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This abstract is on an organization-focused topic.

Increasing competition and an information technology (IT) labor shortage have required management to consider human resources as a strategic necessity for IT departments. In an attempt to hire and retain IT professionals, managers will need to provide training that allows professionals to maintain a current skill mix as the industry continues to rapidly change. Because IT professionals are required to maintain a constantly changing mix of technology skills and “soft” skills (Cheney, Hale and Kaspar, 1990; Dwight, 1993; Lee, Trauth and Farwell, 1995; Leitheiser, 1992; Misic, 1996; Prabhaker, Litecky and Arnett, 1996), they require ongoing training efforts.

Assessing IT professionals’ need for training can be a difficult undertaking. Nelson, Whitener and Philcox (1995) demonstrated that a training needs assessment framework developed by Ostroff and Ford (1989) could be used effectively within an end-user training program. I would like to apply this framework to the training of IT professionals and examine how to practically implement one portion of the framework. This led me to the following research question: Is training with customized content (based on any deficiency in the desired KSA’s in IT professionals) just as effective and more efficient than training with general content?

Importance of Research

Sein, Bostrom and Olfman (1998) identified two research questions that still need to be addressed in IT training research. Their first research question: “What specific methods exist for assessing the training needs of different categories of trainees of IT-based tools?” Their second research question: “What are the most appropriate training methods for specific types of trainees and specific IT-tools?” Although considerable research exists that has examined the second question (Ahrens and Sankar, 1993; Bostrom, Davis and Bostrom, 1993; Davis and Davis, 1990; MacKay and Lamb, 1991; Olfman and Mandivivalla, 1994; Olfman and Sein, 1990; Santhanam and Sein, 1994; Simon, et al., 1996), I have found very little research based on the first question (Nelson, 1991; Nelson, Whitener and Philcox, 1995).

This research study will examine the first of these two questions using IT professionals as trainees. It will apply current theory on job performance evaluation to assessing the need for training among IT professionals.

Theory Base for Research

Ostroff and Ford (1989) proposed a training needs assessment framework (see Table 1) that examines training issues at three levels within an organization: individual, subunit and organizational. At each of these levels of analysis, there are three content areas for training. The authors propose that training needs assessment should consider issues within each of the cells in their framework.

Nelson, Whitener and Philcox (1995) performed a case study on an organization (the IRS) which utilized the Ostroff and Ford framework for setting up an end-user training program for a new IS. The case study indicated that the framework was effective for the training program; however, the authors did not explore individual portions of the framework, nor did they indicate how to implement the various sections. My dissertation would explore one portion of the framework (the Individual level of analysis) and provide empirical and theoretical justification for using it. The cells in the framework at the Individual level of analysis suggest that organizations should examine any knowledge and skill deficiencies in employees based on knowledge and skill requirements for tasks. Also, it is important for the organization to examine the contribution of individual goals, objectives and values to the overall organization.

Motowidlo, Borman and Schmit (1997) have proposed a model of job experience that fits the Individual level of analysis of the Ostroff and Ford framework (see Figure 1). Job experience is composed of two dimensions: task performance (activities that contribute to the organization’s core technical processes) and contextual performance (activities that maintain the “…broader organizational, social, and psychological environment in which the technical core must function”). Task performance appears to relate to the Task content area of the Ostroff and Ford framework, and contextual performance appears to relate to the Organizational
Cognitive ability in combination with learning experiences is proposed to impact primarily task performance through several mediating variables (task habits, skill and knowledge), while personality, again in combination with learning experiences, primarily impacts contextual performance through several mediating variables (contextual habits, skill and knowledge). There is also a secondary cross-over effect, with cognitive ability impacting contextual performance to some degree and personality impacting task performance to some degree.

Training tends to be delivered in standard packages. If the IT professional already possesses some of the KSA’s taught in the training sessions, the efficiency of standard training is lowered. On the other hand, the effectiveness of the training may depend on the entire training package being delivered to the trainee. This study will examine the impact of customized training on the effectiveness and efficiency of the training. In an era of customizing products for the consumer (Hibbard, 1998; Davey, 1998), it will become increasingly important for IT departments to target and customize training for their employees. As this occurs, our understanding of the process of customizing training will also become increasingly important.

Based on this model, I have proposed the following two hypotheses (stated in null form):

\[ H_1: \text{Customized training requires fewer resources (higher efficiency) than standard training.} \]

\[ H_2: \text{Customized training has at least the same level of effectiveness as standard training.} \]

Possible Research Approach or Methodology

This research study would conduct a laboratory experiment with two training groups: a control group and a treatment group. Both groups would have their task and contextual KSA’s measured before and after training. The control group would receive a standard training package. For the treatment group, training would be assigned to employees based on any KSA deficiencies. The effectiveness and efficiency of the training would be measured (both objective and subjective measures) and then compared.

Table 1. Training needs assessment framework.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Person</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Individual KSA’s, motivations and attitudes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subunit</td>
<td>Subunit skills and climate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational</td>
<td>Organizational skills and climate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Task</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Basic tasks performed or technology used by each individual in the organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Basic tasks performed or technology used by each subunit in the organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Basic tasks performed or technology used by all the people in the organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Organizational</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Individual goals, objectives and values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subunit goals, objectives and values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Organizational goals, objectives and values</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1. Model of job performance.
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