41.7	72	37.5
Strongly Agree	22	12.2	3	25.0	25	13.0
Total	**180**	**100.0**	**12**	**100.0**	**192**	**100.0**

Author's computations

From Table 4, the analysis shows that 37% of faculty members, and 42% of management agree that there is fairness in the policy adopted. Furthermore, 23% of faculty members and 17% of management disagree that there is fairness in the policy. Additionally, 12% of faculty members and 25% of management strongly agree that there is fairness in the policy. Also, 28% of the faculty members and 17% of management strongly disagree that there is fairness in the policy. In conclusion, the study shows that a total of 49% of faculty members and a total of 67% of management responded that the training policy of University of Cape Coast allows fairness; whereas a total of 51% of faculty members and a total of 34% of management responded that the training policy of the University of Cape Coast does not allow fairness.

Just like faculty members, the majority of management (66.7%) agree that the training policy of UCC is not used to bully other persons unnecessarily.

When the responses of the two staff groups are compared, although the Chi-square test shows that there

is no significant difference in their views about the fairness of the training policy (with Sig. value of 0.538, which is greater than the 0.05 significance level) (see Michael, 2002). Therefore, this result cannot be accepted. Comparison based on just the percentages would therefore be more relevant.

Table 5. Chi-square tests (Fairness)

	Value	Df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	2.170[a]	3	.538
Likelihood Ratio	1.981	3	.576
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.830	1	.176
N of Valid Cases	192		

a. 4 cells (50.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.56.

Participatory

Although the majority of faculty members (51.5%) responded that the training policy is participatory enough, a substantial proportion (48.5%) of them do not believe that the training policy allows people to freely decide and participate in decision making regarding training and development.

Table 6. **Participatory nature of T&D programmes**

	Faculty members		**Management**		**Total**	
	No.	**%**	**No.**	**%**	**No.**	**%**
Strongly Disagree	39	21.7	2	16.7	41	21.4
Disagree	48	26.7	4	33.3	52	27.1
Agree	85	47.2	3	25	88	45.8
Strongly Agree	8	4.4	3	25	11	5.7
Total	**180**	**100**	**12**	**100**	**192**	**100**

Author's computations

From Table 6, forty-seven percent (47%) of faculty members and 25% of management agree that the policy is fair in terms of participatory. Furthermore, 27% of faculty members and 33% of management disagree that the policy is fair. Moreover, 4% of faculty members and 25% of management strongly agree that the policy is fair. Additionally, 22% of faculty members and 17% of management strongly disagree that the policy is fair. In sum, the study shows that a total of 51% of faculty members and a total of 50% of management responded that the training policy of University of Cape Coast allows participatory; whereas a total of 50% of faculty members and a total of 50% of management responded that the training policy of the University of Cape Coast is not participatory.

Thirty three point three percent (33.3%) of management personnel disagree that the policy is fair. This notwithstanding, as many as (66.3%) management personnel believe that the policy is participatory. Comparatively, there seems to be a significant difference between the responses of the two worker groups (Sig. value of 0.20).

Table 7. **Chi-square tests (Participatory)**

	Value	Df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	9.825[a]	3	.020
Likelihood Ratio	6.530	3	.088
Linear-by-Linear Association	.827	1	.363
N of Valid Cases	192		

Author's computations

Efficiency/effectiveness

In all, 63.7% management personnel responded that the policy allows staff to select the right kind of training at the right time. On the other hand, most teaching personnel (53.9%) do not share this view.

Table 8. **Efficiency/effectiveness**

	Faculty members		Management		Total	
	No.	**%**	**No.**	**%**	**No.**	**%**
Strongly Disagree	37	20.6	2	18.2	39	20.4
Disagree	60	33.3	2	18.2	62	32.5
Agree	66	36.7	5	45.5	71	37.2
Strongly Agree	17	9.4	2	18.2	19	9.9
Total	**180**	**100**	**11**	**100**	**191**	**100**

Author's computations

From the table above, 37% of faculty members and 46% of management agree that the policy is fair in terms of efficiency/effectiveness. Furthermore, 33% of faculty members and 18% of management disagree that the policy is fair. Furthermore, 9% of faculty members and 18% of management strongly agree that the policy is fair. Additionally, 21% of faculty members and 18% of management strongly disagree that the policy is fair for efficiency/effectiveness. In sum, the study shows that 47% of faculty members and 64% of management responded that the training policy of University of Cape Coast allows efficiency/effectiveness; whereas 54% of faculty members and 36% of management responded that the training policy of the University of Cape Coast does not allow efficiency/effectiveness.

Motivating nature

Respondents from both groups show massive agreement to the view that the training policy is motivating.

Table 10. **Motivating nature**

	Faculty members		Management		Total	
	No.	**%**	**No.**	**%**	**No.**	**%**
Strongly Disagree	17	9.4	1	7.7	18	9.3
Disagree	18	10	0	0	18	9.3
Agree	98	54.4	7	53.8	105	54.4
Strongly Agree	47	26.1	5	38.5	52	26.9
Total	**180**	**100**	**13**	**100**	**193**	**100**

Author's computations

From the Table 10, 54% of faculty members and 54% of management agree that the policy is fair in terms of motivating nature. Furthermore, 10% of faculty members and none of the management disagree that the policy is fair. Additionally, 26% of faculty members and 39% of management strongly agree that the policy is fair. In addition, 9% of faculty members and 8% of management strongly disagree that the policy is fair for motivating nature. In sum, the study shows that 80% of faculty members and 93% of management responded that the training policy of University of Cape Coast allows motivating nature whereas 19% of faculty members and 8% of management responded that the training policy of the University of Cape Coast does not allow motivating nature.

Fifty four point four percent (54.4%) of faculty members and 53.8% of management agree to this view. Indeed, in total, only 18.6% either disagree or strongly disagree to the view. This shows a consensus that the training policy has benefits to staff and the University.

Table 11. **Chi-square tests (Motivating)**

	Value	**Df**	**Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)**
Pearson Chi-Square	2.027[a]	3	.567
Likelihood Ratio	3.165	3	.367
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.096	1	.295
N of Valid Cases	193		

Author's computations

Innovativeness

Relatively, a large number of the management persons (63.7%) generally believed that the policy was forward looking uniquely crafted to bring something new to existence, as compared to 56.1% faculty members.

Table 12. **Innovativeness**

	Faculty members		Management		Total	
	No.	**%**	**No.**	**%**	**No.**	**%**
Strongly Disagree	34	18.9	1	9.1	35	18.3
Disagree	45	25	3	27.3	48	25.1
Agree	69	38.3	5	45.5	74	38.7
Strongly Agree	32	17.8	2	18.2	34	17.8
Total	**180**	**100**	**11**	**100**	**191**	**100**

Author's computations

From the Table 12, 38% of faculty members and 46% of management agree that the policy is fair in terms of innovativeness. Furthermore, 25% of faculty members and 27% of management disagree that the policy is fair. Furthermore, 18% of faculty members and 18% of management strongly agree that the policy is fair. In addition, 19% of faculty members and 9% of management strongly disagree that the policy is fair for innovativeness. In sum, the study shows that 56% of faculty members and 64% of management responded that the training policy of University of Cape Coast allows innovativeness. Forty-four percent (44%) of faculty members and 36% of management responded that the training policy of the University of Cape Coast does not allow innovativeness.

Clarity

On clarity, 18.2% of management members responded that the policy is quite explicit. However, 46.1% faculty members indicated that the policy does not effectively communicate what employees are to do.

Table 13. **Clarity**

	Faculty members		Management		Total	
	No.	**%**	**No.**	**%**	**No.**	**%**
Strongly Disagree	29	16.1	1	9.1	30	15.7
Disagree	54	30	1	9.1	55	28.8
Agree	74	41.1	8	72.7	82	42.9
Strongly Agree	23	12.8	1	9.1	24	12.6
Total	**180**	**100**	**11**	**100**	**191**	**100**

Author's computations

From the Table 13, 41% of faculty members and 73% of management agree that the policy is fair for clarity. Furthermore, 30% of faculty members and 9% of management disagree that the policy is fair. Furthermore, 13% of faculty members and 9% of management strongly agree that the policy is fair. In addition, 16% of faculty members and 9% of management strongly disagree that the policy is fair for clarity. In sum, 54% of faculty members and 82% of management responded that the training policy of University of Cape Coast allows clarity while 46% of faculty members and 18% of management responded that the training policy of a University of Cape Coast does not allow clarity.

Coherence

There is a consensus that the strategies and actions in the UCC training policy support the goals of the University on human resource development (80.9%). This view was consistent in both worker groups.

Table 14. **Coherence**

	Faculty members		Management		Total	
	No.	**%**	**No.**	**%**	**No.**	**%**
Strongly Disagree	24	13.3	1	7.7	25	13.0
Disagree	11	6.1	1	7.7	12	6.2
Agree	113	62.8	6	46.2	119	61.7
Strongly Agree	32	17.8	5	38.5	37	19.2
Total	**180**	**100**	**13**	**100**	**193**	**100**

Author's computations

From the table above, 63% of faculty members and 46% of management agree that the policy is fair for coherence. Furthermore, 6% of faculty members and 8% of management disagree that the policy is fair. Moreover, 18% of faculty members and 39% of management strongly agree that the policy is fair. Also, 13% of faculty members and 8% of management strongly disagree that the policy is fair for coherence. In sum, 81% of faculty members and 85% of management responded that the training policy of University of Cape Coast allows coherence whiles 19% of faculty members and 16% of management responded that the training policy of the

University of Cape Coast does not allow coherence.

Complementary nature

Staff were also consistent in their agreement to this view. However, management persons had a stronger belief in this view than faculty members. Whereas 91.7% of management persons agree or strongly agree to this, 72.2% of teaching persons agree or strongly agree.

Table 15. **Complementary nature**

	Faculty members		Management		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Strongly Disagree	22	12.2	1	8.3	23	12.0
Disagree	28	15.6	0	0	28	14.6
Agree	98	54.4	9	75	107	55.7
Strongly Agree	32	17.8	2	16.7	34	17.7
Total	**180**	**100**	**12**	**100**	**192**	**100**

Author's computations

From the table above, 54% of faculty members and 75% of management agree that the policy is fair for complementary nature. Furthermore, 16% of faculty members and none of the management disagree that the policy is fair. Moreover, 18% of faculty members and 17% of management strongly agree that the policy is fair. Additionally, 12% of faculty members and 8% of management strongly disagree that the policy is fair for complementary nature. In sum, 72% of faculty members and 92% of management responded that the training policy of University of Cape Coast allows complementary nature whiles a total of 29% of faculty members and 8% of management responded that the training policy of the University of Cape Coast does not allow complementary nature.

5. Summary of Findings

The study revealed that there is a consensus between management and faculty members whom the training policy of UCC is flexible, motivating and prompts innovation. Furthermore, the policy was found to be clear, coherent and complementary. However, there was no consensus on other issues like fairness, participatory and effectiveness. For example, whereas 63.7% of management persons think, the policy is effective, only 46.1% of faculty members believe so. It must be noted that even on such factors like clarity and prompts innovation, there was strong proportion of respondents who expressed disagreement (especially among faculty members) to the consensus.

The reason may be that faculty members believe that the selection process for training and development is discriminatory or favours particular individuals of influence or departments. Another reason may be that faculty members are not allowed to freely select their own programmes and institutions or place of study. The view of faculty members whom the policy is not effective, further buttresses the view that the policy is neither fair nor participatory. This is because respondents believe that the policy restricts staff on the selection of institution and programmes.

As Gilley, Eggland and Gilley (1992) espoused, successful training programmes should be established to meet specific learning objectives, measure the effectiveness of learning specialist and the competencies of programme design. It may be seen that UCC's training policy is directly helping it to achieve its strategic objectives of recruiting and retaining high-caliber staff. Armstrong (2006) opined training helps organization achieve its goals by adding value to its human capital.

Furthermore, Hussey (as cited in Bukley and Caple, 2000) found in a separate study that only 33% of the respondents felt that there was a direct link between training and the achievement of corporate objectives. This study showed 81.3% believed that the policy is motivating enough to help UCC achieve its strategic objectives..

6. Policy recommendation

Based on the findings and conclusions in the study, the following is recommended to guide future training and development policy issues in and outside the University:

Policy formulators and implementers must strive to make the training and development policy fairer by providing equal opportunity for staff in terms of training. There is the need to set-up a quota system where faculty members know beforehand the number of personnel to undergo such programmes at the beginning of the year. It is also important that the modalities for selection of participants at the faculty level may be well communicated and widely available to all.

Management may encourage people to freely decide and participate in decision making regarding

training and development. The policy should enable staff to select the right kind of training and at the right time and institution. The involvement of staff in the policy formulation stage will enhance their commitment towards achieving the objectives of the programme.

7. References

Al-Khayyat, R. M. & Elgamal, M. A. (1997). A macro model of training and development: validation. *Journal of European Industrial Training.*; 21(3): 87 - 101

Anderson, J. E. (1975).*Public policy making.* London: Thomas Nelson and Sons.

Armstrong, M. (2006).*Handbook of human resource management.* 10th ed. London: Kogan Cage Publishing.

Becker, G. S. (1993).*Higher education and economic growth*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Becker, G. S. (1964).*Human capital: A theoretical and empirical analysis with reference to education.* New York: National Bureau of Economic Research.

Buckler, R., & Caple, J. (2000). *The theory and practice of training.* 4th ed. London: Kogan Page Ltd, UK.

Cole, G. A. (2004). *Personnel and human resource management.* Great Britain: Ashford Press.

Cole, G. A. (2005). M*anagement theory and practice* 6th ed. London: Book Power (formerly ELST).

Denison, E. F. (1976). *How Japan's economy grew so fast: The sources of postwar expansion.* Belmont: Thompson Wadsworth Corporation.

Desimone, R., & Harris, D. (1998). *Human resource development.* 2nd ed. USA: Dryden Press.

Dror, Y. (1968). *Public policy making re-examined.* Pennsylvania: Granada Publishing Ltd..

DuBrin, A. J. (2007). Human relations interpersonal job-oriented skills (9 ed.). New Jersey: Pearson Prentice Hall. p. 2.

Faegri T. E, Dyba T. & Dingsoyr, T. (2010). Introducing knowledge redundancy practice in software development: Experiences with job rotation in support work. Inf. Software Tech., 52: 1118-1132

Ghansah, S. (2009). *Comparative study of HRD practices in public and private sector organisation: The case of UG and Central University College.* Unpublished master's dissertation, University of Cape Coast, Cape coast.

Gilley, W. J., Eggland, S. A., & Gilley, A. M. (1992). *Principles of human resource development*. Cambridge: Perseus Publishing.

Griffin, R .W. (1999). *Management.* 6th ed. USA: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Hannagan, T. (2002). *Management concept: Concepts and practices.* Gosport: Ashford Colour Press Ltd.

Harris, M. (2000). *Human resource management: A practical approach*. New York: The Dryden Press.

Kiker, B. F. (1966).The historical roots of the concept of human capital. *Journal of Political Economy. 74*(5): 481- 499.

Klinger, D.E. & Nalbandian, J. (1985). *Public Personnel management: Context and Strategies*, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ.

Krejcie, R. V., & Morgan, D. W. (970). Determining sample size for research activities. *Educational and Psychological Measurement.* 1; *30:* 607-610. Retrieved May 2012. Available: http://opa.uprrp.edu/InvInsDocs/Krejcieand Morgan.pdf.

Lepak, D., & Snell, S. (1999). The human resource architecture: Toward a theory of human capital allocation and development. *Academy of Management Review; 24*(1), 31 – 48.

Landsberger A H, (1958). Hawthorne revisited, Ithaca.

McCarney R, Warner J, Iliffe S, van Haselen R, Griffin M, Fisher P (2007). The Hawthorne effect: a randomised, controlled trial. BMC Med Res Methodol 7: 30.

Mcleod, M, (1983). Architecture or revolution": Taylorism, technocracy, and social change. Art Journal, 43(2), 132-147.

Megginson, D., Banfield, P., & Joy-Matthews, J. (1999). *Human resource development* 2nd ed. London: Kogan Page Ltd.

Megginson, D., & Clutterbuck, D. (2005). *Techniques for coaching and mentoring*. Oxford: Elsevier Butterworth-Heinemann.

Michael, R. S. (2002). Cross tabulation and Chi square. *Association Indiana University.*

Milne, J. (1999). *Questionnaires: Advantages and disadvantages.* Accessed January, 2013. Available: http://www.icbl.hw.ac.uk/ltdi/cookbook/info_questionnaires/ index.html

Mullins, L.J. (1996). *Management & organisational behaviour.* 4th *Ed.* Pitman Publishing, London.

Nadler, L. (1970). *Developing human resource.* 3rd ed. San Francisco: Jossy Bass.

Nadler, L. (1982). *Designing training programs: The critical events model.* Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., Reading, MA.

Nadler, L., & Wiggs. D.G. (1986). *Managing human resource development*. Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, CA.

Nafukho, F. M., Hairston, N. R., & Brooks, K. (2004). Human capital theory: Implications for human resource development. *Human Resource Development International. 7*(4): 545–51

Noe, R. (1999). *Employee training and development*. New York: McGraw-Hill Companies.
Pettinger, R. (2002). *Mastering employee development.* England: Palgrave Macmillan.
Phillips, J.J. (1996). Was it the training?", *Training and Development.* Vol. 50: 28-32.
Reilly, W. (1979). *Training administrators for development: An Introduction for public servants and government training officers*, Heinemann Educational Books Ltd, Ibadan, Nairobi.
Saunders, M. et al (2007). *Research methods for business students.* Pitman Publishing Imprints.
Schultz, T. W. (1961). Investment in human capital. *The American Economic Review. 51*(1):1-17.
Senge, P. (1998). *The fifth discipline: The art and practice of learning organisations.* New York: Doubleday/Currency.
Serpell, A., & Ferrada, X. A. (2007). competency-based model for construction supervisors in developing countries. Personnel Review. 36(4): 585-602. doi: 10.1108/00483480710752812
Sharma, M. (2010). *The Difference between human resources, human capital and human investment*. Retrieved 26 February. Available: http://www.differworld.or
Stoner, J. A. F. (1995). *Management book.* New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
Taneja, S, Pryor, M G & Toombs, L. A. (2011). frederick w. taylor's scientific management principles: Relevance and Validity', Journal of Applied Management and Entrepreneurship, Vol 16, No 3, pp 60-78
University of Cape Coast. (2012). Division of human resource report: Cape Coast.
University of Cape Coast Student Records and Management Information Section (UCC SRMIS). UCC 44th Congregation basic statistics. 2012.
Vakola, M., Soderquist, K. E., & Pratascos, G. P. (2007). Competence management in support of organizational change. International Journal of Manpower. 28(3/4): 260-275. doi: 10.1108/01437720710755245
Zikmund, W.G. (2003). Business Research Methods, (7th ed.), Thomson South-Western.

The IISTE is a pioneer in the Open-Access hosting service and academic event management. The aim of the firm is Accelerating Global Knowledge Sharing.

More information about the firm can be found on the homepage:
http://www.iiste.org

CALL FOR JOURNAL PAPERS

There are more than 30 peer-reviewed academic journals hosted under the hosting platform.

Prospective authors of journals can find the submission instruction on the following page: http://www.iiste.org/journals/ All the journals articles are available online to the readers all over the world without financial, legal, or technical barriers other than those inseparable from gaining access to the internet itself. Paper version of the journals is also available upon request of readers and authors.

MORE RESOURCES

Book publication information: http://www.iiste.org/book/

IISTE Knowledge Sharing Partners

EBSCO, Index Copernicus, Ulrich's Periodicals Directory, JournalTOCS, PKP Open Archives Harvester, Bielefeld Academic Search Engine, Elektronische Zeitschriftenbibliothek EZB, Open J-Gate, OCLC WorldCat, Universe Digtial Library , NewJour, Google Scholar