
Faculty Development Programs and Their Effect on Individual and Organizational Performance in Pakistan

_____ Sibtah Dar *
===== Nasira Jabeen **, Zafar Iqbal Jadoon*** ,
===== Irum Sajjad Dar****

Abstract

Faculty development programs help to enhance the knowledge, skills and abilities of teachers. The faculty development initiatives are aimed at improving the quality of higher education in a country. This paper attempts to analyze the impact of faculty development programs on performance of faculty members as individuals and on organizational performance. The major objective of the study is to emphasize the training and development needs in public sector universities and to solicit suggestions for improvement in existing faculty training and development programs while using Punjab University as a case in point. The study adopts a mixed method approach including survey and in-depth interviews. For survey a questionnaire was designed and 95 permanent faculty members were selected as respondents while for in-depth interviews 8 permanent faculty members were selected as respondents. The results were analyzed using non-parametric tests which included Mann Whitney U test, Kruskal Wallis H test and thematic analysis. The results suggested that there is a positive relation between faculty training and performance. Personal motivation is the most significant factor affecting individual performance ultimately leading to the organizational growth. To conclude, the

study revealed that there is positive impact of faculty training and development practices on performance of faculty members which ultimately affects the overall performance of the university positively. It was also observed that faculty of University of the Punjab was highly motivated towards receiving faculty development opportunities. The paper provides policy recommendations for both the university administration and the Higher Education Commission including organizing faculty development programs more frequently, nomination of the candidates for such development programs on merit as well as need basis, equality of opportunities for female faculty members, increase in frequency of faculty training and development programs and continuous improvement in the programs through regular review and feedback mechanism.

1. Introduction

The top priority of most of the nations in today's advanced era is economic development. Education is utilized as the tool to achieve this goal (Hussain, 2008).

Training and development when linked to individual and organizational performance is supposed to enhance the skills and abilities of the employees to achieve better results and output. Despite the fact that primary and secondary education plays a significant role in the process of nation building, it is the higher education that facilitates a nation to safeguard its principles, values, cultural boundaries and national philosophy along with providing policy directions through research and development (Memon, 2007). There is indeed a requirement of continuous professional development in the higher education sector to achieve the desired goals of economic and human resource development.

It is widely believed that in this era of information economy the educationists must be well equipped with the required knowledge, skills, and desired attitudes to give their best performance as a result of which the organizational performance will also increase. It is witnessed that those countries that have

given importance to their education system over time have become the top of the list leading countries mainly due to their consistent investment in education in general and higher education institutions in particular (Bloom, 2002).

The quality of education depends largely on qualifications and competencies of faculty. The essential functions and responsibilities of faculty include providing expertise to students in content area, responding to student inquiries about content or course of study, communicating professionally with a diverse group of students, coaching and mentoring students, sharing with them academic resources, empowering students to develop the desired competencies, assessing participants' learning outcomes and making productive efforts in research and development. For performing all these functions efficiently and effectively the faculty needs to get more professional training in their respective fields. Not just only in their respective field but also for emerging technologies so they can use latest tools and technology to make their teaching and research practice better. In order to prepare faculty members to enhance their performance in teaching and research and also to prepare them for their multiple roles that include coaching, mentoring, educating, guiding etc. training and development is needed (Ebrahimi, 2012). Gaff (1975) defines faculty development as a "process that enhances the talents, expands the interests, improves competence, and otherwise facilitates the professional and personal growth of faculty members". Therefore, so much attention is now given worldwide to the faculty training and development practices and all new academic staff is required to attend and participate in orientation programs and courses designed for them. These orientation programs help them to have a better understanding about working of the organization and knowledge of organizational norms, values, ethics, culture etc. A good teacher contributes towards educating students in a number of ways. Beyond just passing the subject related information to the students, a teacher's roles are manifold. S/he must be capable to be an effective communicator, the leader, the mentor, the collaborator, and the role model.

Faculty development specialists provide faculty members the knowledge, skills and requisite attitudes to be a good teacher. These may include, consultation on teaching, interpersonal skills, class organization, research and evaluation. Faculty members are also advised on other aspects of teacher/student interaction, such as advising, tutoring, professional ethics and norms, discipline policies and administration.

1.1 Faculty Development in Pakistan

In Pakistan Higher Education Commission (HEC) is responsible for higher education policy, quality assurance, degree recognition, developing new institutions and uplift of existing institutions in the country. Its main purposes include up gradation of higher education institutions/universities in Pakistan to be centers of learning, education, research and development. Faculty development in Pakistan is also being moved forward by the HEC.

The paper focuses on the needs of faculty development programs and analyzes current faculty training and development practice in public sector universities of the Punjab by taking University of the Punjab, which is the largest and the oldest public sector University of Pakistan as a case in point. It also deliberates upon examining the impact of faculty training and development programs on individual faculty members and the university as a whole in terms of performance.

1.2 Objective of the Study

The main objective of the paper is to analyze the current faculty development practices in public sector universities of Pakistan by taking the University of the Punjab as a case study. And examine the impact of such development practices on performance of individual faculty members and the university performance.

1.3 Significance of the Study

The paper critically reviews the faculty development programs and practices implemented in public sector universities

of Pakistan by taking the largest and the oldest University of the Punjab as a case. Punjab University being the pioneer public sector university is expected to serve as a role model for transforming and strengthening the existing training and development practices in the higher education institutions of Pakistan. The study after investigating the impact of such development initiatives provides useful recommendations to make them more meaningful. The findings of the study will be helpful for the university authorities, higher education institutions, and the Higher Education Commission in terms of evaluating their existing faculty development programs to find strengths and determine areas for improvements. An attempt will be made to understand the linkage between better faculty training and development practices and increased employee performance and growth of higher educational institutions in return.

1.4 Future Recommendations

Current study targets the population including faculty members who have attended faculty training programs. It is recommended that in future a comparison can be made by taking both the groups who have and who have not attended the training programs offered by the university.

2. Literature Review

Training is an organized procedure which helps people to learn and gain knowledge and skills required for specific jobs (Oyitso, 1997). Nwanchukwu (1990) noted that training is a process of increasing human efficiency through which people are provided opportunities to acquire new skills and current knowledge required for carrying out various specialized tasks at their workplaces. While training refers to the specific aspects relating to the work, development is viewed to be broader and futuristic relating to enhancing the potential of individuals. Both training and development are important aspects relating to the career advancement of employees. Training, retraining and education are integral part of human resource development and

are necessary to enhance quality, efficiency and performance of organizations including the higher education institutions attained. Ginns et al. (2010) examined that positively related to training courses and quality of work environment having a positive impact on teachers' approaches. The authors to identified do that the teachers job due to work duties load may not be able to develop and apply new teaching or assessment methods. Saleem & Amin (2013) analyzed that development is made if there is supportive role of organization towards its employees in the academic sector. Naqvi & Raza (2011) revealed that teachers of Pakistani higher education sector are less competent in professionalism. This minimizes organizational output and growth. Dietrich et al. (2004) in their study identified that to enhance teaching effectiveness technology also plays an important role which needs to be integrated in teaching practices. They identified lack of time to create teaching material, lack of technical skills and latest teaching tools and techniques as the major obstacle for teachers to perform their duties.

3. Methodology

The paper adopts descriptive research methods as well as inferential statistical techniques to identify the role and significance of faculty training and development programs. The population of the study included the full time faculty members of University of the Punjab Lahore Campus representing various departments and institutes. The selection included those teachers who have attended or undergone some faculty training or development program organized by the HEC or University of the Punjab. Initial probing on the issue surfaced that out of nearly 675 regular teachers in various cadres only 400 faculty members had received such trainings. The reason is that Limited number of trainings are offered to faculty by university. University cannot spare many teachers for the training programs, as only 2 teachers from each department can attend such trainings at a time. Also teachers are busy in their academic schedule and not willing to spare time to attend trainings. Qualitative and quantitative

approaches to collect data were utilized. Survey method was selected for quantitative data collection and a closed ended questionnaire was duly designed for the study. The questionnaire is attached in the appendix A. For survey 95 respondents were selected by applying Yamne's formula taking margin of error 0.09.

Respondents for quantitative data collection were selected through purposive sampling. This is used primarily when there are a limited number of people that have expertise in the area being researched. To collect qualitative data face to face structured and in-depth interviewing was selected. Respondents who were included in survey were asked to participate in in-depth interviews. Out of 15 respondents who showed their consent to give interviews, 10 were selected through convenience sampling. Quantitative data was analyzed by using factor analysis, Kruskal Wallis H test and Mann Whitney U test. Factor Analysis assisted obtaining the dimensions from quantitative data which were further tested by applying non parametric tests, Kruskal Wallis H test and Mann Whitney U tests. Qualitative data was transcribed and analyzed by using thematic analysis technique.

4. Findings

4.1. Quantitative Data Analysis

The analysis of quantitative data suggests that teachers have a favorable perception about faculty training and development programs offered to them over time. It emerges from the findings that teachers view faculty training as playing a very important part in their career.

They identified factors like instructional development, personal development, personal needs, training transfer environment, personal motivation and linking training with organizational development as key factors relating to their individual performance and organizational performance. All these factors showed reliable results by having value of Cornbach's Alpha close to 0.80.

Results of statistical data suggest that as per Table 1 Mann Whitney test the respondents received training organized by either University/Department or HEC have different opinion about personal development, training, transfer environment and organizational development, where as they have same opinion about instructional development, personal needs and personal. Table 2 depicts that the respondents whether they had received training for language and communication skills or not had different opinion about personal development, personal needs and training transfer environment, where as they have same opinion about instructional development, personal motivation and organizational development. Table 3 exhibits that the respondents either received training for research skills or not they have same opinion about personal development, personal needs, training transfer environment, personal motivation and organizational development. Table 4 depicts respondents either received training for teaching methodologies or not they have different opinion about training transfer environment, where as they have same opinion about instructional development, personal development, personal needs, personal motivation and organizational development. Table 5 shows that the respondents either received training for subject specialization or not have different opinion about personal development and training transfer environment, where as they have same opinion about instructional development, personal needs, personal motivation and organizational development. Table 6 depicts that the respondents either received training for technology and computer skills or not have different opinion about personal development and personal motivation, where as they have same opinion about instructional development, personal needs, training transfer environment and organizational development. According to Table 7 respondents either received training for curriculum and course management or not have same opinion about instructional development, personal development, personal needs, training transfer environment, personal motivation and organizational development. Table 8 shows that the respondents either received training for

organizational ethics or not have different opinion about personal development, personal needs, training transfer environment and personal motivation, where as they have same opinion about instructional development and organizational development.

Results of Kruskal Wallis H test in table 9 suggest that respondents belonging to different age groups have same opinion regarding instructional development, personal development, personal needs, training transfer environment, personal motivation and organizational development. Table 10 exhibits that the respondents having different qualification level have different opinion about instructional development, training transfer environment and personal motivation, whereas they have same opinion about personal development, personal needs and organizational development. Table 11 reflects that the respondents having different length of experience have different opinion about Instructional development, personal development, personal needs and training transfer environment, where as they have same opinion about personal motivation and organizational development. Table 12 shows that the respondents having different designation level have different opinion about personal development and personal needs, whereas they have same opinion about instructional development, training transfer environment, personal motivation, organizational development. Table 13 depicts that the respondents that received different types of trainings (i.e. for Induction/Orientation, professional competency, subject specialization and English language training) have same opinion about, instructional development, personal development, personal needs, training transfer environment, personal motivation and organizational development.

4.2 Qualitative Data Analysis

It is analyzed from the qualitative data that teachers of University of the Punjab have a favorable perception about faculty training and development. It appears that teachers believe that faculty training plays a very important part in their career.

4.2.1 Personal Development

It is analyzed that the faculty is satisfied by the aspect of personal development of faculty training and development programs. It is observed that teachers believe that the personality of a teacher is a strong motivating factor for students. The teachers training about personal grooming has a direct effect on the learning attitudes of the students. The better the teachers holds himself or herself in front of the students the more they easily grasp the knowledge. An inspirational personality of a teacher evokes the students'.

4.2.2 Professional Development

The findings of the study reveal that respondents assume that knowledge and skills are equally important for a teacher to teach in a better way. The teachers realize the importance of faculty training programs in enhancing skills and knowledge of teachers to make them fully aware of job responsibilities as main responsibility of a teacher is to teach students. It seems that teachers feel that training programs on the instructional development aspects must be a continuous process. It produces better graduates and on the whole organization that is University of the Punjab is benefitted. Faculty of University of the Punjab believe that when a teacher is newly hired and s/he is not given training prior to class interaction things can be quite risky in terms of class management. It is analyzed that there is less focus of Higher Education Commission and university administration on the faculty trainings in the field of instructional development.

It is also analyzed from the findings of the study that most of the teachers of University of the Punjab face problems in designing and managing the curriculum. It appears the university is less focusing on the training programs related to curriculum management. It also appears that training related to subject specialization is a disregarded area in terms of training and development. It seems that the teachers of University of the Punjab lack training of the faculty in the instruction aspect of their jobs which is the core responsibility of the teachers.

4.2.3 Organizational Development

It appears from the views of respondents that faculty training and development programs help the university teachers to develop and grow as a result of which the organization grows and benefits. It appears the respondents assume that the organizational development is linked to personal and professional development of the faculty. It is analyzed that respondents assume that University of the Punjab has a large number of students and when these students are being taught by skilled and professional teachers and they go in to the job markets, they make the university proud and more students are attracted towards the university to seek education, in turn the overall image of the university as an organization is enhanced. It appears that the respondents believe that university needs to do a lot of effort in making policies regarding strengthening of faculty training and development programs. Students who are being taught by fully skilled and trained teachers are expected to perform better in their name is jobs and flourished. As a more students are attracted towards the university and the ranking of the university gets improved.

4.2.4 Perception of Teachers about Faculty Training and Development

It appears from the respondents views that they are aware of the importance of training and development in their careers. They know the very concept of training and development in terms of training as relating to the contemporary needs of their careers and development being futuristic catering to the long term needs of career advancement. It seems that respondents believe that training and development opportunities help teachers to groom their personal as well as professional lives by teaching them new techniques, tools, methodologies and strategies of state of the art teaching.

4.2.5 Background of Training and Development in Punjab University

Respondents view that new faculty orientation program is most frequent training program being conducted in University of the Punjab but respondents stated that not only newly hired teachers attend the programs some senior teachers also attend these programs. The new faculty orientation programs include sessions on organizational ethics, teaching methodologies, structure and culture of the university, students handling issues, and information resource management. It is inferred that there are also some workshops offered to faculty members at institutional level including professional development activities and real world management skills The Higher Education Commission also imparts faculty development training to the new incumbents in the above areas. However, the frequency of such programs is very less in number as compared to new faculty orientation programs being offered by the Human Resources Development Centre of the University of the Punjab on regular basis.

4.2.6 Areas Where Punjab University Lack in Training

It is inferred from the findings of the study that personal need analysis is the most neglected factor in faculty development practices of University of the Punjab.

It appears from the view of the respondents that training need analysis should be conducted before organizing a training program and training must be conducted in view of the personal and organizational need analysis. The respondents reported some partiality or biasness in nominating candidates for faculty development programs. It comes into view that respondents are not satisfied with the timings of these faculty development programs. Respondents suggest that these faculty training programs should be offered during the semester break time because taking trainings along with other job responsibilities is tiresome and they cannot grasp the true essence of training.

Respondents seemed quite satisfied with the contents of trainings provided by the University. However, it appears from

the views of the respondents that they feel there is not much effort in development of research and publication. There should be more emphasis on research component in training programs and the new faculty need to learn the importance of research in their own career as well as for the growth and academic ranking of the University.

4.2.7 Teachers Satisfaction with Training and Development Programs

It is inferred that respondents believe that having policies regarding training and development is not enough, giving employees the actual support in this direction is the key. The respondents feel that so many improvements yet need to be made from the aspect of Human Resource Management in the University. It appears that respondents are satisfied with the outcome of training programs but they are not highly satisfied. The respondents believe that there should be binding for attending these programs because these trainings are very important for teachers 'career. It is inferred that teachers are fully aware that to excel in their profession they need to have a PhD in their respective field. It is extracted from the excerpts of the interviews that the respondents want to attend trainings and development programs which help grooming them for the advancement in their career. The respondents expressed the need for trainings of software used for research purposes like SPSS and Nvivo etc. It is also observed that incentives attached to the training and development programs are negligible which makes faculty members less attractive towards such programs. It is inferred that the respondents are not fully satisfied with the rewards attached to these faculty training and development programs. The respondents feel that these training programs must be offered during the vacations or in semester break time and the focus of the training program should be more towards research development. They emphasize on establishing a linkage between training and development efforts and their career advancement.

5. Discussion

The present research is performed to evaluate and appraise the faculty development programs and practices conducted at public sector universities by taking University of the Punjab as a case in point. Permanent faculty members of University of the Punjab who have undergone faculty development training program were taken as sample. This study followed the mixed method approach for data collection and data analysis i.e. both quantitative and qualitative methods were used to collect and analyze the data. Out of 400 permanent faculty members who were undergone some faculty training development practice(s) 95 full time permanent faculty members were selected for survey and 8 full time permanent faculty members from various departments of Punjab University were randomly selected for in depth interview.

The variables of the questionnaire were reduced and grouped into factors with the help of factor analysis technique. The responses on the basis of those factors were tested by applying Mann Whitney U and test Kruskal Wallis H test.

The results of Mann Whitney test indicated that male faculty members are more concerned about training transfer environment. The respondents who have not received trainings for subject specialization are quite concerned about personal development and training transfer environment. The respondents who have received trainings for technological skills are more personally motivated and are concerned for personal development. Since most of available literature and training material is from the developed countries context transfer of training in view of the culture specific context is a challenge. There is a need for transforming these best training practices as per socio, economic, human resources and cultural requirements of higher education institutions of Pakistan. Likewise, technology and technological advances in every arena including university teaching are integral part of development, thus those equipped with these skills feel more confident and are ambitious towards their career advancement.

The results of Kruskal Wallis test indicated that respondents having PhD. qualification are more concerned about training transfer environment and instructional development while respondents having Master degree qualification are more personally motivated. Teachers having experience of 10-20 years are most concerned about instructional development, personal development, personal needs, and training transfer environment. Faculty members working at level of Assistant professor emphasized more on personal development personal needs as they have to grow further in their career i.e. Associate Professor and Professor. The above findings indicate that faculty members at all levels are aware of the current dynamic changes in the field of teaching and they are keen to learn the state of art teaching techniques and methodologies for effective teachings.

From the opinions of respondents it is analyzed that organizational development is dependent upon personal and professional development and personal development and the professional development are highly dependent on training and development opportunities the faculty members are offered over time. The findings indicate that instructional development and personal development of the faculty members of the university are given importance. The teachers are highly motivated towards receiving faculty development related training programs offered to them. It is analyzed that the biasness in nominating the candidates for training is a big hurdle in the way of organizational development as faculty members do not find such opportunities of development evenly and equitably. There is biasness in selecting the candidates for the training programs as a result some faculty members receive more training and development opportunities while others are deprived of such participation. At times, duration and timings of the training programs becomes a barrier for participants particularly female faculty members in view of their multiple cultural roles and domestic responsibilities.

It is identified that there is need for both a central Human Resources Department which need to contribute by offering trainings on the aspects of teaching on regular basis including,

communication and interpersonal skills, research and information management and overall organizational context and policies at university level whereas, at intra departmental or faculty level more focus should be on the specific departmental needs of the faculty members such as subject specialization. Since University of the Punjab is the largest public sector university which is a general university offering a large variety of academic programs in different academic disciplines/subjects. The requirements of each discipline/subject area differ from one to the other so respective faculties and departments can organize such trainings more specifically in view of the specialized requirements of the faculty members.

Overall the teachers of University of the Punjab found the training and development programs supportive for their personal and professional development. They are satisfied with the contents of the training programs.

6. Conclusion

To conclude, the faculty members of University of the Punjab have a positive or favorable perception of faculty training and development programs offered to them at the university level. It can be concluded that the faculty members of University of the Punjab are highly motivated to participate in faculty development programs and practices. The teachers of University of the Punjab are imparted training on interpersonal and communication skills, teaching methodologies, organizational ethics and policies, research and information resource management etc. The respondents view that research being the most important component for university faculty should be dually recognized while designing such training and development programs. As research plays a very important role in the development of universities by creating new knowledge in different fields the University needs to focus more on the research component while designing faculty training and development programs. Since the Higher Education Commission has recently started ranking of the universities where research is one of the key criterion of ranking,

the faculty should be trained on research ethics and academic writing skills in their early careers so that they may learn the art to conduct and publish authentic and meaningful research in their respective areas. Moreover publishing a research article must be a compulsion so that teachers work on it on regular basis.

The growth of a university is determined by the quality of the performance of its students in job market. The better the students learn from the university the better they will be able to apply their knowledge and abilities on the jobs. The performance of the students is dependent upon the teaching style of the teacher. If the teacher is trained and confident s/he can pass knowledge to the student in an effective manner.

7. Recommendations

In view of the above findings of the research the paper provides the following recommendations for strengthening the existing faculty training and development initiatives and improving quality of teaching and research at the University level:

1. Training and development is a vital function of human resource development in any organization including the higher education institutions of Pakistan. The existing efforts of Faculty development in the University of the Punjab are neither sufficient nor comprehensive. The training programs should be based on Training Need Analysis (TNA) including the organizational needs, individual competencies and task analysis. Each program should be designed in view of the above requirements and executed in such a way that efficiency and effectiveness of the effort is enhanced.
2. Contents of the training programs should be carefully developed in view of the university faculty's needs and requirements should be given to the research component as it has a great significance for university

teaching. Special training need to be imparted on carrying out quality research and research analysis through software like SAS, SPSS, and NVIVO etc. Different faculties may outline their specific research agenda in line with their discipline and the national requirements while central human resource department may facilitate them towards this direction.

3. The training sessions should be interactive so the trainees can interact and socialize with other trainees and the trainer in conducive learning environment and transfer of learning may be enhanced as per cultural specific needs.
4. Training and development efforts should be more frequent and offered to the faculty serving at various levels in the university hierarchy including, lecturers, assistant professors, associate professors and professors etc. Like civil servants require mandatory training and development for their promotion and career advancement there should be Continuous Professional Development (CPD) training for all faculty members at various stages of their career.
5. State of the art teaching tools, techniques, methodologies and skills should be incorporated in each training and development program. Changes influencing the teaching methods and methodologies, evaluation techniques, paper marking strategies, script writing skills and instructional skills, curriculum development skills, awareness of plagiarism and desired attitudes relating to both faculty and student motivation, diversity management, sexual harassment and gender need to be covered in such development initiatives.
6. Besides local and national level training programs foreign trainings should also be organized for faculty

members to enhance their exposure and learning of global ethics and best teaching practices. However, an effort should also be made towards creative adaptation of such global teaching skills and practices in view of the indigenous requirements.

7. Nomination of faculty members for training and development programs should be made on merit basis providing equality of opportunities to both females and males irrespective of gender or any other bias. Diversity should be encouraged and reflected in such development efforts as per requirements of the changing landscape of our work organizations. Duration and timings of the trainings should also be selected carefully in view of the diverse representation of the programs.
8. Special emphasis should be placed on learning in all such human resource development initiatives and evaluation of the programs should be made in various phases including immediate feedback, short term and long term feedback of participants' learning and employing training practices at their respective institutions/departments/schools etc. A report in this regard may be solicited from the head of the departments (HODs) on training related aspects of the incumbents' work.
9. Last but not the least, a comprehensive and meaningful effort in this regard needs a strong will and support of the top leadership of the university authorities and the Higher Education Commission towards design, implementation and evaluation of the HRD initiative at each phase for desired results.

Notes and References

- * Mr. Sibtah Dar, M. Phil. Scholar, Institute of Administrative Sciences, University of the Punjab, Lahore
 - ** Prof. Dr. Nasira Jabeen, Director, Institute of Administrative Sciences, University of the Punjab, Lahore
 - *** Prof. Dr. Zafar Iqbal Jadoon, Dean, School of Business, University of Central Punjab, Lahore
 - **** Ms. Irum Sajjad Dar, Assistant Professor, College of Statistical and Actuarial Sciences, University of the Punjab, Lahore
- Tanveer, H., (2008), Dilemma of Higher Education in Pakistan and Role of World Bank. Danish School of Education, University of Arhus Denmark. *Reports*, 2003-2007 Higher Education Commission of Pakistan, Annual Reports.
- Memon, G. H., (2007), "Education in Pakistan: The Key Issues, Problems and the New Challenges" *Journal of Management and Social Sciences*, 3(1), 47-55.
- Bloom, D. E., (2002), "Mastering Globalization: From Ideas to Action on Higher Education Reform. Text of Speech Delivered at University of Laval Conference Globalization", *What Issues are at Stake for Universities*, 18-21.
- Ebrahimi, S., Kojuri, J., (2012) "Assessing the Impact of Faculty Development Fellowship in Shiraz University of Medical Sciences", *Arch Iran Med*, 15(2), 79 – 81.
- Gaff, J., (1975), "Toward Faculty Renewal: Advances in Faculty Instructional and Organizational Development", San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass Inc.
- Oyitso, M.O., (1997). "The Perceived Impact of Manpower Training on Trainees' Job Performance and standard of living in Nigeria's Banking Industry". *CARESON Journal of Research and Development*, 1(1), 94-106.
- Nwanchukwu, O.F., (1990). "Manpower development in Nigeria through in-service training", (Unpublished M.Ed. Thesis), University of Lagos. Nigeria.

- Ginns, P., Kitay, J., and Prosser, M., (2010) "Transfer of academic staff learning in a research-intensive university", *Teaching in Higher Education*, 15(3), 235-246.
- Saleem, S., and Amin, S., (2013) "The Impact of Organizational Support for Career Development and Supervisory Support on Employee Performance: An Empirical Study from Pakistani Academic Sector", *European Journal of Business and Management*, 5(5), 194-207.
- Raza, S. A., and Naqvi, S. A., (2011), "Quality of Pakistani University Graduates as Perceived By Employers: Implications for Faculty Development", *Journal of Quality and Technology Management*, 7(1), 57 - 72.
- Dietrich, J., Johnson, K., Karakaya, F., Morgan, L., Panaccione, C., Pellicio, B., Pierre, F., Whitfield, T., Wilhelm, P. B., (2004), "Faculty Survey on Instructional Technology Use, Resources and Support", Survey report on Faculty Development Practices in Community College of Rhode Island.

Appendix A

Questionnaire

Faculty Development Programs and Their Effect on Individual and Organizational Performance

The Case of University of the Punjab

Background Information

1. Gender

Male

Female

2. Age

Less than 30

30-40

40-50

Over 50

3. Relationship Status

Single

Married

4. Highest degree obtained

Master's

M.phil/M.S

Doctorate

5. Number of years teaching at Punjab University

Less than 1 year

1-10 years

10-20 years

Over 20 years

6. Level of employment

- Lecturer
- Assistant Professor
- Professor
- Associate Professor

7. Type of employment

- Permanent
- Contractual

8. I have attended any formal faculty training program

- Yes
- No

9. The training received was organized by

- University/Department
- HEC

10. The training received was for

- Induction/Orientation
- Professional competency
- Subject specialized
- English Language Training

11. Location of the trainings

- Department
- Campus
- Other city
- Foreign

12. Nature of the trainings mainly focused

- Induction
- Professional competency
- Subject specialized
- English Language Training
- HEC policy guidelines

13. In your department training is given more often to

- | | |
|----------------------|--------------------------|
| Lecturers | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Assistant Professors | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Professors | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Associate Professors | <input type="checkbox"/> |

14. I have received training for Language & Communication

- Yes No

15. I have received training for Research Skills

- Yes No

16. I have received training for Teaching Methodologies

- Yes No

17. I have received training for Subject Specialization

- Yes No

18. I have received training for Technology and Computer Skills

- Yes No

19. I have received training for Curriculum and Course
Management

- Yes No

20. I have received training for Organizational Ethics

- Yes No

Please Mark the Desired Options

	Excellent	Satisfactory	Neutral	Dis-satisfactory	Very Poor
My English Language and Communication skills are	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
I like to learn about new things	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I think of many ways of doing thing	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
University needs highly trained professionals	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The trainings are designed to support the organizational mission	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Training assisted university's operations	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The focus of the training supports my individual training needs	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The training transfer environment was supportive	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The training helped improve my teaching and research skills	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I have learnt something new	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I feel more motivated towards my profession after receiving training	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Design of the training evaluation was satisfactory	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The training outcome measured was truthful	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Teachers are selected for the training program on the basis of genuine training needs	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Very Frequently	Frequently	Occasionally	Rarely	Never
I receive faculty training	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Very Great Extent	Great Extent	Some Extent	Little Extent	Very Little Extent
The trainings are designed in an understandable and easy way	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The trainings are designed to support the organizational mission	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The design of the training supports my individual needs	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I need to improve the knowledge required for teaching	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I need to improve the abilities and skills required for teaching	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The trainer conducted the training in a good way	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I am highly motivated towards my profession	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I am eager to receive faculty development related trainings	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I am satisfied with the results of the training	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I feel improvement in my performance	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
My personal development objectives are met	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I can observe improvements in my professional abilities	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
My boss and my colleagues give me positive	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Please provide at least three suggestions towards strengthening the training and development programs at the University level.

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____

Thank You for Your Participation

Appendix B

Table 1

Grouping Variable: Organized by either University/Department or HEC

Testing Variables: Instructional Development, Personal Development, Personal Needs, Training Transfer Environment and Organizational Development

Hypothesis	Mean Rank	P Value
<p>H₀: Respondents received training organized by either University/Department or HEC have same opinion regarding instructional development.</p> <p>H₁: Respondents received training organized by either University/Department or HEC have different opinion regarding instructional development.</p>	Uni/Dept. 51.22 HEC 41.02	.089
<p>: Respondents received training organized by either University/Department or HEC have same opinion regarding personal development.</p> <p>: Respondents received training organized by either University/Department or HEC have different opinion regarding personal development.</p>	Uni/Dept. 53.59 HEC 35.88	.003*
<p>H₀: Respondents received training organized by either University/Department or HEC have same opinion regarding personal needs.</p> <p>H₁: Respondents received training organized by either University/Department or HEC have different opinion regarding personal needs.</p>	Uni/Dept. 52.48 HEC 38.30	.017

<p>H₀: Respondents received training organized by either University/Department or HEC have same opinion regarding training transfer environment.</p> <p>H₁: Respondents received training organized by either University/Department or HEC have different opinion regarding training transfer environment.</p>	Uni/Dept. 53.37 HEC 36.37	.005*
<p>H₀: Respondents received training organized by either University/Department or HEC have same opinion regarding personal motivation.</p> <p>H₁: Respondents received training organized by either University/Department or HEC have different opinion regarding personal motivation.</p>	Uni/Dept. 48.42 HEC 47.08	.817
<p>H₀: Respondents received training organized by either University/Department or HEC have same opinion regarding organizational development.</p> <p>H₁: Respondents received training organized by either University/Department or HEC have different opinion regarding organizational development.</p>	Uni/Dept. 53.40 HEC 36.30	.004*

P* Shows significant .i.e. ($p \leq 0.05$), P** shows highly significant .i.e. ($p \leq 0.001$)

Table 2

Grouping Variable: Whether Attended Training for Language and Communication Skills or Not

Testing Variables: Instructional Development, Personal Development, Personal Needs, Training Transfer Environment and Organizational Development

Hypothesis	Mean Rank	P Value
H₀: Respondents either received training for language and	Yes 44.88 No 50.47	.320

<p>communication skills or not have same opinion regarding instructional development.</p> <p>H₁: Respondents either received training for language and communication skills or not have different opinion regarding instructional development.</p>			
<p>H₀: Respondents either received training for language and communication skills or not have same opinion regarding personal development.</p> <p>H₁: Respondents either received training for language and communication skills or not have different opinion regarding personal development.</p>	Yes No	35.99 57.52	.000**
<p>H₀: Respondents either received training for language and communication skills or not have same opinion regarding personal needs.</p> <p>H₁: Respondents either received training for language and communication skills or not have different opinion regarding personal needs.</p>	Yes No	39.55 54.70	.007*
<p>H₀: Respondents either received training for language and communication skills or not have same opinion regarding training transfer environment.</p> <p>H₁: Respondents either received training for language and communication skills or not have different opinion regarding training transfer environment.</p>	Yes No	38.45 55.57	.002*
<p>H₀: Respondents either received training for language and communication skills or not have same opinion regarding personal motivation.</p>	Yes No	51.30 45.39	.277

H₁ : Respondents either received training for language and communication skills or not have different opinion regarding personal motivation.			
H₀ : Respondents either received training for language and communication skills or not have same opinion regarding organizational development. H₁ : Respondents either received training for language and communication skills or not have different opinion regarding organizational development.	Yes No	47.70 48.24	.923

P* Shows significant .i.e. ($p \leq 0.05$), P** Shows highly significant .i.e. ($p \leq 0.001$)

Table 3

Grouping Variable: Whether Attended Training for Research Skills or Not

Testing Variables: Instructional Development, Personal Development, Personal Needs, Training Transfer Environment and Organizational Development

Hypothesis	Mean Rank	P Value
H₀ : Respondents either received training for research skills or not have same opinion regarding instructional development. H₁ : Respondents either received training for research skills or not have different opinion regarding instructional development.	Yes 44.70 No 49.67	.400
H₀ : Respondents either received training for research skills or not have same opinion regarding personal development. H₁ : Respondents either received training for research skills or not have different opinion regarding personal development.	Yes 47.23 No 48.39	.846

<p>H₀: Respondents either received training for research skills or not have same opinion regarding personal needs.</p> <p>H₁: Respondents either received training for research skills or not have different opinion regarding personal needs.</p>	<p>Yes 47.64</p> <p>No 48.18</p>	.926
<p>H₀: Respondents either received training for research skills or not have same opinion regarding training transfer environment.</p> <p>H₁: Respondents either received training for research skills or not have different opinion regarding training transfer environment.</p>	<p>Yes 52.67</p> <p>No 45.63</p>	.232
<p>H₀: Respondents either received training for research skills or not have same opinion regarding personal motivation.</p> <p>H₁: Respondents either received training for research skills or not have different opinion regarding personal motivation.</p>	<p>Yes 53.88</p> <p>No 45.02</p>	.121
<p>H₀: Respondents either received training for research skills or not have same opinion regarding organizational development.</p> <p>H₁: Respondents either received training for research skills or not have different opinion regarding organizational development.</p>	<p>Yes 43.64</p> <p>No 50.21</p>	.259

P* Shows significant .i.e. ($p \leq 0.05$), P** Shows highly significant .i.e. ($p \leq 0.001$)

Table 4
Grouping Variable: Whether Attended Training for Teaching Methodologies or Not
Testing Variables: Instructional Development, Personal Development, Personal Needs, Training Transfer Environment and Organizational Development

Hypothesis	Mean Rank	P Value
H₀: Respondents either received training for teaching methodologies or not have same opinion regarding instructional development. H₁: Respondents either received training for teaching methodologies or not have different opinion regarding instructional development.	Yes 46.87 No 51.98	.448
H₀: Respondents either received training for teaching methodologies or not have same opinion regarding personal development. H₁: Respondents either received training for teaching methodologies or not have different opinion regarding personal development.	Yes 46.22 No 54.26	.236
H₀: Respondents either received training for teaching methodologies or not have same opinion regarding personal needs. H₁: Respondents either received training for teaching methodologies or not have different opinion regarding personal needs.	Yes 46.30 No 54.00	.249
H₀: Respondents either received training for teaching methodologies or not have same opinion regarding training transfer environment. H₁: Respondents either received	Yes 44.41 No 60.67	.015*

training for teaching methodologies or not have different opinion training transfer environment.			
H₀ : Respondents either received training for teaching methodologies or not have same opinion regarding personal motivation. H₁ : Respondents either received training for teaching methodologies or not have different regarding personal motivation.	Yes	49.59	.267
	No	42.38	
H₀ : Respondents either received training for teaching methodologies or not have same opinion regarding organizational development. H₁ : Respondents either received training for teaching methodologies or not have different regarding organizational development.	Yes	47.41	.688
	No	50.07	

P* Shows significant .i.e. ($p \leq 0.05$), P** Shows highly significant .i.e. ($p \leq 0.001$)

Table 5

Grouping Variable: Whether Attended Training for Subject Specialization or Not

Testing Variables: Instructional Development, Personal Development, Personal Needs, Training Transfer Environment and Organizational Development

Hypothesis	Mean Rank	P Value
H₀ : Respondents either received training for subject specializations or not have same opinion regarding instructional development. H₁ : Respondents either received training for subject	Yes 35.59 No 49.63	.108

specializations or not have different opinion regarding instructional development.			
<p>H₀: Respondents either received training for subject specializations or not have same opinion regarding personal development.</p> <p>H₁: Respondents either received training for subject specializations or not have different opinion regarding personal development.</p>	Yes No	26.45 50.82	.006*
<p>H₀: Respondents either received training for subject specializations or not have same opinion regarding personal needs.</p> <p>H₁: Respondents either received training for subject specializations or not have different opinion regarding personal needs.</p>	Yes No	34.95 49.71	.088
<p>H₀: Respondents either received training for subject specializations or not have same opinion regarding training transfer environment.</p> <p>H₁: Respondents either received training for subject specializations or not have different opinion regarding training transfer environment.</p>	Yes No	30.32 50.32	.022*
<p>H₀: Respondents either received training for subject specializations or not have same opinion regarding personal motivation.</p> <p>H₁: Respondents either received training for subject specializations or not have different opinion regarding personal motivation.</p>	Yes No	58.55 46.62	.157

H₀ : Respondents either received training for subject specializations or not have same opinion regarding organizational development. H₁ : Respondents either received training for subject specializations or not have different opinion regarding organizational development.	Yes	35.82	.109
	No	49.60	

P* Shows significant .i.e. ($p \leq 0.05$), P** Shows highly significant .i.e. ($p \leq 0.001$)

Table 6

Grouping Variable: Whether Attended Training for Technology and Computer Skills or Not

Testing Variables: Instructional Development, Personal Development, Personal Needs, Training Transfer Environment and Organizational Development

Hypothesis	Mean Rank		P Value
H₀ : Respondents either received training for technology and computer skills or not have same opinion regarding instructional development. H₁ : Respondents either received training for technology and computer skills or not have different opinion regarding instructional development.	Yes	55.88	.055
	No	44.36	
H₀ : Respondents either received training for technology and computer skills or not have same opinion regarding personal development. H₁ : Respondents either received training for technology and computer skills or not have different opinion regarding personal development.	Yes	57.42	.023*
	No	43.65	

<p>H₀: Respondents either received training for technology and computer skills or not have same opinion regarding personal needs.</p> <p>H₁: Respondents either received training for technology and computer skills or not have different opinion regarding personal needs.</p>	Yes 50.12 No 47.02	.604
<p>H₀: Respondents either received training for technology and computer skills or not have same opinion regarding training transfer environment.</p> <p>H₁: Respondents either received training for technology and computer skills or not have different opinion regarding training transfer environment.</p>	Yes 58.75 No 43.04	.009
<p>H₀: Respondents either received training for technology and computer skills or not have same opinion regarding personal motivation.</p> <p>H₁: Respondents either received training for technology and computer skills or not have different opinion regarding personal motivation.</p>	Yes 63.52 No 40.84	.000**
<p>H₀: Respondents either received training for technology and computer skills or not have same opinion regarding organizational development.</p> <p>H₁: Respondents either received training for technology and computer skills or not have different opinion regarding organizational development.</p>	Yes 53.75 No 45.35	.156

P* Shows significant .i.e. ($p \leq 0.05$), P** Shows highly significant .i.e. ($p \leq 0.001$)

Table 7
Grouping Variable: Whether Attended Training for Curriculum and Course Management or Not
Testing Variables: Instructional Development, Personal Development, Personal Needs, Training Transfer Environment and Organizational Development

Hypothesis	Mean Rank	P Value
H₀ : Respondents either received training for curriculum and course management or not have same opinion regarding instructional development. H₁ : Respondents either received training for curriculum and course management or not have different opinion regarding instructional development.	Yes 44.24 No 50.00	.326
H₀ : Respondents either received training for curriculum and course management or not have same opinion regarding personal development. H₁ : Respondents either received training for curriculum and course management or not have different opinion regarding personal development.	Yes 46.09 No 49.02	.621
H₀ : Respondents either received training for curriculum and course management or not have same opinion regarding personal needs. H₁ : Respondents either received training for curriculum and course management or not have different opinion regarding personal needs.	Yes 48.68 No 47.64	.857
H₀ : Respondents either received training for curriculum and course management or not have same opinion regarding training transfer environment. H₁ : Respondents either received	Yes 47.79 No 48.11	.956

training for curriculum and course management or not have different opinion regarding training transfer environment.			
H₀ : Respondents either received training for curriculum and course management or not have same opinion regarding personal motivation. H₁ : Respondents either received training for curriculum and course management or not have different opinion regarding personal motivation.	Yes	50.44	.510
	No	46.70	
H₀ : Respondents either received training for curriculum and course management or not have same opinion regarding organizational development. H₁ : Respondents either received training for curriculum and course management or not have different opinion regarding organizational development.	Yes	50.62	.487
	No	46.60	

P* Shows significant .i.e. ($p \leq 0.05$), P** Shows highly significant .i.e. ($p \leq 0.001$)

Table 8

Grouping Variable: Whether Attended Training for Organizational Ethics or Not

Testing Variables: Instructional Development, Personal Development, Personal Needs, Training Transfer Environment and Organizational Development

Hypothesis	Mean Rank	P Value
H₀ : Respondents either received training for organizational ethics or not have same opinion regarding instructional development. H₁ : Respondents either received training for organizational ethics	Yes	43.25
	No	51.17
		.165

or not have different opinion regarding instructional development.			
H₀ : Respondents either received training for organizational ethics or not have same opinion regarding personal development. H₁ : Respondents either received training for organizational ethics or not have different opinion regarding personal development.	Yes No	37.03 55.32	.001**
H₀ : Respondents either received training for organizational ethics or not have same opinion regarding personal needs. H₁ : Respondents either received training for organizational ethics or not have different opinion regarding personal needs.	Yes No	39.13 53.91	.009*
H₀ : Respondents either received training for organizational ethics or not have same opinion regarding training transfer environment. H₁ : Respondents either received training for organizational ethics or not have different opinion regarding training transfer environment.	Yes No	37.17 55.22	.001**
H₀ : Respondents either received training for organizational ethics or not have same opinion regarding personal motivation. H₁ : Respondents either received training for organizational ethics or not have different opinion regarding personal motivation.	Yes No	56.45 42.37	.011*
H₀ : Respondents either received training for organizational ethics or not have same opinion regarding organizational development. H₁ : Respondents either received	Yes No	44.18 50.54	.258

training for organizational ethics or not have different opinion regarding organizational development.		
--	--	--

P* Shows significant .i.e. ($p \leq 0.05$), P** Shows highly significant. i.e. ($p \leq 0.001$)

Table 9

Grouping Variable: Age of Respondents.

Testing Variables: Instructional Development, Personal Development, Personal Needs, Training Transfer Environment and Organizational Development

Hypothesis	Mean Rank	P Value
H₀ : Respondents of different age groups have same opinions regarding instructional development. H₁ : Respondents of different age groups have different opinions regarding instructional development.	less than 30 46.08 30-40 49.09 40--50 51.86 over 50 53.50	.887
H₀ : Respondents of different age groups have same opinions regarding personal development. H₁ : Respondents of different age groups have different opinions regarding personal development.	less than 30 51.13 30-40 46.16 40—50 36.73 over 50 57.83	.388
H₀ : Respondents of different age groups have same opinions regarding personal needs. H₁ : Respondents of different age groups have different opinion regarding personal needs.	less than 30 48.79 30-40 50.52 40--50 38.73 over 50 42.33	.626
H₀ : Respondents of different age groups have same opinions regarding training transfer environment. H₁ : Respondents of different age groups have different opinions regarding training transfer environment.	less than 30 47.36 30-40 48.06 40—50 49.36 over 50 52.83	.985

H₀ : Respondents of different age groups have same opinions regarding personal motivation. H₁ : Respondents of different age groups have different opinions regarding personal motivation.	less than 30	43.64	.296
	30-40	51.75	
	40--50	57.95	
	over 50	42.67	
H₀ : Respondents of different age groups have same opinions regarding organizational development. H₁ : Respondents of different age groups have different opinions regarding organizational development.	less than 30	51.96	.220
	30-40	43.27	
	40--50	39.45	
	over 50	65.17	

P* Shows significant .i.e. ($p \leq 0.05$), P** Shows highly significant .i.e. ($p \leq 0.001$)

Table 10
 Grouping Variable: Qualification of Respondents
 Testing Variables: Instructional Development, Personal Development,
 Personal Needs, Training Transfer Environment and Organizational
 Development

Hypothesis	Mean Rank	P Value	
H₀ : Respondents having different level of qualification have same opinion regarding instructional development. H₁ : Respondents having different level of qualification have different opinion regarding instructional development.	Masters	35.76	.041*
	M.Phil./M.S.	48.00	
	Doctorate	56.02	
H₀ : Respondents having different level of qualification have same opinion regarding personal development. H₁ : Respondents having different level of qualification have different opinion regarding personal development.	Masters	35.47	.038
	M.Phil./M.S.	47.99	
	Doctorate	56.22	
H₀ : Respondents having different level of qualification have same	Masters	37.16	.065
	M.Phil./M.S.	47.60	

opinion regarding personal needs. H₁ : Respondents having different level of qualification have different opinion regarding personal needs.	Doctorate	55.76	
H₀ : Respondents having different level of qualification have same opinion regarding training transfer environment. H₁ : Respondents having different level of qualification have different opinion regarding training transfer environment.	Masters M.Phil./M.S. Doctorate	35.03 45.41 60.69	.004*
H₀ : Respondents having different level of qualification have same opinion regarding personal motivation. H₁ : Respondents having different level of qualification have different opinion regarding personal motivation.	Masters M.Phil./M.S. Doctorate	60.11 36.28 59.07	.000**
H₀ : Respondents having different level of qualification have same opinion regarding organizational development. H₁ : Respondents having different level of qualification have different opinion regarding organizational development.	Masters M.Phil./M.S. Doctorate	40.21 50.93 48.36	.338

P* Shows significant .i.e. ($p \leq 0.05$), P** Shows highly significant .i.e. ($p \leq 0.001$)

Table 11
Grouping Variable: Experience of Respondents
Testing Variables: Instructional Development, Personal Development,
Personal Needs, Training Transfer Environment and Organizational
Development

. Hypothesis	Mean Rank	P Value
H₀: Respondents having different length of experience have same opinion regarding instructional development. H₁: Respondents having different length of experience have different opinion regarding instructional development.	less than 1 year 41.66 1-10 years 44.60 10-20 years 86.94 over 20 year 54.63	.000**
H₀: Respondents having different length of experience have same opinion regarding personal development. H₁: Respondents having different length of experience have different opinion regarding personal development.	less than 1 year 45.53 1-10 years 43.77 10-20 years 88.50 over 20 years 46.38	.000**
H₀: Respondents having different length of experience have same opinion regarding personal needs. H₁: Respondents having different length of experience have different opinion regarding personal needs.	less than 1 year 47.87 1-10 years 44.73 10-20 years 80.81 over 20 years 35.38	.003*
H₀: Respondents having different length of experience have same opinion regarding training transfer environment. H₁: Respondents having different length of experience have different opinion regarding training transfer environment.	less than 1 year 48.34 1-10 years 43.34 10-20 years 84.25 over 20 years 48.50	.001**
H₀: Respondents having different length of experience have same opinion regarding personal motivation. H₁: Respondents having different length of experience have	less than 1 year 52.58 1-10 years 44.49 10-20 years 62.75 over 20 years 52.88	.224

different opinion regarding personal motivation.		
H₀: Respondents having different length of experience have same opinion regarding organizational development H₁: Respondents having different length of experience have same opinion regarding organizational development.	less than 1 year 1-10 years 10-20 years over 20 years	49.03 45.88 60.44 52.25
		.522

P* Shows significant .i.e. ($p \leq 0.05$), P** Shows highly significant .i.e. ($p \leq 0.001$)

Table 12
 Grouping Variable: Designation of the Respondents
 Testing Variables: Instructional Development, Personal Development, Personal Needs, Training Transfer Environment and Organizational Development

Hypothesis	Mean Rank	P Value
H₀: Respondents having different designation have same opinion regarding instructional development. H₁: Respondents having different designation have different opinion regarding instructional development.	Lecturer Assistant Professor Associate Professor Professor	45.82 9.10 59.00 65.63
		.521
H₀: Respondents having different designation have same opinion regarding personal development. H₁: Respondents having different designation have different opinion regarding personal development.	Lecturer Assistant Professor Associate Professor Professor	41.33 57.69 35.50 58.13
		.039*
H₀: Respondents having different designation have same opinion regarding personal needs. H₁: Respondents having different designation have	Lecturer Assistant Professor Associate Professor Professor	41.56 58.64 14.50 51.75
		.017*

different opinion regarding personal needs.			
H₀: Respondents having different designation have same opinion regarding training transfer environment. H₁: Respondents having different designation have different opinion regarding training transfer environment.	Lecturer Assistant Professor Associate Professor Professor	42.81 55.77 11.00 60.63	.055
H₀: Respondents having different designation have same opinion regarding personal motivation. H₁: Respondents having different designation have different opinion regarding personal motivation.	Lecturer Assistant Professor Associate Professor Professor	46.58 49.43 29.00 59.75	.663
H₀: Respondents having different designation have same opinion regarding organizational development. H₁: Respondents having different designation have different opinion regarding organizational development.	Lecturer Assistant Professor Associate Professor Professor	47.85 47.27 63.00 52.63	.928

P* Shows significant .i.e. ($p \leq 0.05$), P** Shows highly significant .i.e. ($p \leq 0.001$)

Table 13

Grouping Variable: Training Received for whether Induction/Orientation, Professional Competency, Subject Specialization and English Language Training

Testing Variables: Instructional Development, Personal Development, Personal Needs, Training Transfer Environment and Organizational Development

Hypothesis	Mean Rank	P Value
H₀: Respondents received different types of training have same opinion regarding	Induction/Orientation	49.53
	Professional Competency	45.50
	Subject Specialization	48.96
	English Language Training	38.00
		.763

<p>instructional development. H₁: Respondents received different types of training have different opinion regarding instructional development.</p>		
<p>H₀: Respondents received different types of training have same opinion regarding personal development. H₁: Respondents received different types of training have different opinion regarding personal development.</p>	<p>Induction/Orientation 48.01 Professional Competency 49.82 Subject Specialization 56.04 English Language Training 25.33</p>	<p>.153</p>
<p>H₀: Respondents received different types of training have same opinion regarding personal needs. H₁: Respondents received different types of training have different opinion regarding personal needs.</p>	<p>Induction/Orientation 45.61 Professional Competency 61.38 Subject Specialization 45.92 English Language Training 38.08</p>	<p>.137</p>
<p>H₀: Respondents received different types of training have same opinion regarding training transfer environment. H₁: Respondents received different types of training have different opinion regarding training transfer environment.</p>	<p>Induction/Orientation 45.45 Professional Competency 48.50 Subject Specialization 60.65 English Language Training 44.25</p>	<p>.325</p>

<p>H₀: Respondents received different types of training have same opinion regarding personal motivation.</p> <p>H₁: Respondents received different types of training have different opinion regarding personal motivation n.</p>	<p>Induction/Orientation 51.60</p> <p>Professional Competency 4.21</p> <p>Subject Specialization 3.46</p> <p>English Language Training 9.83</p>	.074
<p>H₀: Respondents received different types of training have same opinion regarding organizational development.</p> <p>H₁: Respondents received different types of training have different opinion regarding organizational development.</p>	<p>Induction/Orientation 9.73</p> <p>Professional Competency 3.50</p> <p>Subject Specialization 1.85</p> <p>English Language Training 5.42</p>	.510

P* Shows significant .i.e. ($p \leq 0.05$), P** Shows highly significant .i.e. ($p \leq 0.001$)