Systèmes d'Information et Management

Volume 10 | Issue 2 Article 5

2005

Transferring successful corporate training into e-learning in a large international organization : the case of Early Warning in Conflict Prevention

Geneviève FÉRAUD
IAE Aix-en-Provence, genevieve.feraud@unctad.org

Follow this and additional works at: http://aisel.aisnet.org/sim

Recommended Citation
FÉRAUD, Geneviève (2005) "Transferring successful corporate training into e-learning in a large international organization : the case of Early Warning in Conflict Prevention," *Systèmes d'Information et Management*: Vol. 10 : Iss. 2 , Article 5.
Available at: http://aisel.aisnet.org/sim/vol10/iss2/5

This material is brought to you by the Journals at AIS Electronic Library (AISeL). It has been accepted for inclusion in Systèmes d'Information et Management by an authorized administrator of AIS Electronic Library (AISeL). For more information, please contact elibrary@aisnet.org.

Transferring successful corporate training into e-learning in a large ...
Féraud, Geneviève
Systèmes d'Information et Management, Jun 2005; 10, 2; ABI/INFORM Complete
pg. 89

Transferring successful corporate training into e-learning in a large international organization: the case of Early Warning in Conflict Prevention

Geneviève FÉRAUD

Maître de Conférences
Institut d'Administration des Entreprises d'Aix-en-Provence

ABSTRACT

Companies that wish to develop e-learning may proceed in two different ways: the first one is to create and develop a completely new and original course, where content and tools are developed simultaneously. The second way is to transfer into an e-learning environment a content that already exists in the company's traditional, face-to-face training. This is what a lot of corporations do, because it often enables them to capitalize on previous experiences and investments. However, a mere transfer is often considered as unproductive, if not impossible. Is it possible to transfer a successful face-to-face course into an e-learning environment? In this case, what is the best way to do it? What are the main challenges and the key success factors? This article will answer these questions through the description and analysis of a pilot e-learning project in a large international organization.

Key-words: Corporate training, E-learning, Transfer.

Disclaimer:
The views expressed herein are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of the United Nations.

Acknowledgements:
The author would like to thank the UNSSC project team, Ms S. Korth, Project Manager, and M. F. Bilucaglia, Consultant, for their availability and their help in providing research material and sharing their experience.

Published by AIS Electronic Library (AISeL), 2005.
Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

RÉSUMÉ

Les entreprises qui souhaitent développer du e-learning peuvent procéder soit en créant et en développant un cours nouveau et original, où contenu et outils sont développés simultanément, soit en transférant dans un environnement e-learning un contenu déjà existant dans le catalogue de formation en présentiel de l'entreprise. Beaucoup d'entreprises adoptent ce choix, car il leur permet de capitaliser sur les expériences et les investissements déjà réalisés. Cependant, un simple transfert est parfois considéré comme improductif, voire impossible. Est-il possible de transférer en e-learning un cours qui a déjà fait ses preuves dans une formation traditionnelle ? Dans ce cas, quels sont les principaux défis et facteurs clés de succès ? Cet article tentera de répondre à ces questions en observant le cas d'une expérience pilote dans une grande organisation internationale.

Mots-clés : Formation d'entreprise, E-learning, Transfert.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

INTRODUCTION

Some researchers and practitioners question the possibility of successfully transferring a face-to-face course into an e-learning environment: "The first successful experiences in e-learning demonstrate clearly that it needs to be designed specifically and originally, and not as a simple online transposition of traditional training." (Mingasson, 2002) However, this method is sometimes preferred to the original creation of an e-learning course by companies, because it allows them to capitalize on already existing training investments. Is transfer possible, and how? What are the pitfalls that must be avoided, and the success factors which can be used to increase the quality of the transfer operation? This article will answer these questions through the description and analysis of a pilot e-learning project in a large international organization.

RESEARCH FRAMEWORK

Transferring a successful face-to-face training into an e-learning environment evokes four types of questions: (1) why would a company do it, or, in other words, how is the decision taken? (2) what could be the best way to do it? (3) what are the main difficulties that the company may face, and (4) what are the main success factors?

The transfer decision

There are many reasons why a company will decide to transfer a successful face-to-face training into an e-learning environment. It obviously needs to bring advantages to the organization, and this can be done in many ways: cost reduction, mainly in travels, personalization of the learning process, an easily updatable content, the permanent availability of the training tool, the creation of communities, towards the building of a learning organization, or the profitability increase of previous Intranet and Internet investments (Mingasson, 2002). Transferring training on e-learning may often simply be a necessity, because training needs increase and that the time devoted to it decreases (Ledru, 2002). But, more than that, it may be justified by the fact that the status of learning has changed, from a situation where people needed to learn in order to access employment, to a situation where they have to learn permanently to be able to work, or where, even, learning is work (Kalika, 2002).

Companies will try to seek benefits, both at the company level, such as controlled access, a broader audience, faster response time, and at the learner's level as well; because it is self-directed, the e-learning opportunity is available 24 hours a day, 365 days a year, and it's possible to learn from work and home at an individual's pace. In addition to that, it gives the learner the ability to measure and analyze lifelong learning and readiness (EITO).

Another important reason why companies will transfer a successful face-to-face training into an e-learning environment is because it is an integral part of their human resource development policy, as e-learning is recogni-

Published by AIS Electronic Library (AISeL), 2005
Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

zed by some as a critical necessity to win the "war for talent": "There's no question that learning can be part of a retention strategy. One important reason why good people leave companies is that they don't feel that they're growing or developing. A learning program can help solve this problem: it can give people a community that they belong to and feel great loyalty to." (Webber, 2003)

In the end, and although it is possible to find an infinite list of all benefits of e-learning, the greatest are generally to be found in cost reduction: "According to most cost analyses that break down the financial side of corporate training, the costs for travel and lodging represent approximately 40 percent of the total costs while facilities costs represent about 7 percent. Simply put, nearly half of all corporate training dollars are spent on the buildings that house the training events and getting people to and from those buildings." (Rosenberg, 2001) E-learning enables companies to break the constraints of space and time (Dubois, 2000).

So the rationale is that those companies, and especially those where the staff is spread all around the world, should be willing to transfer or extend face to face training into e-learning in order to save costs, reach more people, and get rid of time constraints.

Transfer process

Usually, the way companies transfer an already existing course into e-learning refers to traditional project management approaches: "The question of "how to implement it" is regularly expressed by managers, HRD and learning specialists, and can be decomposed into several questions: where should we start? How can we convince the company's top management? What type of content? Which audience at the beginning? etc." (Ledru, 2002). This may be explained by the fact that it is often under the responsibility of a team led by the Information Technology function of the company, where detailed project management techniques are at the core of the work processes.

Difficulties

But the transfer of a successful face-to-face course into an e-learning environment may generate some challenges and difficulties.

The first one is that cognitive psychology clearly shows that it is not possible to satisfy all learning needs of companies through e-learning. Senge has described companies as learning organizations (Senge, 1990), where human interactions are most important. Both behaviorists and cognitive psychologists agree on the fact that "... motivational and contextual factors influence learning. It is now clear that non-ability factors exert a significant effect on learning and retention." (Marshall, 2000) Understanding that, although e-learning allows to break the "classical" unity of time, place and action, it may be necessary to achieve a fair balance between remote and face-to-face learning, will help to resolve the issues and problems linked to the need of group awareness and group trust (Favier, 2003).

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

The ability to use e-learning courses depends heavily on culture, topics, and learning styles: "Not all learning activities are adaptable to e-learning, for several reasons. First, people are social animals and the best learning is through experience, collaboration and interaction with others. Also, learning styles differ among individuals; some people are able to adapt to e-learning better than others. Finally, some topics are fact-based or skills-based and can be as effectively addressed with e-learning as with human instruction – perhaps more so." (Harris, 2001) And cultural resistance can appear at all levels of the organization (Ledru, 2002).

In addition to that, the preeminence of one type of cultural framework in the production of e-learning resources may be an obstacle to its successful implementation; most products in e-learning on management are anglo-saxon, mostly American, and they are not culturally adapted to European cultures (Kalika, 2002). It is doubtful that they may be adapted to other non Anglo-Saxon cultures as well.

Very often, the benefits of e-learning may be counterpoised, or even neutralized, by the difficulties that companies meet when they try to implement it. As shown by some surveys done by e-learning suppliers: "... 53% [*of survey participants*] say lack of bandwidth is a major challenge to e-learning, 51% say "cultural resistance" is a barrier to e-learning, and 39% say lack of interaction." (E-Learning Magazine 2001). This is confirmed by practitioners: major difficulties are met with technology (37%), company culture (29%), and the low level of information technology mastery of the learners (29%) (01 Etudes 2001). In this perspective, main risks factors in face-to-face to e-learning course transfer are insufficient content or interface quality, insufficient communication on the project, lack of autonomy of the participants, insufficient evaluation quality, lack of human interaction, and bad technology – or insufficient technology in number (Mingasson, 2002).

The last problem lies with the evaluation of e-learning, because, as often happens with information technology-based projects, the measurement of e-learning may be difficult. Some support the idea that the measurement of e-learning can be addressed through learning retention, the capability of addressing strategic skills, the capability of addressing knowledge gaps, the orientation to enterprise values as well as jobs tasks. "E-learning value and time to payback has a short-term and long-term view. Individual job skill e-learning initiatives have relatively short times to payback... The tradeoff to fast payback in individual e-learning initiatives is a lower overall return and a payback pattern that peaks quickly and just as quickly, declines." (Harris, 2001)

Efficiency of e-learning can then be measured in different ways, may it be through the measurement of satisfaction, like in seminars, with the technological, organizational and pedagogical dimensions, or though the tracking: of the number of connections, number of course pages studied, progression in the program, length of connections (Kalika, 2002).

Published by AIS Electronic Library (AISeL), 2005
Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

But this is controversial, as even at the time of the biggest glory of e-learning, a Forrester report already estimated that although companies invested a lot in e-learning and web-based training, that didn't solve the problem of what they need the most: employee performance (Dalton *et al.*, 2000).

Success factors

This is why a transfer process should be carefully prepared and planned, and should leverage on identified success factors. The necessary conditions for e-learning success have to be prepared at different levels. At company level, it's necessary are convince top management with a business case, to put e-learning in the center of a human resource development strategy and communicate on e-learning in order to avoid resistance to change (Mingasson, 2002). At the facilitator level, there is a need to transform the instructor's role into a tutor and a coach: "Tutoring is the indispensable success factor." (Ledru, 2002) Then, perpetuating interactivity is a necessary success condition, by supporting the constitution of a learners group, and having regular face-to-face meetings. Content and technology quality is a must.

As a synthesis, the following table summarizes transfer decision and processes, and challenges and success factors.

The field research has then helped us compare this framework to the case situation.

THE METHODOLOGY

Preparation of the field research

"Science does not begin with facts and hypotheses, but with a specific problem" (Grawitz, 1990). This is our

Why transfer	Save costs Reach more people Get rid of time constraints Improve content Retain talent (part of HRD policy)
How	Project management approach
Difficulties	Need of group interaction Technical difficulties Company culture Predominance of the Anglo-Saxon culture Evaluation difficulties
Success factors	Top management support Coherent human resource management Communication on the project Transformation of the instructor's role Content quality Technology quality Original design

Table 1: Transfer decision, process, difficulties and success factors.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

situation, as we try to solve a concrete problem, i.e. understand the challenges met by organizations when transferring traditional instruction online. "Difficulties encountered by companies, questions that managers ask themselves are very often privileged starting points for research in management.". (Allard-Poesi & Maréchal *in* (Thiétard, 1999) What is the best way, for a company, to transfer a successful training course into an e-learning course? And what are the challenges and the success factors? In order to answer these questions, we will observe the implementation of a pilot course in a large international organization and we will try an offer some ideas about the best way to do it.

This research will start from one theoretical object (the transfer of a training course into e-learning) and two empirical objects (the corresponding challenges and success factors) and will help to describe a methodological object (guidelines for transfer) and an empirical object, the evaluation of the transfer into a pilot course.

We will "confront theory to reality" in Thiétard (Angot & Milano, 1999), and in order to discover the challenges and the success factors of the transfer, we will "let theoretical elements emerge from reality". Rather than using a measurement system, we will favor a translation process.

Research field

The United Nations System Staff College (UNSSC) developed the Early Warning and Preventive Measures (EWPM) project in 1998 in order to respond to the strong focus of the United Nations on conflict prevention. In his July 1997 report on Renewing the United Nations (Annan, 1997), the Secretary General of the United Nations insisted on the importance of proactivity in the UN organizations. The United Nations System Staff College, with the help of other specialized United Nations agencies and of academic institutions, designed a worldwide training program on Early Warning and Preventive Measures. "The main idea was to use experiences, systems and mechanisms already in place." (Korth & Garcia, 2003) This led to the design and implementation of training workshops all around the world with the following characteristics: "The EWPM project guaranteed the consolidation of the organization's institutional capacity in the area of early warning and the design of preventive measures in various regions of the world, in English, French and Spanish". (Korth & Garcia, 2003). To date a total of 1189 participants coming from 41 different entities of the UN have been trained in 49 workshops, and an electronic platform gives to the alumni the possibility to keep their skills updated.

These workshops are five days long and address five main topics: the analytical processes associated with early warning, the identification of the stages in the conflict cycle and of the potential immediate and structural causes of conflict; the identification, development and integration of preventive measures and preventive action; the mechanisms for coordinating agencies, joint planning, and decision making processes for early warning; and the construction of a matrix of

Published by AIS Electronic Library (AISeL), 2005
Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

preventive measures with recommendations for preventive action, focusing on the structural causes of the conflict.

In 2003, the project team of the UNSSC decided to transfer these workshops in an e-learning environment, and designed and tested a pilot course.

Research process

The research method used is an exploratory case study, conducted along a qualitative process of analyzing primary sources and gathering interviews results among the initiators of the transfer projects. In this respect, it corresponds to Yin's recommendation of investigating "... a contemporary phenomenon within its real life context." (Yin, 1994). Our goal is to underline the main challenges and benefits of e-learning transfer, and hopefully to describe some useful principles for companies, as "...cases are useful for developing sets of principles and concepts that can be applied in practice." (Corey, 1976)

The researcher has followed the EWPM e-learning course in its entirety. Simultaneously, there have been in-depth interviews with the project team. The origins of the transfer decision have been explored through different interviews with the project team. This has allowed the researcher to deal directly with people and their experiences and to probe answers; however, we were aware of the fact that lack of time, cost and the difficulty to analyze answers in depth could be constraints (Chabon-Berger & Pontillo, 2002).

Secondary sources have been provided by the UNSSC and have been analyzed; they have provided some first results, especially in the analysis of the modules, and have been used as well as a basis for further discussions with the project team.

The initial idea was to test an on-line course of 5 sessions on 5 volunteers that had already followed the course. The testing was to be done on 5 weeks, one module per week. "... the tester will be provided with a presentation of the examined analytical tool, the relevant background reading and some example of the output expected from them."[1]. 80 alumni and 5 trainers expressed interest in the experience. Out of the 80 alumni, 10 were selected by following the criteria of country diversity, agencies diversity, and on the basis of first come first serve. Two of these 10 initial volunteers dragged out before starting.

Table 2[2] summarizes this process. Not all the volunteers finished the test, mainly for workload reasons.

Module	Number of volunteers	Final
1	6	6
2	5	5
3	4	3
4	4	4
5	4	4

Table 2: Participants to the pilot.

1. Source: internal email message, 1/EMM/1.
2. Source: internal research 1/IR/1.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

In order to be able to make comparisons between content and the structure of the face-to-face workshop and the e-learning modules, each of their basic component have been coded as shown in Annex E.

DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

The transfer

The decision of transferring the face-to-face workshop into e-learning came from the fact that the organization received some donor funds that, although most welcome, were not sufficient to design a face-to-face workshop. It was then decided to design a pilot e-learning course. Therefore the budget was quite limited, as the team did not receive any additional funds. The reasons comforting this choice was that e-learning was perceived by the team as a vehicle to reach more people, relatively easy to implement as there were some skills already in the organization, and with no additional costs. An external evaluation report had recommended developing a technical platform.

Therefore, in this case, it was not a decision of developing e-learning per se; but rather, e-learning was seen as a relevant and efficient mean to increase the project scope, and rose from a financial opportunity. This process of project budget optimization, rather than an organization-level strategic decision, seized the advantage of e-learning flexibility in order to develop the organization capacity.

In addition to that, the project team wanted to evaluate the quality of the output in relationship with the process: as mentioned earlier, the EWPM training workshops emphasize the importance of the learning process, and the project team wanted to understand to what extent the EWPM methodology could be transmitted only through electronic platform. In this respect, participants' feedback has brought some very valuable information.

The difficulties

The difficulties met in transferring the face-to-face training to an e-learning environment were, on one side, on the specific aspects of the pilot itself, and, on the other side, on the more general level of technical characteristics.

The pilot

According to the project team, the major difficulties encountered in the implementation of the pilot were the following: (1) not enough preparation time for the pilot (15 days); (2) modest amount of technical resources (the technical team experience was only 2 years, and the software version utilized was not up-to-date); (3) the volunteers had an initial perception that the workload in testing the pilot would be light. This initial under-estimation probably had some consequences in their subsequent availability or the reliability of their evaluation, and (4) because of time and cost constraints, the pilot could be developed only in English.

Published by AIS Electronic Library (AISeL), 2005
Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

The pilot was evaluated by the volunteers in a semi-guided form, and communicated to the management team by emails messages. The following table shows the main difficulties as recognized by participants.

Type of difficulty	Number
Use of platform – ergonomics and formatting	4
Design of the course	11
Technology failure or problem	4
Lack of interaction	5

Table 3: Pilot difficulties.

Source: Volunteers' emails.

Technical aspects

An analysis done by the project team shows the same type of categories, where technology failures appears as the main problem: "Use of platform not always easy", design and structure: "need for clear instruction for doing the course", and, among others, ergonomics[3]. This is summarized in the following table.

Type of complaint	Number
Use of platform – ergonomics and formatting	8
Design of the course	8
Technology failure or problem	3

Table 4: Technical difficulties.

Source: Feedback report.

Both the participants and the project team consider the same categories of potential difficulties. However, it's interesting to note that the participants focus more on the process and the interaction, while the project team, although highly aware of it, comments mainly on the technological problems. This shows a difference of perspective.

Success factors

Paradoxically, the transfer of the course online could have been made more difficult by the high quality of the face-to-face training. Because this project was funded by governments, as is often the case with United Nations projects, an external evaluation was conducted and resulted in the following findings: "... feedback from students show that the tools were useful in terms of preventing conflicts and also in other working areas... the design and methodology of the training was relevant to most participants... the workshops provide a valuable opportunity to establish a network among participants." (Korth & Garcia, 2003)

One of the main reasons of the worldwide success of these workshops was their highly participatory design. "Since the workshops are run in a very participatory way, participants ultimately "appropriate" them. Trainers share this sense of "appropriation" since their contributions, experiences and recommendations for improvement are constantly included in the development of the workshops and in the way they are held." This was recognized by all participants: "... as a UN Officer, she considered that the most interesting asset of the workshop she attended was the opportunity to interact with other people, sharing opinions

3. Source: Feedback report.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

and learning from other experiences."[4] Their practical approach was considered as well as very relevant to the professional situation of the participants: "These workshops are one of the few systematic and comprehensive approaches to conflict prevention in which theoretical concepts are taken and applied to practical cases."

Another important success factor of the face-to-face training was the professional behavior of the facilitators: "The main key to its success resides in the high level of commitment and professionalism shown by organizers, facilitators and participants alike... Also, the team of facilitators has chosen a teaching system in which they act as role models for transmitting the essential principles and values of this formative experience and of its subsequent practical applications." (Korth & Garcia, 2003)

Therefore the very strong point of the e-learning course was that it kept the possibility to practice skills. "The practical and applied nature of the training is the strong point of this project." (Korth, 2003) The e-learning course therefore allowed participants to focus on the methodology of the conflict prevention rather than drifting away on the special case of countries. And the fact that many very positive comments related to the quality of the substantive content is remarkable, as most volunteers were already content specialists. The participants appreciated everything that kept the interaction going, as was demonstrated by comments like: "the idea of a gentle reminder email form course designer is appreciated"[5], or "use of email for contact with course designer and prompt feed-back a good idea."[6]

Additional findings

In addition to the observations linked to the four main questions of the research, we looked at the respective duration and content of the modules.

Duration

We first noticed a difference between the duration of the face-to-face workshops (18,5 hours), and the duration of the e-learning modules (47 hours) as seen from the learner's perspective.

According to the project team, this difference can be explained by the fact that the team who designed the e-learning course had no preliminary information on the learners' level of knowledge. Another explanation is that the structure is not the same. The learners' activities are different as well, as in the face-to-face workshop they "do", while in the e-learning they "read and do". A last difference is that in the e-learning module there is no shared labor, less interaction, and, finally, that nobody is pushing the participants on issues.

4. Source: Internal email message I/EMM/10.

5. But should it have come from the course designer? The absence of a tutor clearly was a problem.

6. Source: Report: "Feedback on First Module of EWPM Distance Learning Test", 2004.

Published by AIS Electronic Library (AISeL), 2005
Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Content

The comparison of the workshop activity blocks and the e-learning modules, on the modules that are course presentations by the facilitator, and subject-related work group activities, showed that the e-learning pilot addresses less content than the workshops, and that there are only a few new e-learning modules (see Table 5). However, the active participation of the learner is encouraged by the systematic use of an application exercise at the end of each e-learning module.

Several additional workgroup activities have a general scope (Workshop Navigation Meeting, Presentations, Peer Review & Feedback, Action Planning & Next Steps, Team Debriefings, Course Summary & Evaluation, Closure). The observation shows a very high level of interactivity and learners involvement in the workshops and there is not yet a substitute for these activities in the e-learning modules. This is consistent with the interviews of the project team, who were focusing the test on the transferability of the EWPM substantive methodology rather than on the specific content, the quality of which had already been demonstrated.

Summary of findings

The table 6 summarizes the similarities and differences between the elements commonly found in the literature and our observations on the four main questions of this research.

These findings show that some factors that came from the literature analysis were part of the research field experience, while some others did not appear as critical as expected. All the same, the research conducted on the field pointed out additional findings that appeared as significant. That draws the outline for a transposition scenario between the initial hypothesis and the observation made.

Transfer scenario

The transfer scenario can be described along the answers to the four main questions around which the research is organized: (1) why would a

Name of the session or topic	Number of Workshop Modules	Number of E-learning Modules	Number of Common Modules	Number of Non-transferred Workshop Modules	Number of Original E-learning Modules
Introduction	9	6	5	4	0
SP[7]	3	3	2	1	1
CC	5	4	4	0	0
CCDM	5	0	0	5	0
CAAA	2	4	2	0	2
PAPM	6	3	3	3	0
SB	4	2	2	2	0

Table 5: Modules content.

7. SP, CC, CCDM, CAAA, PAPM and SB refer to specific EWPM content and theories.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

	Literature	Our observation
Why transfer	• Save costs • Reach more people • Get rid of time constraints • Improve content • Retain talent	• Optimized utilization of financial resources • Test of specific methodology • Transferability in preparation of a wider project development
How	• Project management approach	• Pilot project
Difficulties	• Need of group interaction • Technical difficulties • Evaluation difficulties • Predominance of the Anglo-Saxon culture • Company culture	• Need of group interaction • Technical difficulties • Content design
Success factors	• Top management support • Coherent human resource management • Communication on the project • Transformation of the instructor's role • Content quality • Technology quality • Original design	• High quality of the content • Efforts to allow interactivity • Opportunity to practice skills once the course is finished • Focus on the methodology
Duration	N/A	• E-learning course twice and a half longer
Content	N/A	• Not as many common modules as could have been expected in a case of transfer

Table 6: Summary of findings.

company do it, or, in other words, how is the decision taken? (2) What could be the best way to do it? (3) What are the main difficulties that the company may face, and (4) what are the main success factors?

On the first point, the initial framework pointed out that the decision to transfer a successful face-to-face training into e-learning was motivated by the hope to decrease costs, increase the reach, ease the time constraints, increase the content quality and retain key talents. Our observation points out that actually the process was much simpler; although the financial concern was one of the origins of the project, it was more under the form of an opportunistic decision; the desire to increase the content quality corresponded to the goal of testing the methodology of the course, and the other reasons were not specifically addressed. Altogether, a transfer scenario would emphasize a simplification of the process, with a more ambitious overall goal, as this pilot approach was clearly understood as the first step of a much bigger project.

This is reflected by the transfer on the second point, i.e. the process that was used. Here again, the scenario would plead for a simplification, as although our observation showed that

Published by AIS Electronic Library (AISeL), 2005
Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

the organization followed the project management approach, it focused on its initial phase by developing and testing a pilot. This allowed a complete financial control of the budget and made it less risky.

At the level of the difficulties encountered by the project, it was again simpler because although our observation confirmed three of the five mentioned items, it did not meet the obstacles linked to the company culture. This may come from the fact that, due to its very nature, the UN system is probably one of the most diverse organization in the world. Therefore, culture is not as much a limitation as it could be in other organizations. The problem of evaluation difficulties was solved by the e-learning system design, as evaluation of the modules was embedded in its architecture from the beginning.

The last point concerns the success factors of the transfer. Here again a transfer scenario would advocate a simplification of the issues. While the importance given to interaction and content were identical, our observation did not let appear any special focus on top management support or communication. But it pointed out a very important aspect: it addressed the issue of an original design by focusing on the methodology that had been developed in the face-to-face training, and stressed the importance of applying the acquired knowledge in real-world job situations.

At last, our observation showed that e-learning modules could be longer than the initial face-to-face training project, and that direct transfer did not mean mere translation.

CONCLUSION

The question of the transfer of a successful face-to-face course into an e-learning environment has been the subject of many debates both in the academic and the corporate communities. While the process of why and how the transfer should be made already raised a lot of problems, companies who did it met many obstacles and were not always able to take full advantage of online instruction. However, our observation in the case of a UN organization showed that this transfer can be successful, providing that it follows a simplified transfer scenario. Companies that embark in this type of project should therefore concentrate on a tight and opportunistic integration into the organization's other projects, and build and test a pilot before developing a wider solution. Although there is no simple solution to the difficulties relating to the lack of group interactivity and to the technical limitations of the e-learning software, a good content design and its immediate application in the real work life situation would probably increase the chances of success.

Although the validity of the results of this observation is limited by its specificity and the small sample of which the findings have been observed, our results show that it is therefore possible to successfully transfer a good face-to-face course into a e-learning context. The next steps of our work will consist in observing the generali-

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

zation of the pilot to the entire project, and will improve our understanding of difficulties and success factors. Specifically, we will focus on the importance of interactivity, by checking the possible emergence of a "task-artifact" cycle (Baile, 2004) in the context of the generalization of e-learning.

BIBLIOGRAPHIE

01 Etudes (2001), Le E-learning en France, *01 Etudes - E-Learning Agency.*

Annan, K. (1997), Renewing the United Nations: A Programme for Reform, *United Nations*, July, no. A/51/950.

Baile, S. (2004), Pourquoi et Comment Evaluer l'Interaction Homme/Machine?, *9e Conférence de l'Association Information et Management.*

Chabon-Berger, T., and Pontillo, M.J. (2002), *Business Research*, Boca Raton FL, Bart Chart Inc.

Corey, R.E. (1976), The Uses of Cases in Management Education, *Harvard Business School* 9-376-240.

Dalton, J.P., Manning, H., Hagen P.R., Paul Y., and Tong, J. (2000), OnLine Training Needs: A New Course, *Forrester Report.*

Dubois, P.-L. (2000), L'exportation des formations au management et les NTIC, *XIIIes Journées Nationales De L'Enseignement De Gestion,* Fondation Nationale pour l'Enseignement de la Gestion.

EITO - European Economic Interest Grouping, and DG Enterprise and Information Society European Commission (2001), *European Information Technology Observatory 2001.* Brussels.

E-Learning Magazine (2001), 2001 E-Learning User Survey, *LearningMag.Com.*

Favier, M. (2003), *Des Questions Autour du e-Learning,* in *Caron-Fasan Marie-Laurence, Lesca Nicolas: « Présent et Futurs des Systèmes d'Information ».* Grenoble, Presses Universitaires de Grenoble.

Grawitz, M. (1990), *Méthodes des Sciences Sociales*, Paris, Dalloz.

Harris, K. (2001), E-learning: Strategy and Planning, *Gartner Symposium ITxpo 2001*, Cannes, France, November 5-8.

Kalika, M. (2002), Le E-Learning et la Formation Continue au Management. *XIVes Journées Fnege,* Fondation Nationale pour l'Enseignement de la Gestion.

Korth, S. (2003), « Early Warning and Preventive Measures (EWPM): Building UN Capacity - The Experience of a United Nations Training Programme », in *Conflict Sensitive Approaches to Development, Humanitarian Assistance & Peace-Building.* http://www.conflictsensitivity.org: FEWER News Letter - International Alert and Saferworld Programme on Conflict-Sensitive Approaches.

Korth, S. and Garcia, B. (2003), « Alerta Temprana y Medidas Preventivas: un proyecto de formacion de Naciones Unidas ». *Papeles De Cuestiones Internacionales* Otono, n° 83, p. 177-84.

Ledru, M. (2002), *Le E-Learning, Project d'Entreprise - Une Approche Stratégique des Processus Compétences*, Paris, Editions Liaisons.

Marshall, R. (2000), Web-Based Instruction: Training and Education for the 21st Century, *IBT Technologies, Inc.*

Mingasson, M. (2002), *Le Guide du E-Learning*, Paris, Editions d'Organisation.

Rosenberg, M. (2001), Can E-Learning Preserve the Training Department? *E-Learning Magazine.*

Senge, P. (1990), *The Fifth Discipline - The art and practice of the learning organization*, New York, Doubleday.

Published by AIS Electronic Library (AISeL), 2005
Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Thiétard, R.-A. *et coll.* (1999), *Méthodes de Recherche en Management*, Paris, Dunod.

Webber, A.M. (2003), Will Companies Ever learn? *Fast Company*, http://www.fastcompany.com/learning/

Yin, R.K. (1994), *Case Study Research: Design and Methods*, Thousand Oaks, CA, Sage.

ANNEX A: GLOSSARY OF EWPM

A few definitions from the participant's manual:

"Early Warning: The process of collecting and analyzing information for the purpose of identifying and recommending strategic options for preventive measures prior to the outbreak of violent conflict." In this respect, early warning is different from conflict prevention and from peace keeping.

"Preventive measures are specific activities aimed at preventing violent conflict such as diplomatic initiatives, preventive military deployment, human rights monitoring, S-G good offices, etc."

ANNEX B: PRINCIPLES AND VALUES OF THE EWPM TRAINING

Source: (Korth & Garcia, 2003)

"A collective sense of the work to be done and the results achieved

All work to be done has its value

Providing mutual support

Believing in the project and in its potential for bringing about changes

A constant desire to learn and listen

Creativity and innovation

Caring for the human and interpersonal dimension of the learning process

Constant, flexible monitoring and adaptation

Transmitting enthusiasm and confidence in the proposed methodology

Visualizing, summarizing, simplifying and making abstract concepts practical

Always being reading and having an extremely well prepared organizational scheme

Facilitating, not pontificating

Adapting culturally to participants

Aiming to obtain clear results

Showing consistency and personal commitment to the essence of what is being transmitted

And remaining open and prepared for the unforeseen"

ANNEX C: LIST OF PRIMARY SOURCES

"Early Warning and Preventive Measures: Building UN Capacity" – Participant's Manual – United Nations Systems Staff College, 2004.

"Early Warning and Preventive Measures: Building UN Capacity" – Lead Facilitator and Trainer's Manual's Manual – United Nations Systems Staff College, 2004.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

"Early Warning and Preventive Measures: Building UN Capacity" – Pilot Distance Learning Course – United Nations Systems Staff College Web Site, 2004.

Emails messages between project team and participants, 2003-2004.

Report: "Feedback on First Module of EWPM Distance Learning Test", 2004.

UNSSC WEB Site / 2004 / http://www.unssc.org/web1/

EWPM Distance Learning Course/ UNSSC Web Site / 2004 (Restricted Access)

ANNEX D: THE STRUCTURE OF THE E-LEARNING COURSE

The structure of the EL course is as shown in the following picture:

What's this course?

Module 1 _ Situation Profile

Module 2 _ Survey of Conflict Causes

Module 3 _ Composite Analysis

Module 4 _ Preventive Measures Matrix

Module 5 _ Scenario Building

Glossary

EWPM Library

My OUTPUT Archive

ANNEX E: WORKSHOP AND E-LEARNING COURSES

WSx: Workshop Session number x (a traditional "teaching" session)

WGWx: Workshop Group Work number x

ELx E-Learning material number x

ELAEx E-Learning Application Exercise

How to read the following table:

Example: I WS 1 is the first Workshop Session of the Introduction activity block.

PAPM WGW 1 is the first Workshop Group Work of the PAPM activity block.

I EL 2 is the second document for the Introduction E-learning module

SP ELAE 1 is the first Application Exercise on the E-Learning SP module

Published by AIS Electronic Library (AISeL), 2005 17
Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Activity block	Content of the Workshop	Content of the EL module	
Introduction	I WS 1 I WS 2 I WS 3 I WS 4 I WS 5 I WGW 1 I WS 6 I WS 7 I WGW 2	I EL 1 I EL 2 I WS 4 I EL 3 I WS 7 I EL 4	
SP	SP WS 1 SP WGW 1 SP WGW 2	SP ELAE 1 SP ELAE 2 SP ELAE 3	Here, the EL let the participants go directly into the exercise, without previous definition of situation profiles
CC	CC WS 1 CC WS 2 CC WS 3 CC WGW 1 CC WGW 2	CC EL 1 CC EL 2 CC EL 3 CC ELAE 1	
CCDM	CCDM WS 1 CCDM WS 2 CCDM WS 3 CCDM WS 4 CCDM WS 5		No EL transfer of this part of the workshop
CAAA	CAAA WGW 1 CAAA WGW 2	CAAA ELAE 1 CAAA ELAE 2 CAAA ELAE 3 CAAA ELAE 4	
PAPM	PAPM WS 1 PAPM WS 2 PAPM WS 3 PAPM WS 4 PAPM WGW 1 PAPM WGW 2	PAPM EL 1 PAPM EL 2 PAPM ELAE 1	The EL modules asks for an PAPM ELAE, but this is not accessible in the module; maybe it was because of a temporary technical problem when the research was conducted.
SB	SB WS 1 SB WGW 1 SB WGW 2 SB WGW 3	SB EL 1 SB ELAE 1	The EL modules asks for an SB ELAE, but this is not accessible in the module; maybe it was because of a temporary technical problem when the research was conducted.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.