

# Increasing Learner Motivation

---



**This white paper outlines the four key mistakes most training organizations make, and how to remedy those mistakes to increase learner motivation.**

**November 2005**



Copyright © OEi, LLC and Digital Latitudes, Inc. All rights reserved.  
This whitepaper may be distributed in its entirety with appropriate copyright attached.  
Any reproduction, reference, redistribution or other use without written consent and credit to the authors is strictly prohibited.

---

## **About the Authors**

---

### **Joanna Groom King, President Organizational Effectiveness international, LLC (OEi, LLC)**

Joanna Groom King is the President of OE international (OEi), an Organizational Effectiveness consulting firm headquartered in Littleton, CO. Ms. King has an extensive background in organizational development and human resource development, and uses her expertise to assist organizations in maximizing workforce performance. She is especially known for her work in the areas of Work Climate Assessment and Planning, Leadership Assessment and Development, Performance Management Strategy & Process Design, and HR Transformation.

Since 1990 Ms. King has provided her consulting expertise to a broad range of companies ranging from large, multinational corporations to small, family-owned enterprises. These clients have included both unionized and non-unionized workforces, and spanned the U.S., Mexico, Canada, South America and Europe. Among the industries Ms. King has supported are: automotive, manufacturing, communications, finance/banking, healthcare, hospitality, not-for-profits, and retail food service.

In addition to her consulting experience, Ms. King has spent over 15 years in operating management positions from first-line supervisor to senior executive and Board positions. Specific positions held include Vice President of Organizational Development at First Data Corporation, and Vice President of Strategic Development at The HR Management Group. As a result of this experience, Ms. King has a deep appreciation of how important it is that consulting services be both pragmatic and designed to advance the business and operating objectives of an organization.

Ms. King's academic background includes a Bachelor's of Science in Business Administration from the University of Michigan, and a Master's of Business Administration from Wayne State University, in Detroit, Michigan.

**Paul Hilbink, Principal  
Digital Latitudes**

Paul Hilbink is a founding partner and Principal of Digital Latitudes, Inc. Mr. Hilbink has a wide-ranging background in strategy development, marketing, advertising and interactive development for various business-to-business clients, including Hewlett-Packard, Apple Computer, Johns Manville and Sun Microsystems. Before launching Digital Latitudes, he was most recently the Interactive Director for McClain Finlon Advertising, a \$100 million ad agency in Denver, Colorado.

Mr. Hilbink has done graduate-level work in Instructional Technology, Instructional Systems Design and Technical Writing, and is certified in Performance Technology, E-Learning Strategy and E-Learning Design. Areas of expertise include developing E-Learning strategies; planning, designing and evaluating E-Learning; E-Learning and the science of instruction; and developing interactive and engaging web-based training.

Mr. Hilbink has spoken on numerous interactive and marketing topics to local chapters of organizations such as the Business Marketing Association (BMA) and the American Marketing Association (AMA).

Mr. Hilbink holds a Bachelor's of Arts in Advertising and Marketing from Michigan State University, and a Master's of Business Administration from Indiana University.

## Table of Contents

---

<b>About the Authors</b> .....	2
<b>The Challenge</b> .....	5
<i>The Challenge – Experienced</i> .....	5
<i>The Challenge – Defined</i> .....	5
<b>The Four Key Mistakes Training Functions Are Making</b> .....	6
<i>Mistake #1: Failing to Properly Prescribe Development</i> .....	6
<i>Mistake #2: Failing to Align Training with Organizational Priorities and Culture</i> .....	8
<i>Mistake #3: Failing to Create a Clear Link Between Training, Learning, Performance, and Opportunity</i> .....	10
<i>Mistake #4: Failing to Properly Fit Training Delivery Format and Content to the Needs of the Audience</i> .....	13
<b>Bibliography</b> .....	19
<b>About OEi, LLC</b> .....	20
<b>About Digital Latitudes</b> .....	20

## The Challenge

---

### *The Challenge – Experienced*

A Training & Development (T&D) leader standing outside during a break in a company meeting overhears a conversation between some fellow employees. The employees are complaining about “having” to attend training that week. Curious and wanting to hear what they have to say, the T&D leader quietly stands back and listens. . . . . She hears the following four major complaints from the employees:

1. “Training isn’t going to fix this problem. Everyone but management can see that.”
2. “We go through all this training, and then my boss ignores my suggestions. Why offer training when what we learn isn’t valued or supported?”
3. “Why should I bother with this training? It’s not like it’s going to get me a raise or a promotion or anything like that.”
4. “Man, I hate sitting in a classroom listening to an instructor all day. I don’t learn anything that way, and in the meantime the work piles up.”

The T&D leader is disappointed with what she’s heard, and ponders why employees see training as a burden rather than an opportunity, and what she can do to improve the motivation of employees to learn new skills, information, etc.

### *The Challenge – Defined*

For many decades organizations have invested heavily in providing training to their employees. In 2003 U.S. companies spent an estimated \$54 billion on such training (*Training Magazine*, 2003 survey). Despite investing significant money, time and energy in their training programs, many organizations struggle with motivating employees to take advantage of these development opportunities. Classes are often only half full, and employees are lackadaisical about the opportunity.

As training and development professionals, it is important that we ask ourselves why that is. Why wouldn’t employees be eager to participate in opportunities that advance learning, competency and, ultimately, opportunity? What might we be doing wrong?

As is so often the case, there is no single cause of this problem. Organizations and, yes, training functions too, are making four critical mistakes in planning, offering and managing their training activities. These mistakes are discussed below.

## **The Four Key Mistakes Training Functions Are Making**

---

### *Mistake #1: Failing to Properly Prescribe Development*

Our research shows that training as a solution to a perceived performance issue is appropriate only about 20% of the time. Despite this, training is still the development activity that organizations turn to first and most frequently. In almost 20 years as performance enhancement consultants, we have seen scores of times when organizations applied a training solution to a non-training problem.

One example was in an organization where senior management wanted to send all of its mid- and lower-management personnel to training on decision-making skills. These senior leaders were very frustrated at the lower-level managers' "inability to make decisions", and they asked OEi (an organizational effectiveness consulting firm) to design a training program that would "fix this problem". To gain a better understanding of the development need and what was creating it, we conducted interviews with the senior leaders, and focus group meetings with the lower- and mid-level managers. Through this we gathered information that identified: (1) the sorts of decisions needing to be made by individuals in these positions, (2) the parameters of authority for decision making at various levels, (3) the decision making processes used by the lower- and mid-level managers, and (4) actual decisions that had been made and the results of those decisions.

We discovered that it was not an inability to make good decisions that was limiting these lower-level managers, it was (1) a lack of understanding of the parameters of their authority, and (2) a history of senior leadership overriding decisions made by the lower-level managers. These two dynamics, combined, had developed in these managers a sense of confusion and futility that dampened their willingness to make decisions. Training the mid- and lower-level managers in decision making skills would have done nothing to improve the situation. What was needed was to define the parameters of the managers' decision-making authority, and to work with (not train) the senior leaders to examine and modify their behavior patterns related to this issue.

***Training the mid- and lower-level managers in decision making skills would have done nothing to improve the situation. What was needed was to define the parameters of the managers' decision making authority, and to work with (not train) the senior leaders to examine and modify their behavior patterns related to this issue.***

Unfortunately, shortly before we began our work with the organization, the lower- and mid-level managers had been told that they would be provided with training in decision making, and why. What was their reaction? Being told that they needed training when they knew the problem to stem from the higher levels of management triggered resentment both toward the senior leaders and toward the organization's training activities. Additionally, the company's history of applying training inappropriately (which had very predictably resulted in no performance improvement) had already undermined the credibility of all of the organization's training activities.

The mistake that this organization made, of prescribing training to people who didn't need it, is very, very common. The reaction of the intended training population, which was one of resentment and frustration, is equally common. It is a part of what lowers the credibility and perceived value of training, and employees' interest in participating in it.

While well conceived, designed and delivered training programs can be a very effective tool for addressing skill deficiencies, breaking paradigms, and broadening people's minds to differing approaches to work, the above scenario illustrates that training isn't always the appropriate solution. Unfortunately, for most organizations training is the first, and often the only, form of intervention offered. To get away from this paradigm organizations need to:

- (1) Evaluate perceived development needs thoroughly and with an open mind. Properly diagnosing the cause of a performance issue so as to prescribe appropriate interventions requires the careful conducting of a needs assessment. To increase the completeness of the assessment and to minimize skew in the results, the organization should utilize not less than two data gathering techniques. Common methodologies include: interviewing the person(s) to be developed, interviewing their manager, conducting a 360 degree assessment, administering objective skills tests, direct observation of their work, and reviewing the outputs of their work.

Commonly, what at first appears to be a development need for one or a few individuals is found to actually be a wide-spread need within the organization. If that is the case, then addressing the issue at a micro level won't result in a true solving of the problem. Due to this, it is important that HR professionals diligently examine whether a perceived performance problem is occurring on a wide scale so that it can be addressed appropriately.

- (2) Incorporate alternative forms of intervention into the organization's development tool kit. Such interventions should include activities aimed at solving individually-oriented development needs, as well as strategies for addressing needs that are determined through the needs assessment process to be broad-scale in nature.

Examples of the former include not only training, but coaching, mentoring, peer or multi-level discussion groups, special projects/assignments, job shadowing and more. Should the need be large scale, systemic causes or influences such as organizational structure, job/role definitions, management practices, work processes and/or systems, performance management processes, and cultural norms should be examined, and addressed as appropriate.

*Mistake #2: Failing to Align Training with Organizational Priorities and Culture*

In the past decade or so, organizations have very appropriately become more focused on performance and accountability. Additionally, many organizations are now operating more “lean” than ever before, so employees at all levels are stretched to capacity. This combination of forces has resulted in employees and their leaders feeling increased pressure to get done those tasks and objectives that they are being held immediately accountable for, and a corresponding need to forego activities that pull them away from that.

As a result, more than ever training functions must show the practical value of their offerings in growing employees’ ability to work better, smarter, and more efficiently. To do this, training must:

- (1) Clearly link to the organization’s defined and articulated priorities
- (2) Be consistent with its culture

If training is not aligned with organizational priorities – which should drive what people are being held accountable to achieve, then it becomes difficult to sell employees and their leaders on the usefulness of the training. From both a macro and a micro standpoint, the value of training diminishes, and motivation to participate in training decreases.

Too often we see training functions fail to properly align their training offerings with the organization’s objectives and priorities. In fact, we frequently find that training functions are either not knowledgeable regarding what those objectives and priorities are, or that they have not effectively identified the talent implications of those priorities in order to plan appropriate training.

In order to plan appropriate training offerings, training and/or human resource functions must work closely with senior leaders to identify and understand both the organization’s near-term and its strategic objectives and priorities. It must then combine this with information portraying the strengths and weaknesses of the organization’s talent (perhaps found in outputs of the performance appraisal and/or development planning

processes), and identify the organization's competency development needs – which will subsequently become the foundation of the training offering.

***Training must clearly link to the organization's defined and articulated priorities, and be consistent with its culture.***

Though, in our consulting work, we haven't seen nearly enough training functions fulfill the steps just described, we are seeing it more and more often – which is very encouraging! Unfortunately, many of those organizations that are developing and implementing training offerings that stem directly from organizational priorities and talent needs are still experiencing difficulty “selling” the training to employees and leaders. A key reason for this is that though the link between the training and the organization's objectives and priorities is clear to the training personnel (who by this time have usually spent months living and breathing this topic), it is not at all clear to others. Good internal marketing needs to happen, with training personnel explicitly educating the organization's leaders on how the training offering supports the organization's strategic talent needs.

In looking at the second requirement listed above, of ensuring that training is consistent with an organization's culture, we find different problems emerging. When training develops in employees perspectives and approaches to work that are out of alignment with the organization's culture, the application of what they've learned is not supported, and is often even discouraged – be that consciously or unconsciously – by peers and managers. For employees this often results in frustration and disillusionment, and for organizations it can lead to turmoil and even the loss of talent. An example of this scenario is shown below.

Some insightful leaders within one of our client companies realized that their very traditional, somewhat slow-moving organization would need to become more innovative and entrepreneurial in order to survive in an increasingly competitive market. In its eagerness to “kick-start” a new, entrepreneurial culture, the organization required employees to attend training designed to enhance creativity and innovation. However when the employees, excited about what they'd learned in the training, attempted to apply what they'd learned, they were subtly discouraged by their managers and others. Feedback such as “we really don't have time for you to be off chasing these ideas”, and “that's nice, but we'll stick with what we know works” quickly made it clear to the employees that the organization would not give them the opportunity to apply what they

had learned. Ultimately, the organization lost good talent due to the frustration generated by this experience.

You might argue that offering training that is consistent with an organization's future priorities and/or culture is a valid means of leading the organization to a desired future state; that by introducing new concepts and approaches into an organization through training, over time the organization's norms will shift toward those new concepts and approaches. While there is some good logic in that approach, it's problematic.

Looking at the scenario described above, the mistake was not in thinking that the organization needed to shift its culture to become more innovative and entrepreneurial – that was correct. The mistake was that the training was not in alignment with the organization's defined strategies and priorities, and it was ahead of the cultural shift that needed to happen. Though a few of the organization's leaders had come to understand the need to alter the company's strategy, and to shift its culture so as to enable the strategy (and had forwarded word of this to the training group), the rest of the leadership team had not yet gotten "on board" with this new approach. They hadn't agreed to the need for such a shift, or to what it would take to create it. This lack of unified, conscious awareness and agreement undermined the activities and efforts needed to create the change.

To avoid this mistake, rather than jumping into offering training to rank and file employees the supporters of the initiative should have focused first on (1) gaining leadership buy-in and commitment to the new strategy, and (2) helping the leaders to understand the cultural and talent implications of the new strategy. At that point the organization would have been ready for training designed to shift its culture. To further cement the success of the training, the training function would have then needed to educate the leadership team on the new employee behaviors they would need to watch for and encourage in order to create the needed culture. Then, and only then, would employees receive the positive reinforcement needed as they worked to apply the newly learned approaches to their work.

*Mistake #3: Failing to Create a Clear Link Between Training, Learning, Performance, and Opportunity*

As stated above, because employees are stretched to achieve their job requirements, training functions are having to "compete" more than ever to get employees' time and attention – to motivate employees to invest time in learning. As stated above, a partial solution to this is to ensure that training activities link to organizational objectives and priorities. Another important factor in whether employees will be motivated to participate in and get the most from training (and other developmental offerings) has to do with

whether the organization has successfully established a clear link between training, learning, performance and opportunity. If so, then the “opportunity cost” that the employee pays to attend a development activity (e.g., falling behind in work) is much more likely to be seen as worthwhile.

Though one might think that this link is intuitive, or “common sense”, at most companies this link has been compromised or altogether dissolved by a combination of factors such as: ineffective identification of development needs, application of “broad brush” development approaches that are not a good fit to the development needs, poor facilitation of skill transfer back to the job, poor evaluation of the impact of training on performance (resulting in the cause-effect relationship between training/learning and performance not being established properly), and opportunities for advancement being influenced by non-performance factors.

***Overcoming this legacy and successfully establishing a link between training, learning, and performance requires the planned creation and subsequent demonstration of that link.***

Overcoming this legacy and successfully establishing a link between training, learning, and performance requires the planned creation and subsequent demonstration of that link. Doing this is a multi-step process, involving:

- (1) Systematically and diligently identifying and prioritizing an employee’s development needs. This is optimally done using an organization’s performance management process, and/or by partnering with an employee’s manager to identify 1-2 specific skills in which the employee needs development. Limiting targeted development needs to this small number enables the employee to avoid diluting his/her focus over too many skill areas, which commonly results in the inability to make significant progress in any of them.
- (2) Solid matching development activities (training or otherwise) to the identified development need(s). Often organizations take a “shot gun” approach to training – peppering training on employees indiscriminately, without any true matching of the training to the employees’ development needs. For training to result in an employee’s performance improvement, it must be relevant to the employee’s job and address a skill or knowledge deficiency. If both of these criteria are not met, then no noteworthy performance improvement is likely to occur.

- (3) Educating the employee's manager on the behavioral/performance improvements to watch for, encourage and reinforce. A supervisor's informed encouragement and support is critical to employees successfully transferring newly-learned skills back to the job. Despite this, few organizations proactively equip supervisors with an understanding of (1) what they should be looking for from a newly-trained employee in terms of improved performance, and (2) what they should be doing to support and reinforce the improved performance. Optimally, the training function would make the orientation of managers on these issues a standard part of training activities.
- (4) Effectively evaluating employees' performance in the specific skill(s) targeted for improvement, not in overall performance. Even if training provided to an employee is broad in scope (e.g., leadership skills training), it is unlikely that in a single performance period (e.g., one calendar year) the individual will show significant improvement in more than a couple of skills areas – so assessing training by looking at whether overall performance has improved will be disappointing for the employee, his/her manager, and the training professional; and will not be a good measure of the training's effectiveness. (Note: If the employee were to try to improve in all of those areas, then his/her energy would likely be diluted across too much ground, with the result that little-to-no improvement would be seen in any area.)

Though not directly related to the planning, implementation or assessment of training and development activities, there are a couple of other factors that significantly impact an organization's ability to establish the training → learning → performance → opportunity link that is so important to an employee's motivation to learn, and these are noted below:

- (1) Leadership personnel understanding the importance of employee learning to the growth of organizational capability. Leaders who have an understanding of this relationship are more likely than leaders who do not to recognize the strategic role that well planned and executed training/development activities can play in organizational performance, and to actively encourage their employees to grow their skills and abilities through planned development activities.
- (2) The ability and willingness of the organization to eliminate non-performance factors in making decisions regarding raises, promotions, etc. Violating this, or even being perceived as violating it, significantly weakens the training → learning → performance → opportunity link, lowering employees' motivation to pursue learning opportunities.

*Mistake #4: Failing to Properly Fit Training Delivery Format and Content to the Needs of the Audience*

The old saying, “When all you have is a hammer, everything looks like a nail”, often applies to corporate training. Companies have training departments full of people who have been trained to develop and teach traditional, classroom-based courses, so everything gets delivered that way.

We once heard an educational consultant say that if someone who lived in Aristotle or Plato’s time were to come back today, there’s only one thing they would still recognize about our society: the way we teach. The educational system hasn’t changed in thousands of years – it still consists of a classroom of students listening to an instructor.

The obvious problem with this is that it ignores the needs of the audience. Times have changed, and so have the ways in which people gather and absorb information. Everything in our world today is instantaneous, and attention spans are shorter than ever. Most information is now delivered electronically – news, music, entertainment, etc. We now have the power to pause, rewind or fast-forward a television program, and in addition, edit out the commercials. We can now buy one song at a time from a band that we like, rather than the entire album. Movies come with lots of extra features – deleted scenes, director’s commentaries, etc. Most people have their own personalized news page on the web, with weather, sports scores, stock quotes – all of their own choosing. We even have our own ring tones for our cell phones! In short, we live in a world of *personalized experiences*.

Those same expectations apply to training. More and more, employees want to learn at their own pace, in their own way. They’re used to short bits of information. They’re used to photos, music and video. They’re used to being *entertained*. That doesn’t bode well for the old “classroom” model, where people all sit in the same room and listen to an instructor go through the same material at the same speed for everyone.

We as training designers and deliverers must be willing to step away from the traditional ways in which we’ve designed and taught programs, and work to fit training and the mechanisms through which it is delivered to the diverse needs and preferences of our audience.

***Education has changed very little in 2000 years. We need to adapt our delivery methods to fit the needs and expectations of today’s audiences. Provide media-rich, interactive, self-paced, personalized experiences when possible.***

There are a number of ways to segment learning audiences; older vs. younger workers, novice vs. expert learners, how technology-savvy workers are, centralized vs. dispersed workforces, etc. In addition to considering these factors when making decisions about how to develop and deliver training, decisions need to factor in such things as how much time and money to invest in training based on the development time of each course, the shelf-life of the actual information or content, and how mission-critical the information is.

So how do you properly identify and evaluate relevant factors so as to make intelligent decisions about how to offer training that better fits the needs of your audience(s)? We've developed a model called the **Learning Decision Model**. It is designed to help training managers make intelligent decisions with regard to content, audience and delivery. This model is shown below.

**Learning Decision Model**

	Rapid E-Learning	Courseware	ILT	Blended Learning	Points Total
<b>Mission Critical</b>	Know (100)	Support (200)	Represent (300)	Advance (400)	_____
<b>Content Objective</b>	Awareness (100)	Fundamental Knowledge (200)	Competence (300)	Mastery (400)	_____
<b>Time to Market</b>	< 45 days (75)	< 90 days (150)	< 180 days (225)	< 270 days (300)	_____
<b>Content Stability / Shelf Life</b>	< 60 days (75)	180 days (150)	1 year (225)	> 1 year (300)	_____
<b>Learner Outcomes</b>	Desired Behavior (50)	Adaptive Behavior (100)	Proficient Behavior (150)	Expert Behavior (200)	_____
<b>Learner Needs</b>	Episodic Learner (50)	Novice Learner (100)	Regular Learner (150)	Expert Learner (200)	_____

Copyright 2005, TechComm Partners, SDR Instructional Design and Digital Latitudes

The horizontal scales on the model represent content / audience-related decisions. The vertical columns represent delivery / media methods. If you take any individual course or topic, you can plot the content / audience-related particulars on each of the horizontal scales. Once that is complete, you should then be able to see if your choices consistently fall into one or two of the vertical, colored columns. That in turn will help you decide the best format in which to present your training content, and should also help you to make sound decisions with regard to timeframes, budgets, and measurement.

Definitions of the row labels used above are as follows:

- **Mission Critical:** The extent to which a learning intervention furthers organizational strategy
- **Content Objective:** The desired level of audience understanding of the content in relation to the needs of the business
- **Time To Market:** The time duration from concept to course launch
- **Content Stability / Shelf Life:** The duration of content relevance
- **Learner Outcomes:** The relationship between learner performance and the business's goals
- **Learner Needs:** What the learner requires in order to achieve the desired training outcome

Definitions of the column labels used above are as follows:

- **Rapid E-Learning:** A dramatically shortened timeframe for both development and delivery compared to traditional E-Learning courses. Other characteristics of Rapid E-Learning include:
  - SME-centricity
  - Is based on simple, ubiquitous tools such as PowerPoint
  - The ability to be developed in a few weeks rather than months
  - Learning occurs quickly
- **Courseware:** Traditional E-Learning courses, usually delivered via a Learning Management System (LMS) either in HTML format or built with a proprietary tool such as ToolBook or Authorware, etc.
- **Instructor-Led:** Traditional, classroom-based training
- **Blended Learning:** A solution that takes the best parts of instructor-led and courseware, and combines them. Usually the ideal solution if time and budget permits

In addition to using the above model to make decisions on how to plan, develop and deliver training programs, current best practices reveal the following:

- (1) If possible, keep modules short
- (2) Provide accurate, deep content
- (3) Use photos, graphics, audio or video clips where appropriate to explain and demonstrate concepts

- (4) Allow learners to control the pace of learning
- (5) Provide reading lists for those learners who want additional information
- (6) Stay current on the latest technologies for delivering information. For example, audio and video podcasts (mini, internet-based radio or TV programs) and wikis (collaborative portals for employees, clients or vendors) are now being used as E-Learning tools with some degree of success.

*Note:* Don't make the mistake of thinking that simply making training interesting and fun is sufficient. While incorporating varying sights, sounds, composition, delivery format, and other aspects of training can certainly be beneficial, care has to be taken to not take these approaches to an extreme. Numerous studies have shown that adding entertaining elements such as extraneous sound effects, music, stories or characters to E-Learning courses can actually decrease retention by distracting learners away from relevant content.

One study focused on a defense department E-Learning course about explosives. The instructional designers thought it would be "clever" to create a character to help guide the students through the course. They developed a cartoon character of an army general that occasionally popped up in the course to offer information and advice to the students. Although the idea was well-meaning, research found that this character detracted from the learning experience, and retention test scores actually *fell*. The character was eventually removed from the course.

If you make more informed decisions about how to offer training based on the needs and preferences of your audience, you will improve the learner experience and get employees more excited about training.

## Summary

---

Few organizations are fully satisfied with their training activities. All too often, employees aren't excited about the opportunity to learn, and leaders are skeptical about the value of the training activities. To turn this around, organizations and their training functions must fundamentally alter the approach they take to planning and offering training and development activities, doing the following:

- (1) **Quit using training as a cure-all.** Inappropriately prescribing a training solution predictably leads to a lack of significant performance improvement, and eventually results in employees (and their managers) not being interested in corporate training. To avoid this, training functions must transition to becoming *development* functions. This means that they must do three things:
  - Not default to training as the solution to all development needs.
  - Have strong needs assessment skills and the discipline to always apply them before prescribing a solution, and
  - Have alternative forms of development in their tool kit

This does not mean that trainers must become experts in all of the various development options. Rather, they must develop an understanding of the options and circumstances under which each is more and less appropriate, and be willing to suggest the appropriate solution even if it doesn't fall within their area of specialty. This would include recognizing when a situation requires a systemic solution.

- (2) **Ensure alignment between training activities and the strategic goals and priorities of the organization.** Employees and their leaders feel increased pressure to get done those tasks and objectives that they are being held immediately accountable for, and a corresponding need to forego activities that pull them away from that.

As a result, more than ever training functions must show the practical value of their offerings in growing employees' ability to work better, smarter, and more efficiently. To do this, training must:

- Clearly link to the organization's defined and articulated priorities
- Be consistent with its culture

In order to plan appropriate training offerings, training and/or human resource functions must work closely with senior leaders to identify and understand both

the organization's near-term and its strategic objectives and priorities. It must then combine this with information portraying the strengths and weaknesses of the organization's talent and identify the organization's competency development needs – which will subsequently become the foundation of the training offering.

**(3) Establish and promote the link between training, learning, performance, and opportunity.** Because employees are stretched to achieve their job requirements, training functions have to “compete” more than ever to get employees' time and attention – to motivate the employees to invest time in learning. An important factor in whether employees will be motivated to participate in and get the most from training and other developmental offerings has to do with whether the organization has successfully established a clear link between training, learning, performance and opportunity. If so, then the “opportunity cost” that the employee pays to attend a development activity is much more likely to be seen as worthwhile. The keys to establishing this link are:

- Systematically and diligently identify and prioritize employees' development needs
- Match development activities to the identified development need(s)
- Educate the employees' managers on the behavioral/performance improvements to watch for, encourage and reinforce
- Effectively evaluate the employees' performance in the specific skill(s) targeted for improvement, not in overall performance
- Eliminate non-performance factors in awarding raises, promotions, etc.

**(4) Make training more creative and relevant in format, content and delivery mechanism.** Times have changed, and so have the ways in which people gather and absorb information. We live in a world of *personalized experiences*, and those same expectations apply to training. We as training designers and deliverers must be willing to step away from the traditional ways in which we've designed and taught programs, and work to fit training and the mechanisms through which it is delivered to the diverse needs and preferences of our audience. We must identify and weight relevant factors such as those shown in the ***Learning Decision Model*** to make sound decisions regarding training format, content, timeframes, budgets, and measurement.

By taking the steps above, organizations can make great strides toward creating and offering development solutions that motivate employees to learn, and their leaders to promote that learning, yielding meaningful impact and value to the organization.

## **Bibliography**

---

1. "2003 Industry Report." Training Magazine. October, 2003.
2. Chawla, Sarita, and John Renesch, editors. Learning Organizations: Developing Cultures for Tomorrow's Workplace. Productivity Plus, 1995.
3. Ford, Donald J., and Jack J. Phillips. In Action: Designing Training Programs. ASTD, 1996.
4. Laird, Dugan. Approaches to Training and Development (3<sup>rd</sup> Edition). Cambridge, MA: Basic Books, 2003.
5. Nadler, Leonard, and Zeaca Nadler. Designing Training Programs (2<sup>nd</sup> Edition): The Critical Events Model (Building Blocks of Human Potential). Houston, Texas: Gulf Publishing Company, 1994.
6. Schwandt, David R., and Michael J. Marquardt. Organizational Learning: From World-Class Theories to Global Best Practices. Boca Raton, Florida: CRC Press, LLC, 2000.

## **About OEi, LLC**

---

OEi steers companies to maximum workforce performance by addressing three of the most influential drivers of performance – leadership skills, performance management processes, and work climate. For more than 15 years OEi consultants have helped U.S. and international companies meet their productivity and performance goals with practical, high-impact consulting, training, facilitation and change management services. Key service areas are:

- Leadership Development and Training
- Performance Management Strategy and Process Design
- Work Climate Assessment and Consulting

For more information on OEi and its services, go to [www.oeintl.com](http://www.oeintl.com)

## **About Digital Latitudes**

---

Digital Latitudes helps companies build E-Learning solutions that result in better-educated employees and customers, a better return on investment (ROI) than traditional classroom-based training provides, and a better learning experience for employees, customers and vendors. We specialize in:

- Interactive strategy
- User Experience Design
- E-Learning strategy and custom E-Learning course development

For more information on Digital Latitudes, visit [www.digital-latitudes.com](http://www.digital-latitudes.com)