

INDIVIDUAL CHARACTERISTICS AND MANAGEMENT DEVELOPMENT

OUTCOMES: ROLE OF TOP MANAGEMENT

A Research dissertation submitted to  
Kathmandu University School of Management  
in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the  
Degree of Master of Philosophy (MPhil) in Management

Jyoti Pradhan

KU Registration Number: 003740-02

Kathmandu, Nepal

October, 2020

© Copyright Jyoti Pradhan, 2020

## DECLARATION

I hereby declare that this research work entitled *Individual Characteristics and Management Development Outcomes: Role of Top Management among Public Limited Organization in Nepal* embodies the result of an original research work I carried out in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Philosophy (MPhil) in Management of Kathmandu University and that this dissertation has not been submitted for candidature for any other degree.

.....  
yoti Pradhan

October, 2020



RECOMMENDATION

This is to certify that Ms. Jyoti Pradhan has completed her research work on Individual Characteristics and Management Development Outcomes: Role of Top Management under my supervision and that her research dissertation embodies the result of her investigation conducted during the period she worked as an M.Phil. candidate of the School of Management. The dissertation is of the standard expected of a candidate for the partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of M.Phil. in Management and has been prepared in the prescribed format of the School of Management. The dissertation is forwarded for evaluation.

Prof. Dr. Prem Raj Pant  
Research Dissertation Advisor  
Date:

Chair, Research Committee

Member, Research Committee

Member, Research Committee

Member, Research Committee

Internal Examiner

*[Faint signatures and stamps]*

October, 2020



### APPROVAL

We have conducted the viva-voce examination of the dissertation *Individual Characteristics and Management Development Outcomes: Role of Top Management* by Jyoti Pradhan and found the dissertation to be original work of the candidate and written according to the prescribed format of the School of Management. We approve the dissertation as the partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Philosophy (MPhil) in Management.

#### Evaluation Committee

1. Prof. Bijay K.C.

Chair, Research Committee

2. Prof. Binod K. Shrestha

Member, Research Committee

3. Prof. Devi Prasad Bedari

Member, Research Committee

4. Prof. Dr. Achyut Wagle

Member, Research Committee

5. Prof. Dr. Rita Shrestha

External Examiner

October, 2020

*Bijay K.C.*  
*Binod K. Shrestha*  
*Devi Prasad Bedari*  
*Achyut Wagle*  
*Rita Shrestha*

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First of all, I wish to extend my sincere gratitude to my supervisor Prof. Dr. Prem Raj Pant, for his continuous advice, guidance and support throughout my research process.

I would also like to extend my appreciation to Prof. Dev Prasad Bedari, Prof. Binod Krishna Shrestha and Associate Professor Jyoti Regmi for their continuous guidance and advise to improve my research work. This study would not have been completed without the cooperation of KUSOM faculties and staff.

I thank all my friends, especially Mr. Dinesh Basnet for his guidance and support in my research work, Ms. Kabita Gurung, Mr. Ganga Thapa and Mr. Ramesh Ghimire for their encouragement.

My special thanks goes to my husband, Bikram Dhoj Shahi, parents, father in-law, family and my son, Brihat, for his understanding and support by all means.

Jyoti Pradhan

October 2020

## ABSTRACT

The importance of management development to the organization has been well recognized by studies. However, the effect of individual characteristics and organizational variables on management development outcomes in public limited organization has not been explored in Nepali context. The purpose of this study is to explore the relationship among individual characteristics: self-efficacy for development, learning goal orientation and proactive personality and management development outcomes (job satisfaction, affective commitment, innovative behavior and critical opinion sharing) and top management support as the moderating variable. The data was collected from 204 managers and officers working in public organization through survey and analyzed with regression.

The findings reveal that individual characteristics i.e. self-efficacy and proactive personality is positively and significantly associated with management development outcomes (job satisfaction, affective commitment, innovative behavior and critical opinion sharing), whereas learning goal orientation was not supported. Moreover, top management support was found to act as a moderator in critical opinion sharing only; self-efficacy, proactive personality with job satisfaction, affective commitment and innovative behavior was not moderated by top management support.

This study provides empirical evidence to researchers to explore different interactive effects to understand the positive outcomes of management development. Moreover, this study identifies self-efficacy and proactive personality as the most important factors to enhance the positive outcomes which could help to enhance the capacity of the managers to achieve individual and organizational performance.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	i
ABSTRACT.....	ii
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	iii
LIST OF TABLES.....	vi
ABBREVIATIONS.....	viii
CHAPTER I.....	1
INTRODUCTION.....	1
General Background.....	1
Statement of the Problem.....	8
Objectives of the Study.....	11
Significance of the Study.....	11
CHAPTER II.....	14
REVIEW OF LITERATURE.....	14
Management Development.....	14
Outcomes of Management Development.....	19
Job Satisfaction.....	20
Affective Commitment.....	21
Innovative Behavior.....	22
Critical Opinion Sharing Behavior.....	23
Individual Characteristics.....	23
Self-Efficacy for Development.....	23
Learning Goal Orientation.....	24
Proactive Personality.....	25

Top Management Support .....	27
Management Development Approaches.....	28
CHAPTER III .....	31
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY .....	31
Research Design .....	31
Research Hypotheses.....	32
Variables and their Operationalization.....	34
Unit of Analysis.....	35
Population and Sample Design.....	36
Demographic .....	38
Research Procedure .....	40
Pre-test.....	40
Administration of the Questionnaire .....	40
Data Processing .....	41
Data Analysis .....	41
Hypothesis Testing.....	43
CHAPTER IV .....	44
RESULTS .....	44
Descriptive Analysis .....	44
Reliability Analysis.....	45
Comparison among Different Groups .....	47
Effect of Position on Study Variables.....	50
Effect of Year of Experience on Study Variables.....	52
Effect of Qualification on Study Variables.....	54
Effect of Age on Study Variables .....	56

Nature and strength of Relationship among the Study Variables .....	58
Direct Effects of Predictor and Moderating Variables.....	60
Assessment of Moderating Effects.....	65
Summary of Hypothesis Testing .....	71
CHAPTER V .....	72
SUMMARY, DISCUSSION, AND IMPLICATIONS .....	72
Summary of Findings .....	72
Discussion .....	74
Research Question.....	74
Self-Efficacy for Development .....	75
Learning Goal Orientation .....	76
Proactive Personality.....	77
Top Management Support.....	77
Implications of the Study .....	78
Research Implications .....	79
Critique of the Study .....	80
REFERENCES .....	82
Appendix I Questionnaire .....	91
Appendix II .....	97

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 3.1 Name of Public Organizations.....	38
Table 3.2 Questionnaire Response Rate (N=204) .....	38
Table 4.1 Respondent Characteristics (N=204).....	45
Table 4.2 Values of Cronbach Alpha for Different Instruments .....	46
Table 4.3 Descriptive Statistics of Study Variable (N=204) .....	47
Table 4.4 Group Statistics: Gender .....	48
Table 4.5 .....	49
Independent t-test between Male and Female Employees.....	49
Table 4.6 Descriptive Statistics: Position .....	51
Table 4.7 Descriptive Statistics: Year of Experience .....	53
Table 4.8 Descriptive Statistics: Qualification .....	55
Table 4.9 Descriptive statistics: Age .....	57
Table 4.10 One way ANOVA among Position, Year of Experience, Age and Qualification .....	58
Table 4.11 Correlation Coefficients between different study variables .....	59
Table 4.12 Effect of Self efficacy on Management Development Outcomes .....	61
Table 4.13 Effect of Proactive Personality on Management Development Outcomes	62
Table 4.14 Effect of Learning goal orientation on Management Development Outcomes .....	63
Table 4.15 Effect of Top Management Support on Management Development Outcomes .....	64
Table 4.16 Hierarchical Regression Analysis: Top Management(TM) Moderating Self Efficacy (SE) - Affective Commitment (Aff Comm) Relationship.....	65

Table 4.17 Hierarchical Regression Analysis: Top Management(TM) Moderating Self Efficacy (SE)–Innovative Behavior (IN) Relationship.....	66
Table 4.18 Hierarchical Regression Analysis: Top Management(TM) Moderating Self Efficacy (SE)–Critical Opinion Sharing (CS) Relationship .....	66
Table 4.19 Hierarchical Regression Analysis: Top Management(TM) Moderating Self Efficacy (SE)–Job satisfaction (JS) Relationship .....	67
Table 4.20 Hierarchical Regression Analysis: Top Management(TM) Moderating Proactive Personality (PP) - Affective Commitment (Aff Comm) Relationship .....	68
Table 4.21 Hierarchical Regression Analysis: Top Management(TM) Moderating Proactive Personality (PP)–Innovative Behavior (IN) Relationship .....	69
Table 4.22 Hierarchical Regression Analysis: Top Management(TM) Moderating Proactive Personality (PP)–Critical Opinion Sharing (CS) Relationship .....	69
Table 4.23 Hierarchical Regression Analysis: Top Management(TM) Moderating Proactive Personality (PP)–Job satisfaction (JS) Relationship.....	70
Table 4.24 Summary of Hypothesis Testing Results.....	71

## ABBREVIATIONS

MD	Management Development
SE	Self Efficacy
LGO	Learning Goal Orientation
PP	Proactive Personality
JS	Job Satisfaction
AffComm	Affective Commitment
IN	Innovative Behavior
CS	Critical Opinion Sharing
ANOVA	Analysis of Variance
SPSS	Statistical Package for Social Science

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

#### **General Background**

Research on management development (MD) outcomes continues to be one of the most prevalent in management development literature. Extensive research into the effectiveness of management training and development has been done using several techniques (Powell & Yalcin, 2008). Despite the number of techniques to evaluate the outcomes, this study has selected two MD outcomes: Affect and behavior outcomes as mentioned by Ards et al. (2010) in their study. The Affect outcome is measured by job satisfaction and affective commitment and Behavior outcomes are measured by innovative behavior and critical opinion sharing. Different studies have demonstrated a significant relationship between individual characteristics and management development outcomes i.e., job satisfaction, affective commitment, innovative behavior, and critical opinion sharing.

The outcomes variable job satisfaction is one of the most studied variables in industrial and organizational psychology (Spector et al., 1997 as cited in Pool & Pool, 2007). Job satisfaction is an attitude formed by individuals towards one's jobs. It results from the one's perception towards the jobs and the extent to which there is a fit between the individual and the organization (Pool & Pool, 2007). Various reasons create job satisfaction among employees, studies in Nepali organizations have revealed salaries, training, and development opportunities and career development is the reason for job satisfaction (Neupane, 2019; Gautam, 2016). However, there are various reasons for not been satisfied with the job. The significant factors for not being satisfied are job stress, lack of communication, lack of recognition, limited opportunity for growth, poor leadership approaches, and unfavorable management

practices (Alam, 2015). In contrast, according to the dispositional job satisfaction model, certain person characteristics influence the job satisfaction independently of the job characteristics and situation (Franěk & Večeřa, 2008). Further, according to Judge et al. (1998) core self-evaluations which consist of self-esteem, general self-efficacy, locus of control, and neuroticism also determine one's disposition towards job satisfaction. Because job satisfaction is determined by individual factors as well, this factor is included as an outcome measure.

Another important management development outcome is organizational commitment which receives significant importance in research studies (Pool & Pool 2007). Affective commitment refers "to employees' emotional attachment to, identification with and involvement in, the organization" (Allen & Meyer, 1990, p 2). It takes place "when employees are happy to be members of an organization, believe in and feel good about the organization and what it stands for, are attached to the organization and intend to do what is good for it" (George & Jones, 2008, as cited in Wierenga, 2010). More specifically, affective commitment plays a major role in management development outcomes.

In today's competitive business environment innovation and creativity have become vital competence for manager performance. Innovative behavior enables employees to "explore opportunities, identify performance gaps or produce solutions for problems (De Jong & Hartog, 2007, as cited in Ahmad, 2010). Critical opinion-sharing is "one of the observable activities caused by reflection. One expresses the result of reflection by expressing one's opinion, asking critical questions, or suggesting improvements" (Woerkom & Croon, 2004, p. 8). Study on critical opinion sharing reflects how employee shares his learning with peers and supervisor for positive work outcomes (Ards et al., 2010). Innovation is possible when there is

sufficient information, fund, tools and equipment, and professional advice. A study in the Nepali bank indicated that bank employees feel they are free to express their ideas to their boss and a lot of freedom in the company (Maharjan, 2016). However, innovative behavior and critical opinion sharing behaviors are the factors that influenced by the attitudinal and personality of an employee. But in Nepali organization employee does not seem to suggest improvement plan and put their disagreements to their managers. This has come out from the anecdotal comments from the banking professionals.

The outcome variables such as job satisfaction, affective commitment, innovative behavior, and critical opinion sharing are not only influenced by environmental and organizational but also by individual attitudinal factors, thus these variables are included as an outcomes measure.

In this study, the individual characteristics are examined as the predictor of management development outcomes. The three individual characteristics that have been examined are variables that are frequently measured and have influenced learning-related behavior. And it is also related to attitudinal and behavioral aspects. The variables are self-efficacy for development (Bandura, 1994), learning goal orientation, and proactive personality.

Self-efficacy has been receiving growing attention in the organizational behavior literature (Gist, 1987; Gist & Mitchell, 1992). Studies on self-efficacy for development have indicated that individuals with high levels of self-efficacy are more likely to choose to participate in challenging assignments, are positive in their learning attitudes, and take responsibility for personal development than individuals with low levels of self-efficacy (Bandura, 1982; Bandura & Schunk, 1981). Self-efficacy beliefs determine how people feel, think, motivate themselves, and behave.

Empirical evidence on self-efficacy has found a positive and significant relationship with job satisfaction and affective commitment (Alam, 2015). On the other hand, a study in five Dutch companies with 223 managers revealed that self-efficacy is not related to job satisfaction (Ardts et al., 2010). Lent and Hackett (1987) argue that the higher the self-efficacy, the higher the organizational commitment because people have more confidence to pursue career challenges (as cited in Fang, 2001). On the contradiction, a study done by Fang (2001) among 177 hospitality employees at four hospitality companies found that self-efficacy is not a significant predictor of organizational commitment. This shows that there is no consistency in the finding of self-efficacy with job satisfaction and commitment.

Self-efficacy is also positively related to innovative behaviors (Momeni et al., 2014). On the opposite, a study among 453 managerial level employees in Dutch companies, revealed that self-efficacy is not related to innovative behavior (Ardts et al., 2010). This shows that inconsistency in the finding concerning innovative behavior. Hence it can be inferred that self-efficacy belief is not always related to creating positive outcomes.

Learning goal orientation has been receiving increasing attention in organizational settings (Brett & Vandewalle, 1999). Those who emphasize learning goals should have more positive attitudes toward learning and invest more in learning and development activities. Therefore, it was expected that an individual emphasis on learning goals would be positively related to employee attitudes and involvement in development activities. A study conducted by Sazandrishvili (2009) revealed that learning goal orientation appeared to be strongly related to innovative behavior. The individuals with learning goal orientation perceive their skills can be improved through their efforts and create and implement useful ideas as one of the sources of

their self-development and competence (VandeWalle & Cummings, 1997; Sazandrishvili, 2009). Empirical evidence reveals that individuals with learning goal orientation are strongly committed to their organization (Lee et al., 2009; Wierenga, 2010). Learning goal-oriented individuals emphasize increasing their competence and skills in a supportive environment and develop a greater commitment towards organizations that support learning and development. It further states that individuals with affective commitment are also satisfied with their jobs (Lee et al., 2010).

Proactive personality is another individual characteristic which is positively associated with positive and beneficial outcomes, it not only improves performance and leads career success (e.g., Seibert et al., 1999; Seibert et al., 2001; Thompson, 2005) but also creates satisfaction and well-being (e.g., Erdogan & Bauer, 2005; Greguras & Diefendorff, 2010). Prior research has found that proactive personality is positively and significantly related to job satisfaction; it is believed that proactive individuals tend to create conditions that are conducive to personal success at work (Li et al., 2010). According to Erdogan and Bauer (2005), proactive individuals were more satisfied with their jobs because they remove obstacles preventing satisfaction. Proactive personality is also strongly related to affective commitment. Employees with proactive personalities are more likely to get involved in the organization thus creating positive work and affective commitment (Gudermann, 2010). Further, empirical evidence also shows that proactive personality influences innovative behavior in employees (Arbeits et al., 2010; Ahmad, 2009). More, study conduct among teachers has also found that proactive personality is positively associated with innovative behavior (Li et al., 2016). Hence, it can be said that a proactive personality does have positive effects on job satisfaction, affective commitment, and innovative behavior.

The studies show that individual characteristics are related to positive outcomes while some studies show the contradict result. However, the study concentrates on individual characteristics of self-efficacy for development, learning goal orientation, and proactive personality with the belief that these variables are essential for positive management development outcomes.

In this study, top management is expected to moderate the relationship between individual characteristics and management development outcomes. Top management support is necessary for management development to yield desired outcomes (Chiaburu & Marinova, 2005). As the top management, they are responsible for developing strategies, allocating budgets, implementing interventions (Lee et al., 2017). Margeison (1991) asserts that no development program will succeed if not supported by senior or middle management.

One of the studies done in Australia found that in case top management and line manager are supportive then employees take the MD seriously (D'Netto et al., 2008). Employee utilizes the learned skills when there is a support of top management (Dastgeer & Rehman, 2012). Empirical studies reveal that top management plays a significant role in enhancing employee's job satisfaction and commitment (Lee et al., 2017). At the same time, a study shows that top management support affects innovation in the organization. Top management provides a supportive organization climate, provides the necessary infrastructure to support innovation, provides learning and development environments, providing financial support for training programs, and promoting teamwork (Shaar et al., 2015). Hence, the role of top management is crucial in creating positive outcomes.

Further, there is a significant increase in investment in developing managers over the years. For example, statistics shows on average a European company spends

three percent of payroll on management development (Garavan et al., 1999). In 2010, US Corporation used to spend 27 percent of their training budgets to provide management development with 22 percent addition to executive development. And the formal training for managers and executives was \$ 26 billion (Werner & DeSimone, 2011) whereas, in 2019, US organization training expenses including payroll and spending on external products and services was \$ 83 billion (Freifeld, 2019). Similarly, 8 percent of US organizations spend more than \$10,000 per year per person on leadership development, 6 percent spend between \$7,000 and \$10,000 (CLO, 2017). Companies in the United Kingdom spend an average of £1068 per employee on learning and development (Ngure & Juma, 2018). This shows that top management is investing heavily in developing the competencies of their manager for better organizational performance, thus it expects that return on investment, however, the study has found that organizations rarely evaluate the effectiveness of the development programs (Digman, 1980; Adam & Waddle, 2002).

Based on the importance of the role played by the top management in development intervention and positive outcomes it is believed that top management support moderates the relationship between the individual characteristics and management development outcomes.

Empirical research on management development has found that an effective program results in low stress due to lack of skills, high level of job satisfaction, low rate of turnover, and less difficulty in filling executive vacancies (Jansen & Velde, 2001). It also enhances performance (Mabey & Ramirez, 2005) and creates a positive work attitude, increases the level of commitment (Cao & Hamori, 2016) improves morale, motivates, and creates a perception that the organization is a good place to work (Cunningham, 2012).

In the context of Nepal, organizations have realized the need to develop employees for better performance of both employee and organization. But they are focused on training and development, especially on functional and technical training. The public organization especially banks and government-funded organizations are investing in employee development. The banking sector is also spending a significant amount for employee development as Nepal Rastra Bank has formulated a directive that Banks and Financial Institutions to invest 3% of the preceding year's staff expenses on training annually (Nabil bank, 2019). It has been found that banks are providing in-house, external, international, foreign visit programs that provide higher education opportunities both in and out of the country for its staff (Gnawali, 2018). And some organizations have their training center for its employee. Despite such an investment for developing employees, the results on training and developments are not as expected (Pokhrel, 2016). Hence, the focus of the study is to investigate the factors affecting positive outcomes in public organizations and accordingly develop strategies to enhance positive outcomes. As empirical studies on individual characteristics associated with MD outcomes are very limited and rare.

Thus, it becomes important to systematically analyze the phenomena to understand the factors associated with positive management development outcomes. Furthermore, the study also examines the moderating role of top management support to further develop the policies and strategies for positive outcomes from management development programs.

### **Statement of the Problem**

This study is focused on the factors associated that are expected to enhance positive management development outcomes in Nepali public limited organizations.

The variables are related to individual characteristics as an individual factor with the level of outcomes and the role of top management as an organizational factor.

Empirical research on MD effectiveness is very limited in developed and developing countries (Akuratiyagamage, 2006; Jansen & Velde, 2001). Furthermore, evaluating the effectiveness of MD is considered complicated (Smith, 2012). The problem is difficulty in quantifying the effects, the cost of evaluation studies outweighs the value of benefits achieved.

In Nepal, there is a lack of management development policies and programs in Nepali organizations. Even though some public organizations provide management development program to some of its employees, well-planned programs targeted towards the manager and potential managers are very limited. Even study indicates that 4 out of 10 senior managers fails at their job within 18 months (Ellis, 2003), and one possible explanation could be that a considerable number of managers find themselves in senior positions because they are adept at financial and operational procedures but do not yet possess the wider range of management skills (Martin, 2002). In conversation with the HR manager, it revealed that banks have been sending employees to participate the employee in the management development program conducted by Nepal Administrative Staff College (NASC), Management Association of Nepal (MAN), and Nepal Banking Institute (NBI) but evaluation on the outcome is hardly conducted.

Most of the prior research on MD is focused on the MD methods and its effectiveness (Ardts et al., 2010). So, there is a need to understand the effect on MD outcomes from individual and organizational aspects. Similarly, Viitala (2008) has suggested a need for further explanatory research to understand why certain MD-methods are applied within organizations, and what kind of individual and

organizational factors explain variations in their perceived effectiveness. Moreover, Ardts et al. (2010) have indicated that some management development outcomes are influenced by personal characteristics rather than by management development characteristics in their study. Hence, this research seeks to identify individual characteristics that influence positive outcomes. There are few studies on individual characteristics and behavior impact on management development outcomes or effectiveness. One of the studies conducted by Ardts et al. (2010) highlighted on MD characteristics influence management development outcomes while person characteristics (self-efficacy, learning goal orientation, and proactive personality) were considered as control variables. Another study focuses on the individual characteristics (self-efficacy, learning goal orientation, and feedback-seeking) and management development outcome (Wierenga, 2010). Ahmad (2009) in his study has considered MD characteristics as an independent variable and innovative behavior as the dependent variable and proactive personality was considered as a moderating variable. This shows that there are limited studies on individual factors affecting management development outcomes.

In the context of Nepali public organizations, the factors associated with management development outcomes and factors that affect their relationship must be systematically analyzed as there has been no such prior study that helps to draw an insight into this phenomenon. As there is rare study conducted in the Nepali context, this limited the policymakers and management to develop, design, and implement MD intervention in Nepali organizations.

Based on the importance of management development outcomes and the role of individual characteristics in enhancing the positive outcomes, the study is focused on perceived individual characteristics such as self-efficacy for development, learning

goal orientation, and proactive personality as factors responsible for positive management development outcomes. Furthermore, the study examines and also to understand whether top management support influences the relationship. So, the basic question of the study was.

*In what ways individual characteristics affect management development outcomes in Public limited organizations of Nepal and do top management support moderates the relationship?*

### **Objectives of the Study**

Considering the statement of the problem mentioned above, the main aim of the study is to find out the factors that are associated with Management Development outcome in public organizations in Nepal, by relating personal characteristics with the outcomes and assessing the effect of organizational support on the relationship.

More specifically, the aim is:

1. To examine the effect of individual characteristics on management development outcomes among managers and officers in the Nepali public limited organizations.
2. To examine the moderating role of top management support on the relationship between individual characteristics and management development outcomes.

### **Significance of the Study**

The study tries to fill the partial research gap on the present understanding of the level of management development outcomes in the public organization of Nepal.

MD is not a new concept in Nepal, but the study and implementation and evaluation of MD are rare and insufficient. Evaluation of programs is important as it will know how it has contributed to enhancing the skills and knowledge. But

effectiveness research is rare and insufficient. The study provides in-depth knowledge of the area. This study attempts to provide significant information to the organization's stakeholders on the need for MDP and helps in formulating policies and strategies.

Most of the research on MD are based on the MD method and its effectiveness. But this study tried to understand the effectiveness of MD through individual and environmental factors. The study provides a new direction for the organization and future research.

Organizations invest in training and development programs to enhance the productivity of the employee for the ultimate productivity of the organization (Khan et al., 2015). The study helps to identify the factors that enhance MD effectiveness in the context of Nepal.

### **Organization of the Report**

The study consists of five chapters. The first chapter briefly introduces the theme of the study, context, and domain of the study. It consists of an introduction, statement of the problem, objectives of the study, and organization of the report.

The second chapter consists of a review of both theory and empirical literature on management development concept, context, methods, individual characteristics, and management development outcomes. The relevant literature gave an in-depth understanding of the concept and evidence to develop the construct for the study and to formulate the conceptual framework.

The third chapter details the methodology; it consists of research design, procedure, research hypothesis, variables, unit of analysis used to carry out the study. It also incorporates the population, sampling, data collection procedure, data analysis tools, and procedures.

The fourth chapter details the statistical analysis results of the study. It has covered the result of demographic analysis; descriptive statistics and necessary analysis along with regression analysis are carried out to test the hypothesis, and the results are presented.

Finally, the last chapter presents the summary, discussion, implication for practice, and critique of the study. The discussion is based on the analysis done concerning extant literature.

## CHAPTER II

### REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The chapter focuses on the theoretical literature and empirical evidence relevant to the relationship on personal characteristics of trainees such as self-efficacy for development, learning goal orientation, and proactive personality and management development effectiveness. First, the concept of management development was reviewed followed by theories and prior research on management development effectiveness. Finally, based on empirical and theoretical evidence, a conceptual framework was designed to analyze the research work.

#### **Management Development**

Management development is one of the popular tools of Human Resource Development (Werner & DeSimone, 2011). The complex and turbulent business environment requires managers who are adaptive, flexible, high quality and can lead the organization from a strategic perspective (Garavan et al., 1999) and helps to survive (Wexley & Baldwin, 1986). The need for survival can only be done through human differentiation and this made the organization adopt and invest in management development for its employee so that individuals can learn, grow, and improve their skills, abilities, and competencies and perform effectively and efficiently (Wexley & Baldwin, 1986). Thus, management development is a means to an end helping organizations attain their short and long terms goals (Reitsma, 2001).

In recent years organizations globally are emphasizing the importance and need of MD and research on MD are also growing in numbers, despite all the efforts, scholars still consider "management development as an ambiguous concept attracting multiple and often conflicting definitions and conveying different things to different

people both in the literature and organization" (Lees, 1992, as cited Garavan, data). Cullen and Turnbull (2005) agree that although MD is still growing the definition is "disorganized and inchoate" and defined in many ways and most misunderstood and poorly implemented (Wright & Belcourt, 1994). However, Turnbull and Cullen (2005) view it as a "multi-vocal and theoretically pluralistic" as MD is derived from multi-discipline that tries to understand the process of learning, methods, and perceived impact on the organizational and individual context. Moreover, Garavan, Barnicle, and O' Suilleabhain (1999) state conceptualization of the term depends upon the context and the objectives.

The definition of MD is the board (Paauwe & Williams, 2001) and varies depending upon the strategic emphasis of the organization (Brown, 2003). Literature shows that the MD definition was either based on organizational development or personal development but at present, it is an integration of both OD and PD (Jansen, Velde et.al, 2001). According to Garavan, Barnicle, & O'Suilleabhain (1999) traditional definition of MD stress on "conscious intent feature, emphasizing the formal, planned and deliberate aspects of the management development process whereas the present management development focus is more generic, encompassing both education and training, formal and informal process." For Mumford and Gold (2004) management development is as "an attempt to improve managerial effectiveness through a learning process", whereas Swanson and Holton (2001, p 52) define it as "any education or development activity specifically designed to foster the professional growth and capability of persons in or prepared for management and executive roles in the organization." However, MD is a holistic, systematic, and long-term process seeking to have the right manager at the right time (Jansen & Velde, 2001). And for effective implementation of MD according to Werner and DeSimone

(2011), it should be organizational specific, the goals should be developed individually within its context for effective results, linked to the strategy of the organization, an organization should have a planned program and it should provide opportunities for its employee to learn to grow and change.

Most of the definition of MD states that MD is a systematic process through which manager skills and abilities are developed to manage and attain the objectives of the organization. It aims to create a learning organization and continuously engaged in developing, preparing, and improving managers for the present as well as future responsibilities so that ultimately it can have a positive impact on organization performance and productivity.

Management Development started with the need to fulfill the vacant position with the well-developed manager for the organization and over the years it has grown and become one of the integral parts of organizational objectives. After the World Wars, with the growing number of companies, the need for top managers increased but due to the acute problem of the skilled manager for top management, organizations started to give formal training to employees to fill these positions. During these eras, MD was a tool for succession planning and the employee was trained just to fill the vacant positions (Lagat & Makau, 2018). During the 60s and 70s with the expansion of companies and industries, the interest in MD also increased and managers were given specialized training to take the position (Vloeberghs, 1998). More attention on MD increased in the late 70s and 80s with large and mid-sized organizations started to take interest in MD to develop their managerial capabilities and MD policy began to form. However, in the 90s the economic developments also enlarge the domain of MD, and it was considered as an integrated approach for the development of individual careers (Vloeberghs, 1998). Moreover, the focus on MD

differs the Americans emphasized “performance outcome paradigms” where individuals were developed for organization performance whereas the British focused on learning and development paradigm giving more importance to training and development (Lagat & Makau, 2018). Vloeberghs (1998) highlights that literature on MD “lack of coherence and agreement”. MD can mean different in different organizations and can be according to managerial and organizational needs.

The organization adopts MD for positive outcomes, and the reason for adoption differs. According to Velde and Mul (2001), organization adoption of MD strategy depends upon the degree to which its emphasis on organizational development or personal development.

Organizations are giving high priority to an effective MD as it yields positive outcomes and benefits organizations (Meldrum & Atkinson, 1998). Although the investment in MD is increasing, the results of the development do not appear, to make it result-oriented according to Kyle's organization requires a great deal of planning, participation of senior management, and must have a clear understanding of its management philosophy (Kyle, 1986). Scholar proposed that for result-oriented outcomes, MD intervention includes three steps: need assessment, MD program design, and implementation and evaluation of the program (Desimone et al., 2002).

Past research shows the prevalence of benefits of effective, MD. An effective MD results to improve productivity and performance. And the study of organizational productivity of six European country firms has resulted, size of the organizations, and line manager's perception of the importance of MD is significantly related to firm productivity (Mabey & Ramirez, 2005). Not only this but MD also lower absenteeism, better customer services, job satisfaction, lower turnover, better career management, prepare the employee for greater responsibilities, improve morale and

motivation. It also help managers to increase the level of commitment towards the organization and help to boost the perceptions of the organization as a good place to work (D'Netto et al. 2008; Dastgeer & Rehman, 2012).

Even studies about the perception of management development in UK organizations found that a significant number of employees felt that the provision of management development in their organization is poor or below average, and there is a poor link between the management development and the need of business. However, they believe that MD can help them in their current role and prepare them for greater responsibilities, help organizations grow and adjust to changing environments and business circumstances, and support manage their career (Meldrum & Atkinson, 1998). Another study conducted among Indonesian managers of the Telecommunication sector found that there is no significant relationship between MDP methods and individual performance. Giving the reason it states that the focus of the MD program was not aligned with the goal of the organization and that the measurement unit used to evaluate the factors are different (Nuraini et al., 2015).

Positive benefits are yield only when the knowledge, skills, and attitudes learned are fully transferred to job-related activities (Aguinis & Kraiger, 2009). Baldwin and Ford's (1980) model stressed that trainee characteristics, trainee design, and work environment are important for impact on training output and transfer, adding to these factors Aguinis and Kraiger (2009) emphasized that interpersonal factor such as supervisor and peer support and transfer climate are a vital factor in the transfer. According to Jansen, Velde, and Mul (2001), there is little insight into the effectiveness and cost, and benefit of MD.

### Outcomes of Management Development

Management development is effective “if managers feel that it contributes to their ability to perform successfully in their management roles” (Luoma, 2005). Scholars suggest that there is a variety of models to measure the outcomes of the development efforts. For example, Kirkpatrick evaluation model of four-level – reaction, learning, transfer, and results (cited in Ardts et al., 2010). Holton's and Collin's (2004) learning level outcome and performance level outcomes. However, Ardts et al. (2010) argue that the different model has different outcomes such as attitude towards work, learned skills, acquired knowledge, perceived utility of what is been learned and performance result. The study done by Ardts et al. (2010) has considered four outcomes to understand the effectiveness are: affect, behavior, utility, and performance. It further clarifies that reaction outcome is related to satisfaction with the development program, learning outcome tells how much is learned, behavior outcomes tell a change in job-related behaviors or individual performance, and result outcomes tell the utility of the program of the organization.

Another model developed by D'Netto et al. (2008) also tried to understand the predictor that influences the management development effective, and it has also examined the strength of the relationships within the factors. Scholars emphasize there is not a comprehensive model to understand the effectiveness fully (D'Netto et al., 2008; Luoma, 2005).

The study focused on the outcomes based on affect, utility, and behavior as developed by Ardts et al. (2010) however among the four outcomes only two outcomes are considered for this study that is Affect and Behavior. The affect outcome is measured by job satisfaction, affective commitment, and behavior outcomes are measured through innovative behavior and critical sharing behavior.

## Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction is the most widely studied variables in industrial and organizational psychology, job satisfaction is defined as a “pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from an appraisal of one’s job or job experiences” (Locke, 1976, p. 1300). Job satisfaction is an attitude an individual forms in context to the job. It is the extent to which an employee enjoys one's job and “the degree to which there is a good fit between the individual and the organization” (Pool & Pool, 2007). Scholars and empirical evidence have indicated that job satisfaction influences numerous work-related outcomes such as organizational commitment, job performance, and staff turnover intention (Pool & Pool, 2007; Lee et al., 2017).

Prior studies indicate that job satisfaction is influenced by constant learning opportunities as well as strategic leadership in learning (Dirani, 2009, as cited in Lee et al., 2017). Job satisfaction and organizational commitments are the major determinants of organizational performance (Riketta, 2002) and effectiveness (Laschinger, 2001). An employee with high job satisfaction leads to have low undesirable organizational outcomes such as turnover, intention to leave. MD programs have a positive impact on job satisfaction when designed properly. Studies have found that development activities have a positive and significant relationship with job satisfaction (Anwar& Shukur, 2015). High-quality training according to Tai (2006) will lead to higher job satisfaction, which ultimately effect on organizational performance (Sahinidis & Bouris, 2007). Studies reveal that self-efficacy has a significant impact on job satisfaction. An employee with a high level of self-efficacy has confidence in his ability and performs hard to achieve the task and success in the task gives them job satisfaction (Randawa, 2003). However, studies on individual characteristics (self-efficacy for development, learning goal orientation,

and feedback) on Job satisfaction as MD effectiveness have found a negative relationship (Ards et al., 2010). The construct is included in the study to understand whether participation in management development programs helps create job satisfaction among the participants.

### **Affective Commitment**

Affective commitment “refers to the employee's emotional attachment to, identification with, and involvement in the organization” (Meyer & Allen, 1991, p. 67). An employee with strong affective commitment remains in the organization because they want to (Allen & Myer, 1990). Managers who are more satisfied with employee development practices are more committed to the organization (Tansky & Cohen, 2001; Hamori & Cao, 2016). Empirical evidence has proven that Affective commitment is related to negative turnover, low absenteeism, and enhances organizational commitment behavior (Mercurio, 2015). Empirical research adopting a social exchange theory shows that development opportunities and perceived investment into employee development helps boost perception of organizational commitment and unsupportive organizational culture (Brown & McCracken, 2009). A study conducted across sixty countries in a variety of industries about Development assignment (consisting of coaching, mentoring, training, and support from the direct supervisor and senior management) has shown that development assignments are the stronger driver for organizational commitment along with support from senior management (Hamori & Cao, 2016). Another study on individual characteristics effects on MD outcomes has shown that learning goal orientation is significantly and positively related to both affective commitments (Wierenga, 2010).

Birdi et al. (1997) study found that job satisfaction and organizational commitment are high among an employee who had previously taken part in

development activities. This shows those employees who are active hold a more positive work attitude and are committed. Considering these aspects affective commitment is taken as a management development outcome for the study.

### **Innovative Behavior**

Innovation is considered as important for the survival of an organization in this dynamic environment. Innovative behavior is defined as "intentional generation, promotion and realization of new ideas within a work role, group and organization" (Scott & Bruce, 1994). According to DeJong and Hartog (2007), innovative behavior initiates individual "to explore opportunities, identify performance gaps, or produce solutions for problems". Innovative employees are more focused on finding a solution, engaged in developing and implementing new ideas (Seibert et al., 2001). Here, for this study, innovation is defined "as a change in the process which begins with idea generation and culminates in the successful implementation of the idea within the organization" (Ahmad, 2010).

A study in Netherlands's bank found that the availability of training, self-development, career opportunities, and intergenerational teams predicts innovative behavior and suggests that when an employee is provided with the development opportunities, they display an increasing amount of innovative behavior (Slagter, 2009). Evidence shows that training, induction, team working, appraisal and exploratory learning focus stimulate innovation (Shipton et al., 2006; Edralin, 2007).

From behavior aspect studies have found that proactive personality has a positive and significant relationship with innovative behavior and at the same time, WD characteristics (availability of role model) positively influence innovative behavior (Ahmad, 2009; Ardts et al., 2010; Seibert et al., 2001).

### **Critical Opinion Sharing Behavior**

Critical opinion-sharing refers to an examination of social and political “taken-for-granted” (Reynolds, 1998) in the organization. According to Woerkom and Croon (2004), Critical opinion-sharing is “one of the observable activities caused by reflection. One expresses the result of reflection by expressing one’s opinion, asking critical questions, or suggesting improvements.” Woerkom (2003) states employee with critical opinion-sharing share the outcomes and learning processes with others, which ultimately cause the organization to learn and to work more effectively. Prior research has revealed critical opinion sharing is positively related to proactive personality (Ardts et al., 2010). Study on critical opinion sharing reflects how employee shares his learning with peers and supervisor for positive work outcomes.

### **Individual Characteristics**

Individual characteristics refer to the personal attitudes and behaviors inherent to the individual. The variables are related to learning behavior and are frequently used in behavioral research. Self-efficacy for development, learning goal orientation, and proactive personality are included in the present study to characterize the participants.

### **Self-Efficacy for Development**

Self-efficacy as defined by Bandura (1977) according to Social learning Theory is “an employees’ belief that they can cope with challenging situations.” An employee with high self-efficacy is related to a high level of task performance; the use of new technology takes challenging assignments and takes responsibility for personal development (Bandura 1982; Bandura & Hunk, 1981). For the present study, self-efficacy for development is examined. Maurer and Tarulli (1994) define “relative self-

efficacy for development as one's belief that he/she is capable to learn at a level at or above the average when participating in development activity".

Self-efficacy is a popular concept in the organizational behavior literature and is particularly relevant to research on continuous learning (Maurer & Tarulli, 1994). Studies have shown that showed that self-efficacy positively influences development behavior and self-efficacy is also related to interest and participation in development (Maurer & Tarulli, 1994).

Self-efficacy is not related to the skills but to the judgment of what one can do with whatever skills one possesses. The higher the level of self-efficacy the more positive their learning attitudes and stronger their belief that they can get benefit from development activities and greater their awareness of development needs (Neo & Wilk, 1993). Self-efficacy has been a key predictor of attitudes, intention, and participation in training and development activities (Maurer & Palmer, 1999; Maurer & Tarulli, 1996; Noe & Wilk, 1993). Moreover, self-efficacy can be affected through mastery experiences, vicarious experiences, social persuasion, and emotional states (Maurer, Lippstreu, & Judge, 2008). Thus, self-efficacy for development may influence positive management development outcomes.

### **Learning Goal Orientation**

According to Maurer et al. (2008) employees who are 'learning goal orientation' are more interested to understand and try new things and are involved in developing their skills and competencies for challenging jobs. They are positive, confident, and eager to learn and take the opportunity and accept challenges. An individual with learning goal orientation is eager to understand new and work to increase their competencies, look for the challenging task (Maurer et al., 2003). Those who are learning-goal-oriented believe that effort leads to success. And they take effort as

“activating current ability for task achievement and as a means for developing the ability needed for future task mastery” (Vandelle & Cumming, 1997).

Individuals who are learning goal orientation tend to understand new things and to increase their competence and skills through pursuing challenging development activities. They are attracted to learning opportunities and maintain a positive, confident composure during challenging experiences. Those people who are learning-oriented will perceive greater benefit from participation in development activity and will be more self-confident about their success in them (Maurer et al., 2008).

Empirical evidence shows that learning goal orientation has a positive impact on outcomes such as performance (Locke & Latham, 2002), perceived benefit for development (Maurer et al., 2008), and MD satisfaction (Arbeits et al., 2010). Another study conducted to understand the management development effectiveness in Dutch industries found that learning goal orientation, have a positive influence on affective commitment, MD satisfaction, intrinsic MDP benefits, and organizational MDP benefits (Wierenga, 2010). Employees who are learning goal-oriented likes to learn new skills and are satisfied with the opportunity provided by the organization and are more committed to the organization to participate in the MDP (Wierenga, 2010).

### **Proactive Personality**

Proactive personality is the most recognized and studied construct in career development and human resource development (Bateman & Crant, 1993; Ahmad, 2010). Bateman and Crant (1993) characterized proactive personality as “someone who is relatively unconstrained by situational force and who affects environmental changes” (as cited in Seibert, Kraimer, & Crant, 2001). Individuals with proactive personalities are highly involved in constructing positive changes towards people,

situations, and work environment and organizational improvement (Seibert, Kraimer, & Crant, 2001).

A longitudinal study on proactive personality and career success shows that highly proactive employees are engaged in behaviors that contribute to career success (Seiberetal., 2001). Research has revealed that a strong proactive personality has the tendency to be involved in career management activities and could be interesting to explore and likely to take advantage of MD programs (Ahmad, 2009). They are more engaged in career planning and are involved in identifying and seeking opportunities for self-improvement.

Prior studies have mentioned that proactive personality is positively related to several career development outcomes (Crant, 1995; Hough, 2003). Empirical evidence shows that proactive personality influences innovative behavior in employees (Seibert, Kraimer, & Crant, 2001; Ardts et al., 2010; Ahmad, 2009). A study found that a proactive personality does not moderate the relationship between MD characteristics and innovative behavior (Ahmad, 2009). Employees with proactive personality are positive towards making changes, resolving problems, and suggesting improvement, thus it is an important behavior for a manager. Therefore, this study will focus on its influence on management development outcomes.

In sum, research suggests these individual personality characteristics are related to a learning and development orientation, thus contributing to involvement in learning activities. However, research examining the management development outcomes in relation to individual characteristics is necessary to gain a richer understanding of the learning and development process.

### **Top Management Support**

Top management support is very essential for the success of any development activities. Support of top management give a positive influence on employee job attitudes and for the organization (Lee, Park, & Bakers, 2017). Here, top management support refers to top management's dedication and involvement in MD outcomes. Top management is "all inside top-level executives including the chief executive officer, chief operating officer, business unit heads and vice presidents" (Kor, 2003, as cited in Lee et al., 2017).

Studies show that organizational support is very important for proper utilization of the investment and it also results in positive outcomes (Chiaburu & Marinova, 2005; Lim & Johnson, 2002, as cited in D'Netto et al., 2008). Not only it enhances the line manager's support but also provides opportunities for better utilization of acquired skills and knowledge (Garavan, Barnicle, & O' Suilleabhain, 1999).

Top management is perceived as an important in terms of providing resources, commitment, and creating a supportive organizational culture (Garavan, Barnicle, & O' Suilleabhain, 1999). Margeison (1991) asserts that development program will not succeed if not supported by senior or middle management. The study done in Australia has found that in case top management and line manager are supportive then employees take the MD seriously (D'Netto et al., 2008). Another study has also found that individual initiative is enhanced with the support from the top and line manager. Further, it also emphasis that top management support is linked with skill utilization, which means employees are more open to using the learned skill when top management support (Dastgeer & Rehman, 2012).

A support from top management gives a positive signals throughout the organization and all the employees in the organization take management-development

seriously (Reitsma, 2001) Past research also indicates that top management support is very important for effective training and development outputs (Neo & Schmitt, 1986).

A study found that top management support moderates the relationship between HRD efforts and employee attitudes such as improves employees' job satisfaction and organizational commitment. It also emphasizes that when top management emphasis on learning and development of the employee, employees are more satisfied, reliable, committed, and put extra efforts in their work which significantly improves the organization productivity and innovation. (Lee, Park, & Bakers, 2017). There are studies conducted on top management on outcome variables but its moderate effect on the outcome variable is rarely measured. Thus, in this study, it is expected that top management support will moderate the relationship between individual characteristics and MD outcomes.

### **Management Development Approaches**

Managerial development is a complex process (Suutari & Viitala, 2008) and to develop managerial skills and competencies organization adopts different development methods. Different methods have different effectiveness (Goodge, 1998). Longenecker and Fink (2001) emphasize that organizations should evaluate the strength and weaknesses of each method to be adopted while planning management development activities.

Practitioners state the design of the strategies of development mostly based on the "content and objectives" of the organization. The researcher has highlighted that the adoption of the strategies also depends upon the age, intelligence, motivational background, achievement history, and participating autonomy. (Gage & Berliner, 1979, Cornwall, 1981 as cited in Garavan, Barnicle, & O' Suilleabhain, 1999)

Literature has mentioned different approaches to learning and development.

According to Woodall and Winstanley, there are two categories on the job methods and off the job methods. Whereas Werner and DeSimonem (2011) have categorized the MD into the component which are management education (acquisition of knowledge and skill in a formal classroom in a degree-granting institution), management training (focus on specific skill and knowledge to be applied immediately) and on the job experiences (planned and unplanned opportunities to gain self-knowledge or enhance the skill e.g., Mentoring, coaching and assignment to a task force).

However, in recent literature, the focus of learning and development is categorized as informal and formal learning. At the same time organizations are also encouraging managers to self-development (Garavan, Barnicle, & O' Suilleabhain, 1999). Empirical evidence has shown a mixed result on the effectiveness of the method adopted. A study in the US found that MD methods that managers considered to be the most important to improve their performance are role clarity, goals and performance expectations, regular evaluation of performance and coaching, mentor by senior managers, discussion on career planning, challenging job assignments. In Sri Lankan studies regarding preference for formal and informal learning and development, it revealed that job design processes are the most popular followed by job rotation and attending seminars and conferences. The least was the self-development process. The employee stressed they learned the most important lesson in their work when they struggle between task accomplishment and chaos (Akuratiyagamage, 2006). Finnish senior managers perceived methods for effective personal development were international assignments, career planning, and job rotation as strong methods for developing competencies. The methods used in the

organization were management training and education program, self-help activities, and special job assignment (Suutari & Viitala, 2008). Though there are various methods to develop the manager in the organization, in context to Nepal frequently practices MD methods are education. For this study, the researcher has taken management training and management education as MD methods.

## CHAPTER III

### RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This chapter deals with the research approaches and research design used to carry out the study. It presents the detailed research activities in the research process such as research hypothesis, variables, and their operations, unit of analysis, population, sampling design, instrumentation, data collection, and data analysis procedures.

#### **Research Design**

The main purpose of this study is to examine the relationship between the individual characteristics and management development outcomes in Nepali Public Limited organizations and also assess the moderating effect of top management support in this relationship. This requires that the construct adopted for the study is measured in terms of numerical values and the values are associated with each other to establish a relationship.

Hence, the research followed a positivist epistemology as it adopts the methods and systematic ways of knowledge generation process that helps to quantify the description of factors and their relationship. Positivist methodology is directed at explaining relationships. Positivists attempt to identify causes that impact outcomes (Creswell, 2009, p. 7). It aims to formulate laws, thus yielding a basis for prediction and generalization. (Scotland, 2012)

This study follows the quantitative research methodology within the positivism epistemology. According to Richard (2009) quantitative research is the more “scientific” approach to doing social science. And Creswell (2012) states a quantitative approach is the best when the problem identified requires “identification

of factors that influence an outcome, the utility of an intervention, or understanding, the best predictors of outcomes.”

This study follows the quantitative approach to analyze the data. Here management development outcomes (effectiveness) literature is reviewed and on the basis of the literature and empirical evidence, a conceptual framework is formulated and tested by a survey of cross-sections of public organizations and employees.

The study is designed as a non-experimental and used a cross-sectional research method and self-administered questionnaire technique for data collection and analysis.

### **Research Hypotheses**

A logical relationship between two and more variables formed on the basis of a testable statement is stated as a hypothesis (Sekaran & Bougie, 2015). It brings clarity and focuses on research problems to be investigated (Kumar, 2011). Thus, to understand the relationship and their strengths between the individual characteristics and management development outcomes following hypothesis were formulated and tested:

*H 1 a: There is a significant positive relationship between perceived self-efficacy for development and Job Satisfaction.*

*H 1 b: There is a significant positive relationship between perceived self-efficacy for development and Affective Commitment.*

*H 1 c: There is a significant positive relationship between perceived self-efficacy for development and Innovative Behavior.*

*H 1 d: There is a significant positive relationship between perceived self-efficacy for development and Critical Opinion Sharing.*

H 2 a: There is a significant positive relationship between perceived learning goal orientation and Job Satisfaction.

H 2 b: There is a significant positive relationship between perceived learning goal orientation and Affective Commitment.

H 2 c: There is a significant positive relationship between perceived learning goal orientation and Innovative Behavior.

H 2 d: There is a significant positive relationship between perceived learning goal orientation and Critical Opinion Sharing.

H 3 a: There is a significant positive relationship between perceived proactive personality positively and Job Satisfaction.

H 3 b: There is a significant positive relationship between perceived proactive personality positively and Affective Commitment.

H 3 c: There is a significant positive relationship between perceived proactive personality positively and Innovative Behavior.

H 3 d: There is a significant positive relationship between perceived proactive personality positively and Critical Opinion Sharing.

H 4 a: The relationship between self-efficacy and management development Outcomes ( Job Satisfaction, Affective Commitment, Innovative Behavior, and Critical Opinion Sharing) is moderated by top management support

H4 b: The relationship between learning goal orientation and management development Outcomes (Job Satisfaction, Affective Commitment, Innovative Behavior, and Critical Opinion Sharing) is moderated by top management support

H4 c: The relationship between proactive personality and management development Outcomes (Job Satisfaction, Affective Commitment, Innovative

Behavior, and Critical Opinion Sharing) is moderated by top management support

### **Variables and their Operationalization**

The variables used in the study are individual characteristics and management development outcomes. This research study has eight variables. The independent variables for the study are individual characteristics which include self-efficacy for development, learning goal orientation, proactive personality. The dependent variable is management development outcomes consist of job satisfaction, affective commitment, innovative behavior, and critical opinion sharing behavior. The moderating variables have a strong contingent effect on the independent and dependent variables such that the presences of the moderating variables can modify the original relationship between the independent and dependent variables (Sekaran & Bougie, 2015). Here, the moderating variable is perceived as top management support whereas demographics variables such as age, gender, years of experience, qualification, and position are taken as control variables.

The source of the variables for this study was taken as mentioned by Ardts et al. (2010) for dependent variables. The independent variables consist of four variables that are self-efficacy for development from Maurer and Tarulli (1994), learning goal orientation from VandeWalle (1997), and proactive personality (Seibert et al., 1999). The organizational factor which is top management support was used by D'Netto et al. (2008). Here, Self-efficacy for development, learning goal orientation, and proactive personality are attitude and personality related variables whereas top management support and management development outcomes are perceived based on data as perceived by the participants.

- **Self-efficacy for development:** This dimension refers to belief in his/her capability to learn at the level at or above the norm when participating in development activities.
- **Learning goal orientation:** This dimension refers to the desire to develop oneself by acquiring new skills, mastering new situations, and improving one's competence.
- **Proactive Personality:** This dimension refers to describe a person who creates positive change in his or her environment, regardless of or even despite situational constraints.
- **Top management support:** This dimension refers to executives who support development activities. Here, top management is "all inside top-level executives including inside top-level executives including the chief executive officer, chief operating officer, business unit heads, and vice president" (Kor, 2003, p. 712).
- **Job Satisfaction:** This dimension refers to the employee's satisfaction with one's job.
- **Affective Commitment:** This dimension refers to the emotional attachment of participants to their employing organization.
- **Innovative behavior:** This dimension refers to the extent to which an employee comes up with new ideas and work to implement them.
- **Critical Opinion Sharing:** This dimension refers to the extent to which an employee gives an opinion about development at work.

#### **Unit of Analysis**

The unit of analysis is the entity that is analyzed; in this study the unit of analysis is individual. The individual unit is taken as the study is about individual

perception of the management development efforts. The perception of an individual about the individual characteristics, organizational support, and approaches and its impact on management development outcomes is considered. The data is collected from individual working in a public organization which consists of banks and public organizations of Nepal. Employees working in different hierarchy such as officers and managers were the respondents. Individual responses will be entered for the data analysis process.

### **Population and Sample Design**

The population is the total collection of elements from which we make some inferences. Sampling, therefore, is selecting some of the elements and concluding the population (Cooper et al., 2012).

In this study, the sampling frame of this study was done in two steps. First, the sample organizations were determined out of 28 commercial banks operating in Nepal; for study 12 commercial banks, Nepal Rastra Bank, Nepal Telecom, and Nepal Airline Corporation were chosen randomly through the lottery method. Those organizations that meet the following criteria were chosen which whereas:

1. Banks and public organizations
2. Banks and public organizations that provide managerial training and development opportunities (especially related to management development such as Management Development Programs, Leadership Development Program, Managerial level Training, Supervisory Training, etc. along with higher education opportunities i.e. EMBA, MBA)

Secondly, the eligibility criteria of the respondent from the selected organizations were determined as follows:

- Manager and Senior Officer level

- Minimum of one year of work experience in the same organization
- Participants must have participated in at least one management-related training or development activity. (Here Management Training can be In House, External, International, or Management Education e.g. EMBA, MBA)

As mentioned above there are certain criteria to fulfill for participation in the survey, and as probable participants are specific types of people who meet the criteria set by the researcher, thus it is a non-probability purposive sampling design.

According to Marks (1966, as cited in Green, 1991), 200 minimum observations are required for any regression analysis. Thus, the sample size of the study was 250 respondents.

A total of 300 questionnaires were distributed among the organizations. A maximum of thirty questionnaires was distributed to each organization with the expectation of a 30% response rate acceptable rate in behavioral research (Green & Salkind, 2014 as cited in Singh, 2016). Also, 350 questionnaires were emailed to the respondents.

The questionnaire was distributed through two methods. First, the name list and telephone number were collected from the Human Resource Department/Training and Development Department of those who had attended management development programs or training. Then the respondents were contacted personally through the phone and were asked to complete the online questionnaire in Google Form. The questionnaire was sent in their emails which could be accessed through a click on the link. The email briefed about the study and its objectives and was ensured by the anonymity of their responses. And as the number of responses was very low, the Human Resource Department of banks was contacted professionally to distribute the hard copy questionnaire to employees who have attended the programs.

Table 3.1

*Name of Public Organizations*

S. N	Name of the Organizations
1	Himalayan Bank Limited
2	Everest Bank Limited
3	Nepal Bank Limited
4	Prabhu Bank Limited
5	Machhapuchhre Bank Limited
6	Global IME
7	Laxmi Bank Limited
8	Century Bank Limited
9	Nepal Agriculture Bank
10	RastriyaBanijya Bank
11	Nepal Investment Bank
12	Sanima Bank
13	Nepal Airline Corporation
14	Nepal Telecom
15	Nepal Rastra Bank

Table 3.2

*Questionnaire Response Rate (N=204)*

The response rate was as follows:

	Distributed	Collected	Rate of response
Online Questionnaire	350	124	35.42
Questionnaire	300	166	55.33

### Demographic

Demographic information was asked to the respondent to filter the sample according to the criteria set by the researcher. The demographic was collected from the questionnaire Section A which provided the personal information of the

respondent, which was age, gender, education level, a position held, job tenure, training and development activities participated, etc.

### **Instrumentation**

The study has adopted the items and measures developed and valid by prior researchers. Here, individual characteristics cover three components there is self-efficacy for development, learning goal orientation, and proactive personality.

- The scale for self-efficacy for development was measured by Maurer and Taurilli (1994) scale consisting of four items with Cronbach's alpha 0.70.
- Learning goal orientation was measured by a six-item scale developed and validated by VandeWalle (1997) and VandeWalle and Cummings (1997), item consists of such as "I enjoy challenging and difficult tasks at work where I'll learn new skills" (The Cronbach's alpha is 0.75).
- Proactive personality was measured by a 10-item scale from Seibert, Crant, and Kraimer (1999). An example of the item is "No matter what the odds if I believe in something, I will make it happen." The reliability is 0.75.
- Top management support was measured using a seven-item scale. The scale includes items such as "top management supports management development". The scale was developed by D'netto et al. (2008), and its reliability range .70 to.90.

The Management Development Outcomes were as

- Job satisfaction consisted of one-item developed by Ardlts et al. (2008).
- Affective Commitment consisted of five-items developed by Allen and Myer (1990, 1996). A sample of affective commitment item is "I feel as if this organization's problems are my own." The Cronbach alpha is .81.

- Innovative Behavior was measured from a scale developed by Scott and Bruce (1994) and modified by Ardlts et al. (2008) six-items. A sample of the item is “I am someone who searches out new technologies, processes, techniques and or product ideas”. The Cronbach's alpha is .69.
- Critical Opinion sharing was measured from a scale developed by Van Worekem (2010) A sample of the critical item is “I give my opinion about developments at work.” Cronbach's alpha is 0.69.

The measures used in this study have been tested and used by different researchers, thus its validity and reliability were already tested so it can be assumed to be used in this study. Response for the items was captured on three different Likert scales ranging from 1 to 5, 1 to 7, and 1 to 6. The questionnaire developed in English was distributed as the respondents were employees working as officers and manager it is believed that it will not be difficult for them to understand.

### **Research Procedure**

In this section the administration of questionnaires, data collection and process, and data analysis has been discussed, which are as follows:

#### **Pre-test**

Before the administration of the final questionnaire, a pre-test was carried out with five volunteers. This was done so that there is less possibility of error and any mistake could be identified timely.

#### **Administration of the Questionnaire**

The questionnaire contains 48 items which include individual characteristics, organizational support, and management development outcomes. In the questionnaire contents, three-section and a clear instruction were given to the respondent about the purpose of the study, the target group, and confidentiality.

Section A contains demographic information about the subject. Section B contains management development activities one has participated, and section C contains items related to the construct.

There were altogether 650 sets of questionnaires distributed, but only 290 questionnaires were received from the respondent within a period of one month. Considering section, A which is checking the eligibility, only 204 were usable for analysis.

### **Data Processing**

The questionnaires were manually screened to ensure that all the information is completed, and the respondent meets the minimum eligibility. After the screening of the usable questionnaire and discarding of the incomplete questionnaire, each questionnaire that met the criteria was coded for further analysis. The data were entered into SPSS 25 software for further statistical analysis.

### **Data Analysis**

The data were analyzed using the software SPSS 25. Each variable was entered and cross-checked to ensure that there is no error in the data entry. The items that were to be reversed was converted as required. Descriptive and inferential statistics were used to analyze the data.

First, a reliability test (Cronbach's alpha) was conducted to ensure that the instruments used in the study to measure the different variables could be considered in the Nepali context (Adhikary, 2013, as cited by Singh, 2016).

And t-test was tested for gender and also, ANOVA was used to test the relationship between other demographic variables and individual characteristics and management development outcomes.

Correlation and regression analysis were formed to understand the relationship between two variables as stated in the conceptual framework. Hierarchical Regression was carried out to test the impact of independent variables on dependent variables. The moderation effect of top management support on management development outcomes was conducted by using Moderation Multiple Regression.

The relationship investigated was:

Self-efficacy for development with management development outcomes which consists of job satisfaction, affective commitment, innovative behavior, and critical opinion sharing.

Learning goal orientation with management development outcomes consists of job satisfaction, affective commitment, innovative behavior, and critical opinion sharing.

Proactive personality with management development outcomes consists of job satisfaction, affective commitment, innovative behavior, and critical opinion sharing.

Top management support with self-efficacy and management development outcomes (Job Satisfaction, Affective Commitment, Innovative Behavior, and Critical Opinion Sharing).

Top management support with learning goal orientation and management development outcomes (Job Satisfaction, Affective Commitment, Innovative Behavior, and Critical Opinion Sharing).

Top management support with proactive personality and management development outcomes (Job Satisfaction, Affective Commitment, Innovative Behavior, and Critical Opinion Sharing).

## Hypothesis Testing

To understand the strength of the relationship of hypothesized variables whether it is positively and significantly related as expected a correlation coefficient was used. A hierarchical regression analysis was carried out to confirm the relationships indicated by the correlation coefficients. Moreover, in the study control variables were gender, years of experience, qualification, position, and age.

## CHAPTER IV

### RESULTS

This chapter deals with interpreting the result obtained from data in terms of research questions, objectives and hypothesis. First, the demographics of the respondents were determined which is followed by test for model fit. The Cronbach's alpha was used to test to know whether the items are reliable. Later, correlation coefficients and regression analysis was presented. The finding reveals that self-efficacy and proactive personality has a positive and significant relationship with job satisfaction, affective commitment, innovative behavior, and critical opinion which is referred to as Management Development Outcomes. The details of results are as follows:

#### **Descriptive Analysis**

A total number of 650 questionnaires were distributed, out of which 204 were usable from 290 collected, the response rate was 31.38% only as per sampling criteria. The respondent's characteristics are mentioned in Table 4.1.

The table shows that majority of the respondent were managers i.e. 39.2 percent followed by 33.3 percent officers. Among the respondents, 77.5 percent were male whereas 22.5 were female. Similarly, out of the total respondents, 49.5 percent of the respondents lie between the age of 36 to 45 years, followed by 38.7 percent between 25 and 35. In regard to the academic qualification, the 91.7% respondents have completed a master's degree. Similarly, 29.9 percent of the respondents have been working in the organization for less than 5 years.

Table 4.1

*Respondent Characteristics (N=204)*

Variable	No. of Respondents	Percentage
Position		
Manager	80	39.2
Senior Officer	40	19.6
Officer	68	33.3
Senior Manager	16	7.8
Tenure		
1 year to 5 years	61	29.9
6 years to 10 years	58	28.4
11 years to 15 years	53	26
16 years to 20 years	26	12.7
Above 20 years	7	2.9
Gender		
Male	158	77.5
Female	46	22.5
Age		
Under 25		
25 – 35	79	38.7
36-45	101	49.5
46-55	23	11.3
Above 55	1	.55
Qualification		
MPhil/ PhD	4	2
Master Degree	187	91.7
Bachelor Degree	13	6.4

**Reliability Analysis**

The reliability was assessed through Cronbach Alpha which was calculated for each variable in SPSS. The results of the reliability analysis before and after item deletion are presented in Table 4.2. The Cronbach's Alpha for each dimension has

alpha values vary in the range of  $\alpha=.743$  to  $\alpha =.941$ . The scale was found reliable with Cronbach Alpha values for Self-Efficacy (.743), Learning Goal Orientation (.941), Proactive Personality (.920), Top Management Support (.892), Affective Commitment (.902), Innovative Behavior (.891) and Critical Opinion Sharing (.867).

Table 4.2

*Values of Cronbach Alpha for Different Instruments*

Instruments	No of Items	No of Item Deleted	No of items retained	Cronbach alpha before deletion	Cronbach alpha after item deletion
Self Efficacy	4	-	4	-	.743
Learning Goal Orientation	6	-	6	-	.941
Proactive Personality	10	-	10	-	.920
Top Management Support	7	-	7	-	.892
Affective Commitment	8	-	8	-	.902
Innovative Behavior	6	-	6	-	.891
Critical Opinion Sharing	6	-	6	-	.867

**Minimum, Maximum and Mean Values of Study Variables**

The minimum, maximum, skewness and kurtosis of each study variable are presented in Table 4.3. Skewness and kurtosis test were examined to know the normality of the data. The table shows that 5.5833 highest mean value followed by 5.5426. Here, the skewness range from -.613 to 2.301, and kurtosis range from .251 to 6.070, the values are in the acceptable range. Threshold value of skewness is  $\pm 3$  and for kurtosis is  $\pm 10$  (Kline, 1998, as cited in Basnet, 2019).

Table 4.3

*Descriptive Statistics of Study Variable (N=204)*

Variables	Minimum	Maximum	Skewness	Kurtosis
<b>Personal Characteristics</b>				
SE	1.00	5.00	-.881	2.139
LGO	1.00	6.00	2.301	6.070
PP	1.00	7.00	-1.739	3.952
<b>Organizational Characteristics</b>				
TM	1.00	7.00	-1.281	1.634
<b>MD Outcomes</b>				
JS	1.00	7.00	-1.335	2.113
Aff Commit	1.00	7.00	-1.171	1.326
IN	1.00	5.00	-.613	.251
CS	1.00	6.00	-.851	2.114

### **Comparison among Different Groups**

The study has different demographic variables (gender, position, year of experiences, qualification, and age); a statistical analysis was conducted to know whether these demographic variables have a significant relationship with study variables. A T-test and one way ANOVA was conducted to understand the relation between the mean of two or more unrelated sub-groups. Here, demographic variables are also divided into various sub groups. An independent T-test was conducted between the means of two unrelated groups whereas One Way ANOVA was conducted with the means of more than two unrelated groups.

An independent T-test was conducted between self-efficacy, learning goal orientation, proactive personality, top management support, job satisfaction, affective commitment, innovative behavior and critical sharing behavior with gender, so as to understand whether gender differ the relationship.

Similarly, One Way ANOVA was conducted to understand whether there is a difference in self- efficacy, learning goal orientation, proactive personality, top management support, job satisfaction, affective commitment, innovative behavior and critical opinion sharing behavior on the base of position, year of experiences, qualification and age. The results are presented as below:

### Effect of Gender on Study Variables

An independent t-test was computed to examine the effect of gender on study variables that is self-efficacy, learning goal orientation, proactive personality, top management support, job satisfaction, affective commitment, innovative behaviors and critical sharing. The gender is divided into two subgroups i.e. Male and Female. The results of the t-tests are mentioned in Table 4.4 and 4.5 respectively.

Table 4.4

#### Group Statistics: Gender

Variables	Gender	N	Mean	SD
Self-Efficacy	Male	158	4.1582	.51441
	Female	46	4.1630	.62186
Learning Goal Orientation	Male	158	1.9040	.95294
	Female	46	2.0217	1.06029
Proactive Personality	Male	158	5.5639	.99394
	Female	46	5.4696	1.15063
Top Management Support	Male	158	5.3101	1.14549
	Female	46	4.9596	1.31403
Affective Commitment	Male	158	5.5807	1.14669
	Female	46	5.5462	.91072
Innovative Behavior	Male	158	3.6361	.68262
	Female	46	3.2899	.79848
Critical Sharing	Male	158	4.5295	.82566
	Female	46	4.4710	.68160
Job Satisfaction	Male	158	5.6456	1.33104
	Female	46	5.3696	1.08236

Table 4.5

*Independent t-test between Male and Female Employees*

Variables		Levene's test for equality of variance		t-test for equality of means	
		F	Sig	T	Sig.( 2-tailed)
Self-Efficacy	Equal variances assumed	3.052	.082	-.053	.958
	Equal variances not assumed			-.048	.962
Learning Goal Orientation	Equal variances assumed	.047	.829	-.719	.473
	Equal variances not assumed			-.678	.500
Proactive Personality	Equal variances assumed	.301	.584	.546	.585
	Equal variances not assumed			.504	.616
Top Management Support	Equal variances assumed	1.589	.209	1.765	.079
	Equal variances not assumed			1.637	.106
Affective Commitment	Equal variances assumed	6.528	.011	.187	.851
	Equal variances not assumed			.213	.832
Innovative Behavior	Equal variances assumed	3.763	.054	2.910	.004
	Equal variances not assumed			2.670	.010
Critical Opinion Sharing	Equal variances assumed	.733	.393	.439	.661
	Equal variances not assumed			.487	.627
Job Satisfaction	Equal variances assumed	.809	.370	1.287	.199
				1.441	.153

Levene's test for equality of variance shows variables do not show any statistically significant difference invariance. On the other hand, the t-test for equality of means shows that there is a statistically significant difference between males and females on innovative behavior ( $t= 2.670, p>0.05$ ). The mean of male is 3.6361 which suggest that male respondents have innovative behavior. Whereas, other variables do not have a statistically significant difference between male and female on self-efficacy, learning goal orientation, proactive personality, top management support, job satisfaction, affective commitment and critical opinion sharing.

### **Effect of Position on Study Variables**

One-way ANOVA was conducted to understand whether there exist statistically significant differences in self-efficacy, learning goal orientation, proactive personality, top management support, affective commitment critical sharing, innovative behavior and job satisfaction through different position. The position was divided into four categories which were Manager, Senior Officer, Officer and Senior Manager. The one way ANOVA is presented in Table 4.6 and Table 4.10.

Table 4.6

*Descriptive Statistics: Position*

<i>Variables</i>		<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Std. Deviation</i>
Self-Efficacy	Manager	80	4.2250	.42397
	Senior Officer	40	3.9625	.57051
	Officer	68	4.1140	.54880
	Senior	16	4.5156	.72151
	Manager			
	Total	204	4.1593	.53887
Learning Goal Orientation	Manager	80	1.9021	.92348
	Senior Officer	40	2.0000	1.11325
	Officer	68	1.9657	1.02318
	Senior	16	1.7500	.68041
	Manager			
	Total	204	1.9306	.97671
Proactive Personality	Manager	80	5.5525	1.09648
	Senior Officer	40	5.6125	.97302
	Officer	68	5.4882	1.02659
	Senior	16	5.5500	.89740
	Manager			
	Total	204	5.5426	1.02913
Top Management Support	Manager	80	5.3804	1.16722
	Senior Officer	40	5.1857	1.20751
	Officer	68	5.1513	1.18830
	Senior	16	4.9375	1.29884
	Manager			
	Total	204	5.2311	1.19128
Affective Commitment	Manager	80	5.7203	1.09520
	Senior Officer	40	5.7313	1.17824
	Officer	68	5.3309	1.03749
	Senior	16	5.4688	1.02926
	Manager			
	Total	204	5.5729	1.09591
Innovative Behavior	Manager	80	3.6813	.68652
	Senior Officer	40	3.5958	.74142
	Officer	68	3.3652	.75928
	Senior	16	3.6667	.56765
	Manager			
	Total	204	3.5580	.72302
Critical Sharing	Manager	80	4.6646	.65415

	Senior Officer	40	4.4792	1.03993
	Officer	68	4.3211	.77818
	Senior Manager	16	4.6979	.66170
	Total	204	4.5163	.79424
Job Satisfaction	Manager	80	5.8375	1.10744
	Senior Officer	40	5.5250	1.35850
	Officer	68	5.3971	1.37287
	Senior Manager	16	5.2500	1.39044
	Total	204	5.5833	1.28190

The above table indicates that position has statistically significant influence on self-efficacy and critical opinion sharing. The descriptive statistics indicate that senior managers have high self-efficacy and critical sharing behavior followed by Managers. It can be concluded that as the one move in higher position employees have more self-efficacy and they are more expressive of their opinions and suggests improvement in the work.

### **Effect of Year of Experience on Study Variables**

To examine the impact of a year of experience on self-efficacy, learning goal orientation, proactive personality, top management support, affective commitment critical sharing, innovative behavior, and job satisfaction, a One Way ANOVA was tested. The work of experiences was divided into five categories which were 1 to 5 years, 6 to 10 years, 11 to 15 years, 16 to 20 years, and above 20 years. The results are mentioned in table 4.7 and Table 4.10.

Table 4.7

*Descriptive Statistics: Year of Experience*

Variables		N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Self-Efficacy	1 to 5	61	4.1066	.46650
	6 to 10	58	4.1724	.55450
	11 to 15	53	4.2075	.57541
	16 to 20	26	4.2404	.53142
	Above 20	6	3.7917	.74861
	Total	204	4.1593	.53887
Learning Goal Orientation	1 to 5	61	2.0191	1.04885
	6 to 10	58	1.7730	.84449
	11 to 15	53	1.8082	.73336
	16 to 20	26	2.2821	1.40140
	Above 20	6	2.1111	.87348
	Total	204	1.9306	.97671
Proactive Personality	1 to 5	61	5.5852	.98739
	6 to 10	58	5.5776	1.06656
	11 to 15	53	5.3415	1.19187
	16 to 20	26	5.7538	.71062
	Above 20	6	5.6333	.57155
	Total	204	5.5426	1.02913
Top management Support	1 to 5	61	5.2014	1.20045
	6 to 10	58	5.4360	1.02158
	11 to 15	53	4.9730	1.35499
	16 to 20	26	5.4231	1.15315
	Above 20	6	5.0000	1.10657
	Total	204	5.2311	1.19128
Affective Commitment	1 to 5	61	5.3320	1.13351
	6 to 10	58	5.7349	.97025
	11 to 15	53	5.5377	1.20983
	16 to 20	26	5.7692	1.08668
	Above 20	6	5.9167	.34157

	Total	204	5.5729	1.09591
Innovative Behavior	1 to 5	61	3.5055	.62581
	6 to 10	58	3.6322	.68096
	11 to 15	53	3.5126	.84911
	16 to 20	26	3.5833	.81820
	Above 20	6	3.6667	.50553
	Total	204	3.5580	.72302
Critical Sharing	1 to 5	61	4.4098	.78148
	6 to 10	58	4.4799	.79231
	11 to 15	53	4.6038	.85061
	16 to 20	26	4.6410	.77128
	Above 20	6	4.6389	.54177
	Total	204	4.5163	.79424
Job satisfaction	1 to 5	61	5.4754	1.38572
	6 to 10	58	5.6552	1.10106
	11 to 15	53	5.4906	1.51432
	16 to 20	26	5.9231	.89098
	Above 20	6	5.3333	1.03280
	Total	204	5.5833	1.28190

The One way ANOVA (Table 4.10) of tenure shows that there is no statistically significant relationship between tenure and self-efficacy, learning goal orientation, proactive personality, top management support, job satisfaction, affective commitment, innovative behavior, and critical sharing. So, it can be concluded that work experiences do not influence the perceived personal behaviors and their outcomes.

#### **Effect of Qualification on Study Variables**

To determine the impact of qualification on self-efficacy, learning goal orientation, proactive personality, top management support, affective commitment, critical sharing, innovative behavior, and job satisfaction, a One Way ANOVA was

conducted. The qualification was categorized as MPhil & Ph.D., Master's Degree, and Bachelor's Degree. The descriptive statistics and F statistics are presented in

Table 4.8 and Table 4.10

Table 4.8

*Descriptive Statistics: Qualification*

Variables		N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Self-Efficacy	MPhil/PhD	4	4.4375	.42696
	Master	187	4.1471	.55154
	Bachelor	13	4.2500	.33850
	Total	204	4.1593	.53887
Learning goal orientation	MPhil/ PhD	4	1.7083	.87533
	Master	187	1.9394	.99230
	Bachelor	13	1.8718	.81409
	Total	204	1.9306	.97671
Proactive Personality	MPhil/ PhD	4	5.9500	.47958
	Master	187	5.5487	1.00938
	Bachelor	13	5.3308	1.40082
	Total	204	5.5426	1.02913
Top Management Support	MPhil/ PhD	4	5.5357	.64286
	Master	187	5.2086	1.21202
	Bachelor	13	5.4615	1.01879
	Total	204	5.2311	1.19128
Affective Commitment	MPhil/ PhD	4	6.4688	.58072
	Master	187	5.5702	1.09373
	Bachelor	13	5.3365	1.16747
	Total	204	5.5729	1.09591
Innovative Behavior	MPhil/ PhD	4	4.1250	.83194
	Master	187	3.5508	.72480
	Bachelor	13	3.4872	.64356
	Total	204	3.5580	.72302
Critical Sharing	MPhil/ PhD	4	5.2917	.56724
	Master	187	4.5285	.78560
	Bachelor	13	4.1026	.79797
	Total	204	4.5163	.79424
Job Satisfaction	MPhil/ PhD	4	7.0000	.00000
	Master	187	5.5829	1.26887
	Bachelor	13	5.1538	1.40512
	Total	204	5.5833	1.28190

The One Way ANOVA ( Table 4.10) result shows that qualification does have a significant relationship with critical sharing and job satisfaction. It shows that those respondents who hold MPhil/Ph.D. degrees are given critical opinions and are satisfied with their job. It can be concluded that qualification and development activities do have an extensive influence on job satisfaction.

#### **Effect of Age on Study Variables**

To examine the influence of age on self-efficacy, learning goal orientation, proactive personality, top management support, affective commitment critical sharing, innovative behavior, and job satisfaction, a One Way ANOVA was conducted. Age was categorized as Under 25, 26 to 35; 36 to 45; 46 to 55 and above 55. The descriptive statistics and F statistics are presented in Table 4.9 and Table 4.10.

Table 4.9

*Descriptive statistics: Age*

Variables	N	Mean	SD	
Self-Efficacy	25 to 35	79	4.1614	.46347
	36 to 45	101	4.1584	.60075
	46 to 55	23	4.1413	.52129
	above 55	1	4.5000	.
	Total	204	4.1593	.53887
Learning goal orientation	25 to 35	79	2.0063	1.06700
	36 to 45	101	1.8350	.83815
	46 to 55	23	2.1014	1.21516
	above 55	1	1.6667	.
	Total	204	1.9306	.97671
Proactive Personality	25 to 35	79	5.6063	.86504
	36 to 45	101	5.4752	1.16991
	46 to 55	23	5.5826	.90987
	above 55	1	6.4000	.
	Total	204	5.5426	1.02913
Top Management Support	25 to 35	79	5.2297	1.12076
	36 to 45	101	5.1683	1.29479
	46 to 55	23	5.4658	.94586
	above 55	1	6.2857	.
	Total	204	5.2311	1.19128
Affective Commitment	25 to 35	79	5.5190	1.10906
	36 to 45	101	5.5495	1.13152
	46 to 55	23	5.8261	.89008
	above 55	1	6.3750	.
	Total	204	5.5729	1.09591
Innovative Behavior	25 to 35	79	3.5316	.68929
	36 to 45	101	3.5000	.77280
	46 to 55	23	3.8696	.52694
	above 55	1	4.3333	.
	Total	204	3.5580	.72302
Critical Opinion Sharing	25 to 35	79	4.4958	.75295
	36 to 45	101	4.4835	.88113
	46 to 55	23	4.6957	.45961
	above 55	1	5.3333	.
	Total	204	4.5163	.79424
Job Satisfaction	25 to 35	79	5.5190	1.37618
	36 to 45	101	5.5842	1.29048
	46 to 55	23	5.7826	.90235
	above 55	1	6.0000	.
	Total	204	5.5833	1.28190

The above analysis reports present that there are no statistically significant differences among the different age groups on self-efficacy, learning goal orientation, proactive personality, top management support, affective commitment critical sharing, innovative behavior, and job satisfaction. This shows that age does not influence the development activities participation and it is influence on the variables.

Table 4.10

*One way ANOVA among Position, Year of Experience, Age and Qualification*

Variables	Position	Year of Experience	Qualification	Age
Self-Efficacy	4.939*	1.109	.764	.140
Learning Goal Orientation	.299	1.624	.134	.737
Proactive Personality	.126	.832	.590	.484
Top Management Support	.862	1.293	.405	.649
Affective Commitment	1.941	1.436	1.650	.664
Innovative Behavior	2.604	.323	1.306	2.092
Critical Opinion Sharing	2.671*	.657	3.794*	.816
Job Satisfaction	1.942	.733	3.242*	.284

Note. \*p<0.1, \*\*p<0.05

#### **Nature and strength of Relationship among the Study Variables**

The Pearson coefficients of correlation were tested between predictors, moderating and outcome variables. The table 4.11 below shows the result of correlation along with mean and standard deviation

Table 4.11

*Correlation Coefficients between different study variables*

	Mean	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1. Self-Efficacy	4.1593	.53887	1							
2. Learning Goal Orientation	1.9306	.97671	-.166*	1						
3. Proactive Personality	5.5426	1.02913	.304**	-.091	1					
4. Top Management Support	5.2311	1.19128	.189**	-.031	.514**	1				
5. Job Satisfaction	5.5833	1.28190	.220**	-.118	.339**	.547**	1			
6. Affective Commitment	5.5729	1.09591	.214**	-.085	.355**	.601**	.708**	1		
7. Innovative Behavior	3.5580	.72302	.253**	-.031	.431**	.319**	.313**	.328**	1	
8. Critical Opinion Sharing	4.5163	.79424	.327**	-.084	.383**	.193**	.242**	.228**	.557**	1

\*Correlation is significant at the level .05 level ( 2-tailed)

\*\*Correlation is significant at the level .01 level ( 2-tailed)

The correlation coefficient shows that self-efficacy and proactive personality have a positive and significant relationship. The dimensions were measure on different scales ranging from 5 to 7 Likert scales. Considering the mean values of the dimension, it shows that learning goal orientation has the lowest mean value of 1.9306. It suggests that the employee's perception of learning goal orientation in the organization is very low. The mean values of affective commitment and proactive personality are 5.5729 and 5.5426, which indicates that employees are proactive in developing themselves and have a strong desire to work with the organization

The correlation table shows that self-efficacy, proactive personality, top management support, job satisfaction, affective commitment, innovative behavior, and critical opinion sharing have a statistically strong significant ( $p < .01$ ) and positive relationship.

However, learning goal orientation has a significant relationship with self-efficacy but has no significant relationship with other variables. The significant and positive correlation analysis indicates that the most of the relationships are robust for testing the proposed hypotheses.

### **Direct Effects of Predictor and Moderating Variables**

The correlation analysis suggested that only two of three predictor variables, self-efficacy and proactive personality were positively associated with management development effectiveness i.e. Job Satisfaction, Affective Commitment, Innovative Behavior, Critical Opinion Sharing. The moderating variable, top management support is also positively correlated to management development outcomes variables.

As the correlation of learning goal orientation was not established with other outcome variables it was excluded from further analysis, so only two predictors that are self-efficacy and proactive personality were used in regression analysis.

To test the hypothesis, regression analysis was conducted to understand the direct and moderate relationship between the study variables. Twelve were hypothesized to have a direct relationship, and two were hypothesized to have moderating relationship. The finding indicates that

### **Direct Effect of Self efficacy on Management Development Outcomes**

The correlations suggest that the two of the variable were positively and significantly related to outcome variables. To examine the strength of the effect of each predictor variable and the outcome variables, a hierarchical regression analysis was performed. Here, two-step regression was done in Step 1 demographic variables (i.e. gender and qualification) were used as a control variable and in step 2 all the explanatory variables were included. In order to

test the hypothesis standardized beta coefficients,  $R^2$ ,  $R^2$  change, F-statistics, and significant values were identified.

To determine the relationship between self-efficacy and job satisfaction, affective commitment, innovative behavior, and critical opinion sharing a regression were conducted between the variables. The regression result is as mentioned in Table 4.12.

Table 4.12

*Effect of Self efficacy on Management Development Outcomes*

	Job satisfaction		Affective Commitment		Innovative Behavior		Critical Opinion Sharing	
	(1)	(2)	(1)	(2)	(1)	(2)	(1)	(2)
Gender	-.090	-.091	-.013	-.014	-.201**	-.202**	-.031	-.032
Qualification	-.151*	-.152*	-.105	-.105	-.076	-.077	-.184**	-.185**
Self- Efficacy		.220**		.214**		.254***		.328***
$\Delta R^2$	.31	.49	.011	.046	.046	.064	.035	.107
F	3.217	5.760**	1.130	4.026**	4.852	8.273***	3.623	11.050* **

The regression result reveals that self-efficacy has a significant influence on management development outcomes (i.e. job satisfaction, affective commitment, innovative behavior and critical opinion sharing) after controlling the demographics variables (qualification and gender) ( Job Satisfaction:  $F = 5.760$ ,  $p \leq .001$ , Affective Commitment  $F = 4.026$ ,  $p < .008$ , Innovative Behavior:  $F = 8.273$ ,  $p < .000$ , Critical Opinion Sharing:  $F = 11.050$ ,  $p < .000$ )

The result of hierarchical regression indicates that self-efficacy has a positive and significant relationship, thus, it can be concluded that hypothesis (H1a, H1b, H1c, H1d) were found to be supported.

### Direct effect of Proactive Personality on Management Development Effectiveness

To examine the relationship between Proactive Personality and job satisfaction, affective commitment, innovative behavior and critical opinion sharing, regressions were estimated between the dependent and independent variable, Proactive Personality. The regression result is shown in Table 4.13, which reveals that proactive personality has a direct relationship with dependent variables after controlling the demographic factors (qualification and gender).

Table 4.13

#### *Effect of Proactive Personality on Management Development Outcomes*

	Job Satisfaction		Affective Commitment		Innovative Behavior		Critical Opinion Sharing	
	(1)	(2)	(1)	(2)	(1)	(2)	(1)	(2)
Gender	-.090	-.078	-.013	.000	-.201**	-.185**	-.031	-.017
Qualification	-.151*	-.127	-.105	-.079	-.076	-.045	-.184*	-.157*
Proactive Personality		.326**		.349***		.421***		.370***
$\Delta R^2$	.031	.106	.011	.121	.046	.176	.035	.136
F	3.217*	10.570***	1.130	10.162***	4.852**	19.000***	3.623*	13.756***
R <sup>2</sup>		.137		.132		.222		.171

Notes. \* $p < 0.05$ ; \*\* $p < 0.01$ ; \*\*\* $p < 0.001$

The regression result shows that proactive personality shows a positive and significant relation with management development outcomes. (Job satisfaction  $F=10.570$ ,  $p < .000$ ,  $R^2 = .137$ ; Affective Commitment  $F=10.162$ ,  $p < .000$ ,  $R^2 = .132$ ; Innovative Behavior  $F=19.000$ ,  $p < .000$ ,  $R^2 = .222$  and Critical Sharing  $F: 13.756$ ;  $p < .000$ ,  $R^2 = .171$ ).

Here, the Hierarchical regression result reveals that Proactive Personality positively and significantly affected the job satisfaction, affective commitment, innovative behavior and critical opinion. Thus, the hypotheses H3 a, H3 b, H3 c and H3d was supported.

### Direct Effect of Learning Goal Orientation on Management Development Outcomes

To examine the relationship between learning goal orientation and job satisfaction, affective commitment, innovative behavior and critical opinion sharing, regressions were conducted between the dependent and learning goal orientation, independent variable. The result shown in Table 4.14 reveals that learning goal orientation personality does not have a direct relationship with dependent variables after controlling the demographic factors (qualification and gender).

Table 4.14

*Effect of Learning goal orientation on Management Development Outcomes*

	Job Satisfaction		Affective Commitment		Innovative Behavior		Critical Opinion Sharing	
	(1)	(2)	(1)	(2)	(1)	(2)	(1)	(2)
Gender	-.090	-.085	-.013	-.009	-.201**	-.200**	-.031	-.027
Qualification	-.151*	-.151*	-.105	-.104	-.076	-.076	-.184**	-.2.655**
LGO		-.113		-.085		-.021		-.082
$\Delta R^2$	.031	.013	.011	.007	.046	.001	.035	.007
F	3.217*	3.051*	1.130	1.240	4.852**	3.251*	3.623*	2.892*
R <sup>2</sup>		.044		.018		.047		.042

LGO: Learning goal orientation note: \* $p < 0.05$  \*\* $p < 0.01$ ; \*\*\* $p < 0.001$

The regression result shows that learning goal orientation is not significantly related with management development outcomes. Here, Learning goal orientation not related with job satisfaction (Job satisfaction  $\beta = -.113, p < .104$ ); Innovative behavior ( $\beta = -$

.021,  $p < .759$ ) and Critical Opinion Sharing ( $\beta = -.082$ ,  $p < .235$ ) and affective commitment ( $\beta = -.085$ ,  $p < .229$ ). Here, the Hierarchical regression result reveals that learning goal orientation is not significantly related with job satisfaction, affective commitment, innovative behavior and critical opinion sharing. Thus, the hypotheses H3 a, H3 b, H3 c and H3d were not supported.

### Direct effect of Top Management Support on Management Development

#### Outcomes

Here, the direct effect of top management support on job satisfaction, affective commitment, innovative behavior and critical opinion sharing was examined. The table below shows the regression result of top management support with variables after controlling the demographic factors (qualification and gender).

Table 4.15

*Effect of Top Management Support on Management Development Outcomes*

	<i>Job satisfaction</i>		<i>Affective Commitment</i>		<i>Innovative Behavior</i>		<i>Critical Opinion Sharing</i>	
	(1)	(2)	(1)	(2)	(1)	(2)	(1)	(2)
Gender	-.090	-.023	-.013	.062	-.201*	-.164*	-.031	-.007
Qualification	-.151*	-.165**	-.105	-.120*	-.076	-.084	-.184**	-.189**
Top Management Support		.548***		.612***		.301***		.197**
$\Delta R^2$	.031	.296	.011	.368	.046	.089	.035	.038
F	3.217*	32.361***	1.130	40.716***	4.852**	10.413***	3.623*	5.245**
R <sup>2</sup>		.327		.379		.135		.073

The results indicate that Top management support has a positive and significant relationship with job satisfaction, affective commitment, innovative behavior and critical opinion sharing (Job Satisfaction: F: 32.361,  $P < .000$ ,  $R^2 = .327$ ; Affective Commitment: F: 40.716,  $P < .000$ ,  $R^2 = .370$ ; innovative Behavior: F: 10.413,

$P < .000$ ,  $R^2 = .135$ ; COS:  $F: 5.245$ ,  $P < .002$ ,  $R^2 = .073$ ). Top management support is a strong predictor of Job Satisfaction, Affective Commitment, and Innovative Behavior.

### Assessment of Moderating Effects

#### Interactive Effect of Top Management on Self Efficacy and Management

#### Development Outcomes

Table 4.16

*Hierarchical Regression Analysis: Top Management(TM) Moderating Self Efficacy (SE) - Affective Commitment (Aff Comm) Relationship*

	Affective Commitment			
	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	Step 4
Gender	-.013	-.014	.059	.058
Qualification	-.105	-.105	-.120	-.120
SE		.214**	.102	.097
TM			.592***	.589***
SE*TM				-.013
R2	.011	.046	.332	.000
F	1.130	4.026**	31.702***	25.248***
Total R2				.389

Moderated multiple regression result indicates that the interaction of self-efficacy and top management support to affective commitment is not significant at 90% confidence level (estimated  $\beta = -.013$ ,  $p > 0.1$ ), the coefficient is not significant as shown in Table 4.16. The moderating effect of Top management support on the relationship between self-efficacy and affective commitment is not established.

Hence, H 4 a was not supported.

Table 4.17

*Hierarchical Regression Analysis: Top Management(TM) Moderating Self Efficacy (SE)–Innovative Behavior (IN) Relationship*

	Innovative Behavior			
	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	Step 4
Gender	-.201	-.202	-.169	-.164
Qualification	-.076	-.077	-.083	-.083
SE		.254***	.204**	.220**
TM			.262***	.270***
SE*TM				.042
R2	.046	.064	.065	.001
F	4.852**	8.273***	10.573***	8.494***
Total R2				.176

Moderated multiple regression result indicates that there is no significant relation between the interaction of self-efficacy and top management support to innovative behavior at 90% confidence level (estimated  $\beta=0.042$ ,  $p>0.1$ ), the coefficient is not significant at 10% as shown in Table 4.17. The moderating effect of Top management support on the relationship between self-efficacy and innovative behavior is not established. Hence, H 4 a was not supported.

Table 4.18

*Hierarchical Regression Analysis: Top Management(TM) Moderating Self Efficacy (SE)–Critical Opinion Sharing (CS) Relationship*

	Critical Opinion Sharing			
	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	Step 4
Gender	-.031	-.032	-.015	-.031
Qualification	-.184	-.185**	-.188**	-.189**
SE		.328***	.301***	.249**
TM			.139*	.113
SE*TM				-.135
R2	.035	.107	.018	.014
F	3.623**	11.050***	9.510***	8.380***
Total R2				.175

Moderated multiple regression result indicates that the interaction of self-efficacy and top management support to Critical Opinion sharing is not significant at

90% confidence level (estimated  $\beta = -.135$ ,  $p > 0.1$ ), the coefficient is not significant as shown in Table 4.18. The moderating effect of Top management support on the relationship between self-efficacy and Critical Opinion sharing is established. Hence, H 4 a was supported.

Table 4.19

*Hierarchical Regression Analysis: Top Management(TM) Moderating Self Efficacy (SE)–Job satisfaction (JS) Relationship*

	Job Satisfaction			
	Step 1 $\beta$	Step 2 $\beta$	Step 3 $\beta$	Step 4 $\beta$
Gender	-.090	-.091	-.026	-.036
Qualification	-.151	-.152	-.165	-.165**
SE		.220**	.121*	.090
TM			.525***	.510***
SE*TM				-.079
R2	.031	.049	.261	.005
F	3.217*	5.760**	25.730***	20.931***
Total R2				.346

Moderated multiple regression result indicates that the interaction of self-efficacy and top management support Job Satisfaction is not significant at 90% confidence level (estimated  $\beta = -.079$ ,  $p > 0.1$ ), the coefficient is not significant as shown in Table 4.19. The moderating effect of Top management support on the relationship between self-efficacy and job satisfaction commitment is not established. Hence, H 4 a was not supported.

Here, the interaction between the self-efficacy and management development outcomes (Job satisfaction, affective commitment, innovative behavior) is not significant to top management support. However, the result shows that top management support does moderate the relationship between self-efficacy and critical opinion sharing.

## Interactive Effect of Top Management on Proactive Personality and Management Development Outcomes

Table 4.20

*Hierarchical Regression Analysis: Top Management(TM) Moderating Proactive Personality (PP) - Affective Commitment (Aff Comm) Relationship*

	Affective Commitment			
	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	Step 4
Gender	-.013	.000	.061	.064
Qualification	-.105	-.079	-.116*	-.112*
PP		.349***	.047	.077
TM			.587***	.599***
PP*TM				.065
R2	.011	.121	.249	.003
F	1.130	10.162***	30.593***	24.650***
Total R2				.384

Moderated multiple regression result indicates that the interaction of self-efficacy and top management support to affective commitment is not significant at 90% confidence level (estimated  $\beta = -0.065$ ,  $p < 0.1$ ), the coefficient is not significant as shown in Table 4.20. The moderating effect of Top management support on the relationship between proactive personality and affective commitment is not established. Hence, H 4 c was not supported.

Table 4.21

*Hierarchical Regression Analysis: Top Management(TM) Moderating Proactive Personality (PP)–Innovative Behavior (IN) Relationship*

	Innovative Behavior			
	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	Step 4
Gender	-.201**	-.185**	-.173**	-.173**
Qualification	-.076	-.045	-.052	-.053
PP		.421***	.363***	.362***
TM			.112	.112
PP*TM				-.001
R2	.046	.176	.009	.000
F	4.852**	19.000***	14.935***	11.888***
Total R2				.231

Moderated multiple regression result indicates that there is no significant relation between the interaction of self-efficacy and top management support to innovative behavior at 90% confidence level (estimated  $\beta = -.001$ ,  $p > 0.1$ ), the model is not significant as shown in Table 4.21. The moderating effect of Top management support on the relationship between proactive personality and innovative behavior is not established. Hence, H 4 c was not supported.

Table 4.22

*Hierarchical Regression Analysis: Top Management(TM) Moderating Proactive Personality (PP)–Critical Opinion Sharing (CS) Relationship*

	Critical Opinion Sharing			
	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	Step 4
Gender	-.031	-.017	-.016	-.023
Qualification	-.184**	-.157*	-.157*	-.165*
PP		.370***	.367***	.302***
TM			.006	-.019
PP*TM				-.144
R2	.035	.136	.000	.014
F	3.623*	13.756***	10.267***	9.006***
Total R2				.185

Moderated multiple regression result indicates that the interaction of self-efficacy and top management support to Critical Opinion sharing is not significant at 90% confidence level (estimated  $\beta = -.144$ ,  $p > 0.1$ ), the coefficient is not significant as shown in Table 4.22. The moderating effect of Top management support on the relationship between proactive personality and Critical Opinion sharing is established. Hence, H 4 c was supported.

Table 4.23

*Hierarchical Regression Analysis: Top Management(TM) Moderating Proactive Personality (PP)–Job satisfaction (JS) Relationship*

	Job Satisfaction			
	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	Step 4
Gender	-.090	-.078	-.024	-.027
Qualification	-.151*	-.127	-.160**	-.164**
PP		.326	.060	.033
TM			.517***	.506***
PP*TM				-.061
R2	.031	.106	.193	.003
F	3.217*	10.570***	24.443***	19.681***
Total R2				.333

Moderated multiple regression result indicates that the interaction of self-efficacy and top management support Job Satisfaction is not significant at 90% confidence level (estimated  $\beta = -.061$ ,  $p > 0.1$ ), the estimated coefficients not significant as shown in Table 4.23. The moderating effect of Top management support on the relationship between proactive personality and job satisfaction commitment is not established. Hence, H 4 c was not supported.

Hence, it can be summarized that the interaction between the proactive personality and management development outcomes (Job satisfaction, affective commitment, and innovative behavior) is not significantly related to top management

support. But the top management support does moderate the relationship between proactive personality and critical opinion sharing.

### Summary of Hypothesis Testing

The regression analysis was used to examine the eight hypothesized direct relationships and eight moderation relationships. The result supported eight direct relationships and a moderate relationship was not supported. The result of the analysis is based on the hierarchical regression model. The summary of the hypothesis result is as in Table

Table 4.24

#### Summary of Hypothesis Testing Results

Hypotheses	Independent Variables	Dependent Variables	Hypothesized Relationship	Finding
H1a	SE	JS	Positive	Supported
H1b	SE	AffComm	Positive	Supported
H1c	SE	IN	Positive	Supported
H1d	SE	CS	Positive	Supported
H2a	LGO	JS	Positive	Not Supported
H2b	LGO	AffComm	Positive	Not Supported
H2c	LGO	IN	Positive	Not Supported
H2d	LGO	CS	Positive	Not Supported
H3a	PP	JS	Positive	Supported
H3b	PP	AffComm	Positive	Supported
H3c	PP	IN	Positive	Supported
H3d	PP	CS	Positive	Supported
H4a	TM	SE and JS, AffComm, IN, CS	Moderating-0	Not Supported
H4b	TM	PP and JS, AffComm, IN, CS	Moderating	Supported Not Supported

Note. SE- Self efficacy, PP- proactive personality, JS- Job satisfaction, AffComm= Affective Commitment, IN- Innovative Behavior and CS- Critical Opinion Sharing

## CHAPTER V

### SUMMARY, DISCUSSION, AND IMPLICATIONS

This chapter summarized the major findings, followed by a discussion on finding and their potential uses. The present study revealed that personal characteristics influence independently management development outcomes as reported by employees. The research and practical implications for further research and practitioners are also presented. At last critique of the study is presented.

#### **Summary of Findings**

The study examined the effect of personal characteristics i.e., Self-efficacy for development, learning goal orientation, and proactive personality on management development outcomes which consists of Job satisfaction, affective commitment, innovative behavior, and critical sharing opinion of public organization employees. The major findings are summarized below based on correlation and regression analysis:

1. The mean value of Self-efficacy is 4.15 and Innovative Behavior is 3.55 out of 5 which is above average. The mean of Proactive personality is 5.5426, top management support is 5.2311, Job satisfaction is 5.5833, and Affective Commitment is 5.5729 out of 7 which is also above average. Critical sharing mean value is 4.5163 out of 6 which is also above average. However, the mean value of learning goal orientation is 1.9306 (out of 6) which is below average.

2. Skewness and Kurtosis were conducted to test the normality, and the results show that all the variables lie between the acceptable range of  $\pm 3$  and  $\pm 10$  respectively. Skewness ranges from 2.301 to  $-0.613$  and kurtosis ranges from  $0.251$  to  $6.070$ .

3. An independent t-test was conducted for gender, and it revealed that Levene's test for equality of variance shows variables do not have any statistically significant difference invariance. However, the t-test for equality of means shows that there is a statistically significant difference between males and females on innovative behavior ( $t= 2.670$ ,  $p>0.05$ ). The mean of males is 3.6361, which suggests that male employees have innovative behavior. Whereas other variables do not have a statistically significant difference between males and females on self-efficacy, learning goal orientation, proactive personality, top management support, job satisfaction, affective commitment, and critical opinion sharing.

4. The descriptive statistics of position indicates that senior managers have high self-efficacy and critical sharing behavior followed by Managers.

5. One way ANOVA of tenure shows that there is no statistically significant relationship between tenure and variables.

6. One way ANOVA results show that qualification does have a significant relationship with critical sharing and job satisfaction. It shows that those respondents who hold MPhil/Ph.D. degree are given critical opinions and are satisfied with their job.

7. The descriptive statistics of age indicate that there are no statistically significant differences among age and the variables.

8. The correlation analysis revealed that there is a positive and significant relationship between both self-efficacy and proactive personality and job satisfaction, affective commitment, innovative behavior, and critical opinion sharing.

9. However, the correlation analysis of learning goal orientation indicated that there is negative and no significant relationship with proactive personality, job

satisfaction, affective commitment, innovative behavior, and critical opinion sharing. Learning goal orientation has a negative but significant relationship with self-efficacy.

10. The result of hierarchical regression reveals that self-efficacy and proactive personality have a positive and significant effect on job satisfaction, affective commitment, innovative behavior, and critical opinion sharing.

11. The hierarchical regression reveals that learning goal orientation is not significantly associated with job satisfaction, affective commitment, innovative behavior, and critical opinion sharing.

12. The moderated regression analysis result revealed that the top management support did not support the relationship between self-efficacy, proactive personality, and Management development outcome except for critical opinion sharing.

13. The hierarchical regression result of top management support with management development outcomes shows that it has a positive and significant relationship.

## **Discussion**

### **Research Question**

“In what ways personal characteristics affect management development outcomes in Public organizations of Nepal and do top management supports moderate the relationship?”

The research question was about the relationship between the personal characteristics of the management trainee with management development outcomes in an organization. The finding shows that there are a positive relationship between personal characteristics, specifically, self-efficacy and proactive personality, and management development outcomes. The finding is partially consistent with the results of other research (Ardts et al., 2010). Thus, the mean value of Job satisfaction

is 5.58, Affective Commitment is 5.57, Innovative Behavior is 3.55 and Critical Opinion Sharing is 4.5163 which are above average. The mean is above average, one of the possible reasons could be that while filling out the questionnaires the respondents might not have considered the management development program attended and its influence on their behavior and might have answered it on their personal behavior. Another reason might be that the questionnaire is perception based, employees do not want to perceive as ineffective, so, they might have overrated themselves (Singh, 2016).

### **Self-Efficacy for Development**

The result indicates that self-efficacy has a positive and significant relationship with job satisfaction (.220). The results do not align with the previous research (Ardts et al., 2010; Wierenga, 2010). One possible explanation for the result might be employees are satisfied with their job as the majority of the respondents are from the banking sectors and training opportunities & compensation packages are relatively high in banks, so, they are satisfied with the overall job. Another reason could be they do not want to show that there are unsatisfied with their banking career, thus, the feedback from their supervisor and human resource manager may only provide a realistic response.

The finding associated with self-efficacy and employee commitment is positive and significant (.214). According to Vance (2006 as cited in Mercurio, 2015), training and development are a factor in fostering affective commitment and it also helps to build self-efficacy and self-esteem leading to affective commitment. Research has shown that management development programs improve employee commitment (affective commitment) (Kuvass & Dysvic, 2010). Those who are satisfied with the development programs are more committed to the organization

(Tansky & Colen, 2001; Nepali, 2016). Moreover, the type of management development program also impacts the level of affective commitment, example a study among MBA graduates shows that assignments with a high level of responsibilities and support from senior management increase the commitment (Cao & Hamori, 2016).

The finding related to innovative behavior and critical opinion sharing is also positively and strongly significant (.254 and .328 respectively). However, previous research shows that self-efficacy is not significantly related to innovative behavior but is significantly related to critical opinion sharing.

### **Learning Goal Orientation**

The result reveals that learning goal orientation is not significantly related to management development outcomes i.e job satisfaction (-.113), affective commitment (-.085), innovative behavior (-.021), and critical opinion sharing.

Studies of Ards et al. (2010) and Wierenga (2010) states that LGO does not have a significant relationship with job satisfaction. However, learning goal orientation is significantly and positively associated with affective commitment Wierenga (2010). In prior studies learning goal orientation is significantly related to innovative behavior and critical opinion sharing (Ards et al., 2010) whereas in this study learning goal orientation does not have a positive and significant relationship with any management development outcome. A possible reason could be learning goal-oriented are more active in learning and enjoy a challenge so they might not stay in one organization for a long period of time if there are no career development opportunities and freedom to work.

The result reveals that learning goal orientation is not significantly related to management development outcomes i.e job satisfaction ( $-.113$ ), affective commitment ( $-.085$ ), innovative behavior ( $-.021$ ), and critical opinion sharing (.....).

### **Proactive Personality**

The result suggested that proactive personality is positive and significant to job satisfaction and affective commitment ( $.326$  and  $.349$  respectively). Research shows that proactive personality led to affective commitment and an employee with a proactive personality is more likely to get involved in the organization (Gudermann, 2010).

Proactive personality is positively and strongly associated with innovative behavior and critical opinion sharing. Consistent with prior research Ardts et al., (2010) and Ahmad (2016) also found that proactive personality has an impact on innovative behavior but not critical opinion sharing.

It can be concluded that proactive personality and affective commitment have a strong relationship. Thus, employees with a proactive personality are more likely to get involved in the organization as described by Allen and Meyer (1990). This is connected with more positive work experience and higher affective commitment.

### **Top Management Support**

Personal characteristics and management development outcomes were not moderated by top management support except critical opinion sharing. The employee may perceive that top management does not support the management development training, and development activities are not adequate as required.

The finding of gender suggests that gender was related to innovative behavior however previous research shows that gender is not related to innovative behaviors (Ardts et al., 2010). And qualification is related to critical opinion sharing and job

satisfaction. It has revealed that those who hold MPhil/Ph.D. are satisfied with their job and are critical opinions sharing.

### **Implications of the Study**

The present study contributes to new knowledge about the relationship between individual characteristics and management development outcomes. The results of the management development outcomes can be used by the organization. The study revealed that management development is an important means of developing the manager for sustaining a competitive advantage. Nepali organizations could consider developing MD strategy, plan, and policies in alignment with the organizational strategy for more effective outcomes.

Self-efficacy is found to be positive and significantly related to management development outcomes. So, it can be considered as one of the important dimensions employees needs to have and even the study has shown that self-efficacy can be developed among the employees. Therefore, to make employees participate in learning and development activities, the organization can use techniques to enhance the belief capacity of the employee to execute behaviors necessary to achieve the performance (Maurer, 1994).

Also, an organization might take into consideration the level of self-efficacy when choosing an employee for development programs. As people with high self-efficacy will learn more from the training and will be more likely to transfer the learning into job performance (Lunenburg, n.d.).

Research shows that training outcomes are influenced by both individual and situation characteristics. Thus, the HR manager needs to incorporate and understand the individual characteristics while involving them in the learning activities and also while recruiting and selecting individuals in the organization.

The job, work environment, and individual characteristics play an important role in positive MD outcomes. Therefore, HR, supervisor, and top management need to create a learning environment where employees are given opportunities and trained according to the need of the individual.

### **Research Implications**

MD is not a new concept in Nepal. MD is taken as a part of training and development activities, so there is a need to understand the view of MD in the organization from both individual and management perspectives across different organizations.

This study has analyzed from individual characteristics. Outcomes are also determined on the basis of social support, environmental, and management development characteristics (such as design, trainer, and content, understand MDP, availability of role model, etc). Thus, incorporating these variables might result in a different and new perspective on the outcomes.

The study showed that top management support is not related to management development outcomes, thus further research should explore whether supervisor support and social support moderates the relationship between the individual characteristics and management development outcomes.

The study found that learning goal orientation is not related to management development outcomes; however, a study in western context result shows a positive and significant relationship with the variables. Therefore, further studies should consider other individual characteristics such as motivation to learn, feedback for more positive outcomes.

Further research could also explore the relationship between management development methods and management development outcomes with moderating and

mediating effects of individual characteristics. This can also help to understand the effect of management development methods on the outcomes, which may help the organizations to adopt the methods more appropriate to enhance the capability of individual and better performance.

### **Critique of the Study**

This study has some methodological limitations that should be discussed.

First, in the study, all the variables were measured by self-reports i.e., on the perception of the employees. Self-reports are subjected to all kinds of response bias and it could be affected by common method variance (Podaskoff et.al.2003).

The study adopted quantitative methodology, to better understand the behavior of the employee and the impact on the result, qualitative or mixed-method study methodology with the different stakeholder (e.g., HR manager, supervisor and peer) should be carried out so as to strengthen the result and give an enrich perceptively on the area.

Second, the data set has a limitation of lack of generalizability, the sample was taken from banks and two government organizations. In order to generalize the result, future research should examine the influence of individual characteristics and management development effectiveness on different organizational contexts/sectors.

Third, the questionnaire was distributed through Google form and in some organizations through Human Resource Manager. As the questionnaire was completed by anonymous and distributed through HR and the Head of the organization there may be a possibility of bias.

Fourth, the design of the study was cross-sectional. Due to time constraints, the study was conducted in a one-time study which may not be able to capture the perpetual variables. It would be more appropriate to conduct a longitudinal study. The

study consists of behavioral outcomes, and those outcomes could be better captured through before and after training.

Fifth, the study has included personal characteristics and organizational characteristics to understand the effectiveness of MD, MD design and other characteristics are also as important as thus future research should consider the MD characteristics for a robust result.

Sixth, due to the pandemic of COVID 19, the sample size is limited to 204 only and it incorporates only banks and two government organizations. The distribution through Google form was not effective and thus later hard copy questionnaires had to be sent to the HR manager for data collection. Due to the limited number of data, employees who had been working for more than one year were considered. The analysis would be better if data were collected from the employee who has been working in the same organizations for three years and is working at a senior officer level and above. Thus, the generalization of the study is limited and should be considered in that field only. The ability to generalize is stronger if the same study is done in different places with different people and at different times. (Trochim, 2008, as cited Singh, 2016)

Lastly, most of the bank's employees were involved in functional and technical training; therefore, identifying the employee who had participated in management-related training was difficult.

## REFERENCES

- Adams, D., & Waddle, C. (2002). Evaluating the return from management development programmes: Individual returns versus organizational benefits. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality, 14*(1), 14-20.
- Ahmad, K. (2009). *Management development: Its influence on innovative behavior and the moderating role of proactively* (Master's thesis). University of Twente, Netherland.
- Akuratiyagamage, V. M. (2006). Management development practices: Empirical evidence from Sri Lanka. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management, 17*(9), 1606-1624.
- Al Shaar, E. M., Khattab, S. A., Alkaied, R. N., & Manna, A. Q. (2015). The effect of top management support on innovation: The mediating role of synergy between organizational structure and information technology. *International Review of Management and Business Research, 4*(2), 499.
- Alam, A. A. S. (2016). The effects of self efficacy on organizational commitment: A survey on junior executives working in the private sector of Bangladesh. *Management, 30*(1&2).
- Ardts, J. C., van der Velde, M. E., & Maurer, T. J. (2010). The influence of perceived characteristics of management development programs on employee outcomes. *Human Resource Development Quarterly, 21*(4), 411-434.
- Bandura, A., & Schunk, D. H. (1981). Cultivating competence, self-efficacy, and intrinsic interest through proximal self-motivation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 41*(3), 586.
- Becker, K., & Bish, A. (2017). Management development experiences and expectations: Informal vs formal learning. *Education+ Training, 565-578*.

- Berry, J. K. (1990). Linking management development to business strategies. *Training & Development Journal*, 44(8), 20-23.
- Birdi, K., Allan, C., & Warr, P. (1997). Correlates and perceived outcomes of 4 types of employee development activity. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82(6), 845-857.
- Brett, J. F., & VandeWalle, D. (1999). Goal orientation and goal content as predictors of performance in a training program. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 84(6), 863.
- Brown, T. C., Warren, A. M., & Khattar, V. (2016). The effects of different behavioral goals on transfer from a management development program. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 27(3), 349-372.
- Burgoyne, J. (1988). The individual and organization. *Personnel Management*, 40-44.
- Cao, J., & Hamori, M. (2016). The impact of management development practices on organizational commitment. *Human Resource Management*, 55(3), 499-517.
- Cianni, M., & Bussard, D. (1994). CEO beliefs, management development, and corporate strategy: An exploratory study. *Group & Organization Management*, 19(1), 51-66.
- Cloete, C. (2015). *Evaluation of middle management development program within the South African Policy Service* (Doctoral dissertation). Stellenbosch University, Stellenbosch.
- Cullen, J., & Turnbull, S. (2005). A meta-review of the management development literature. *Human Resource Development Review*, 4(3), 335-355.
- Cunningham, C. (2012). Designing effective management-development programs. *Employment Relations Today*, 38(4), 27-33.

- Dastgeer, G., & Rehman, A. (2012). Effectiveness of management development in Pakistan corporate sector: Testing the D'Netto Model. *Journal of Management Development*, 740-751.
- Digman, L. A. (1980). How companies evaluate management development programs. *Human Resource Management*, 19(2), 9-13.
- D'Netto, B., Bakas, F., & Bordia, P. (2008). Predictors of management development effectiveness: An Australian perspective. *International Journal of Training and Development*, 12(1), 2-23.
- Erdogan, B., & Bauer, T. N. (2005). Enhancing career benefits of employee proactive personality: The role of fit with jobs and organizations. *Personnel Psychology*, 58(4), 859-891.
- Fang, M. (2001). *Job characteristics and self-efficacy as predictors of Las Vegas* (Unpublished thesis). University of Nevada.
- Francoeur, C., Labelle, R., & Sinclair-Desgagné, B. (2008). Gender diversity in corporate governance and top management. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 81(1), 83-95.
- Garavan, T. N., Barnicle, B., & O'Suilleabhain, F. (1999). Management development: Contemporary trends, issues and strategies. *Journal of European Industrial Training*, 191-207.
- Gist, M. E., & Mitchell, T. C. (1992). Self-efficacy: A theoretical analysis of its determinants and malleability. *The Academy of Management Review*, 55(1), 5-14.
- Gnawali, A. (2018). Human resource development practices: Empirical evidence from Nepal Rastra Bank. *Kathford Journal of Engineering and Management*, 57-63.

- Goodge, P. (1998). How do we make management development effective? *Journal of Management Development*, 83-87.  
<https://doi.org/10.1108/02621719810368727>
- Greguras, G. J., & Diefendorff, J. M. (2010). Why does proactive personality predict employee life satisfaction and work behaviors? A field investigation of the mediating role of the self-concordance model. *Personnel Psychology*, 63(3), 539-560.
- Gudermann, M. (2011). *The relationship between proactive personality, affective commitment and the role of job stressors* (Bachelor's thesis). University of Twente.
- Jansen, P., & Velde, M. V. (2001). A typology of management development. *Journal of Management Development*, 106-120.
- Juhdi, N., Yazit, F., Jusoh, W. J., & Supar, N. (2015). Management development programs and the readiness for changes: A study in Malaysia. *International Journal of Accounting & Business Management*, 376-384.
- Khan, N., Tayal, S., & Khalique, F. (2015). Understanding management development techniques for organization and employee growth: A conceptual study. *Advances in Economics and Business Management*, 800-804.
- Kyle, J. D. (1986). Essentials of Management Development. *Business Quarterly*, 36-45.
- Lagat, C., & Makau, M. S. (2018). Management development: A conceptual framework based on literature review: A research agenda. *European Journal of Social Sciences*, 65-76.

- Lee, J. Y., Park, S., & Baker, R. (2018). The moderating role of top management support on employees' attitudes in response to human resource development efforts. *Journal of Management & Organization*, 24(3), 369-387.
- Lee, O. F., Tan, J. A., & Javalgi, R. (2010). Goal orientation and organizational commitment Individual difference predictors of job performance. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, 18(1), 129-150.
- Li, N., Liang, J., & Crant, J. M. (2010). The role of proactive personality in job satisfaction and organizational citizenship behavior: A relational perspective. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 95(2), 395-404.
- Lisiński, M., & Szarucki, M. (2011). Exploring management development programs in MNCs. Example of Eads group. *Business, Management and Education*, 9(1), 93-108.
- Longenecker, C. O., & Fink, L. S. (2001). Improving management performance in rapidly changing organizations. *Journal of Management Development*, 20(1), 7-18.
- Longenecker, C. O., & Neubert, M. (2003). The management development needs of front-line managers: Voices from the field. *Career Development International*, 8(4), 210-218.
- Luoma, M. (2005). Manager's perceptions of the strategic role of management development. *Journal of Management Development*, 2, 615-655.
- Luthans, F., Lyman, D., & Lockwood, D. L. (1978). An individual management development approach. *Human Resource Management*, 17(3), 1-5.
- Mabey, C., & Ramirez, M. (2005). Does management development improve organizational productivity? A six-country analysis of European firms. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 16(7), 1067-1082.

- Maurer, T. J., & Tarulli, B. A. (1994). Investigation of perceived environment, perceived outcome, and person variables in relationship to voluntary development activity by employees. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 79*(1), 3-14.
- Maurer, T. J., Lippstreu, M., & Judge, T. A. (2008). Structural model of employee involvement in skill development activity: The role of individual differences. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 72*(3), 336-350.
- Maurer, T. J., Wrenn, K. A., Pierce, H. R., Tross, S. A., & Collins, W. C. (2003). Beliefs about 'improvability' of career-relevant skills: Relevance to job/task analysis, competency modelling, and learning orientation. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 24*(1), 107-131.
- Meldrum, M., & Atkinson, S. (1998). Is management development fulfilling its organizational role? *Management Decision, 36*(8), 528-532.
- Mercurio, Z. A. (2015). Affective commitment as a core essence of organizational commitment: An integrative literature review. *Human Resource Development Review, 14*(4), 389-414.
- Momeni, M., Ebrahimpour, H., & Ajirloo, M. B. (2014). The effect of employees' self-efficacy on innovative work behavior at social security organization employees in Ardabil province. *Kuwait Chapter of the Arabian Journal of Business and Management Review, 3*(8), 29-38.
- Neo, R. A., & Wilk, S. L. (1993). Investigation of the factors that influence employee's participation in development activities. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 291*-302.

- Nepali, T. N. (2016). Employee development program in Agriculture development bank limited of Nepal: A survey. *The Nepalese Management Review*, 2(1), 37-47.
- Ngure, H. M., & Juma, D. (2018). Factor influencing management training effectiveness in commercial banks in Kenya: A case of Cooperative Bank of Kenya, Nairobi County. *Journal of Business and Change Management*, 1387-1414.
- Noe, R. A., & Wilk, S. L. (1993). Investigation of the factors that influence employee's participation in development activities. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78(2), 291-302.
- Nuraini, E., Hermawan, A., Hubeis, A. V., & Panjaitan, N. K. (2015). The impact of management development program to employees, job performances of a telecommunication company in Indonesia. *European Journal of Business and Management*, 7(11), 161-168.
- Powell, K. S., & Yalcin, S. (2010). Managerial training effectiveness: A meta-analysis. *Personnel Review*, 39(2), 227-241.
- Reitsma, S. G. (2001). Management development in unilever. *Journal of Management Development*, 20(2), 131-144. doi:10.1108/02621710110382150
- Sazandrishvili, N. (2009). *Contextual and personal antecedents of innovative behavior* (Master's thesis). University of Twente, Netherland.
- Seibert, S. E., Crant, J. M., & Kraimer, M. L. (1999). Proactive personality and career success. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 84(3), 416-427.
- Sekaran, U., & Bougie, R. (2015). *Research methods for business* (5<sup>th</sup>ed.). Delhi: Wiley.

- Singh, S. (2016). *Trainee characteristics and transfer of training: Effects of supervisory support* (MPhil thesis). Kathmandu University School of Management, Lalitpur, Nepal.
- Smith, E. (2012). *Assessment of the effectiveness of development activities*. Digital Commons @URI.
- Suutari, V., & Viitala, R. (2008). Management development of senior executive's methods and their effectiveness. *Personnel Review*, 37(4), 375-392.
- Tansky, J. W., & Cohen, D. J. (2001). The relationship between organizational support, employee development, and organizational commitment: An empirical study. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 12(3), 285-300.
- Tell, J. (2016). An informal approach to management development at small and medium-sized manufacturing companies. *International Journal of Information and Operations Management Education*, 6(2), 135-146.
- VandeWalle, D. (1997). Development and Validation of a work domain goal orientation instruments. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 57(6), 995-1015.
- VandeWalle, D., & Cummings, L. L. (1997). A test of the influence of goal orientation on the feedback-seeking process. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82(3), 390-400. doi:10.1037//0021-9010.82
- Vloeberghs, D. (1998). Management development in a context of drastic changes. *Journal of Management Development*, 17(9), 644-661.
- Werner, J. M., & Desimone, R. L. (2012). *Human resource development* (6<sup>th</sup>ed.). New York, NY: South Western Cengage Learning.

- Wierenga, M. (2010). *On the road to developing knowledge: A study on the effectiveness of management development Programmes* (Master's thesis). University of Twente.
- Winterton, J., & Winterton, R. (1997). Does management development add value? *British Journal of Management*, 8, 65-76.
- Woodall, J. (2000). Corporate support for work-based management development. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 10(1), 18-32.
- Wright, P. C., & Belcourt, M. (1994). Management development. *International Journal of Career Management*, 6(5), 3-10.

## Appendix I

### Questionnaire

Dear Respondent,

I am conducting this survey for an academic research as required by the MPhil program. The title of my research is "**Personal Characteristics and Management Development Effectiveness: Role of Top Management**". Management Development (MD) is one of the important tools of developing competent managers for organizations. MD is an organization effort to provide its managers (and potential managers) with opportunities to learn, grow and change, and equip them with the necessary skills and competencies that are required for the present and future. The study focus on the management development outcomes in context to what you feel about the outcomes from participating in the management development programs.

So, we request you that while responding to the statement mentioned below please answer the statements keeping in mind your engagement / participation in management development program in last three years.

This questionnaire serves as an important data collection tool for the analysis of the constructs in consideration for this research.

I would like to state that this research is purely for an academic purpose and I am simply interested in your candid and honest opinion. I assure you that strict confidentiality will be maintained and the information furnished by you will be used only for the academic purpose. It will take you about **20 minutes** to complete this questionnaire survey.

Thanking you for your cooperation.

JyotiPradhan

M.Phil Scholar, Kathmandu University School of Management (KUSOM)

#### Part I

Please provide the following information about yourself. All information will be kept confidential

<b>Organization</b>	
<b>Department</b>	
<b>Present position: ( Please Tick)</b>	a. Manager b. Senior Officer c. Officer d. Other, if any, Please specify .....
<b>Your job tenure ( in years)</b>	
<b>Gender</b>	a. Male                      b. Female
<b>Qualification (Highest Degree) (Pick Tick)</b>	1. MPhil / PhD 2. Master Degree 3. Bachelor Degree
<b>Age</b>	a. Under 25      b. 25 – 35      c. 36 – 45      d. 46 – 55      e. Over 55
<b>Marital Status</b>	1. Single    2. Married    3. Divorced / Separated    4. Widowed

## Part II

## Participation in Management Development Program

Have you participated in the following management development program in the last three years?

1. Have you participated in In house management Development training Programs?  
 a. Yes  
 b. No

If Yes , (Please tick the number of training you participated and also please Specify )

	Number of Training	Name of the Training	Duration
a.	One	1.	
b.	Two	1.	
		2.	
c.	Three	1.	
		2.	
		3.	
d.	Four	1.	
		2.	
		3.	
		4.	

2. Have you participated in External Management Development Training Program (organized by MAN, NBI)?  
 a. Yes  
 b. No

If Yes, (Please tick the number of training you participated and also please specify the training and the duration)

	Number of Training	Name of the Training	Duration
a.	One	1.	
b.	Two	1.	
		2.	
c.	Three	1.	
		2.	
		3.	
d.	Four	1.	
		2.	

		3.	
		4.	
3.	Have you participated in International Management Development Training Program? a. Yes b. No		
	If Yes, (Please tick the number of training you participated and also please specify the training and the duration)		
	Number of Training	Name of the Training	Duration
a.	One	1.	
b.	Two	1.	
		2.	
c.	Three	1.	
		2.	
		3.	
4.	Management Education (After joining this organization) Degree Earned: _____ Year: _____		

### PART III

**Instruction:** Below are several statements about the behaviors that you may agree or disagree. Please indicate your level of agreement by circling the number that best reflects your feelings:

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Uncertain	Agree	Strongly Agree
1. If I were to participate in a development activity (workshop, course, etc.), my success in that activity would be at least comparable to most other participants.	1	2	3	4	5
2. If I took part in a career-related workshop, seminar, or course, I would probably learn at least as much as anyone else.	1	2	3	4	5
3. I could succeed and learn as well as the next person in a class designed to improve skills.	1	2	3	4	5
4. I could learn as well as most other participants in a developmental learning activity.	1	2	3	4	5

	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Agree	Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. I often read materials related to my work to improve my ability	1	2	3	4	5	6
2. I am willing to select a challenging work assignment that I can learn a lot from	1	2	3	4	5	6
3. I often look for opportunities to develop new skills and knowledge	1	2	3	4	5	6
4. I enjoy challenging and difficult tasks at work where I'll learn new skills	1	2	3	4	5	6
5. For me, development of my work ability is important enough to take risks	1	2	3	4	5	6
6. I prefer to work in situations that requires a high level of ability and talents	1	2	3	4	5	6

	Strongly disagree	Moderately Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Slightly Agree	Moderately Agree	Strongly Agree
1. I am constantly on the lookout for new ways to improve my life	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2. Wherever I have been, I have been a powerful force for constructive change	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3. Nothing is more exciting than seeing my ideas turn into reality	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4. If I see something I don't like, I fix it	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5. No matter what the odds, if I believe in something I will make it happen	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
6. I love being a champion for my ideas, even against others' opposition	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
7. I excel at identifying opportunities	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8. I am always looking for better ways to do things	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
9. If I believe in an idea, no obstacle will prevent me from making it happen	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
10. I can spot a good opportunity long before others can	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

**Instruction:** Below are the statements which reflect the support of top management in regard to management development Program and activities in your organization. Please indicate your level of agreement by circling the number that best reflects your feelings:

	Strongly disagree	Moderately Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Slightly Agree	Moderately Agree	Strongly Agree
1. Management development programs are perceived as a priority	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2. Top management supports management development	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3. Senior managers conduct in-house management development programs	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4. My organization spends an adequate amount of money on management development programs	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5. Management development is perceived positively	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
6. Senior management always chooses the right people for management development programs	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
7. Management development programs are not perceived as a perk	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

**Instruction:** Below are the statements which reflect the outcomes of management development programs in context to your participation in the programs. Please indicate your level of agreement by circling the number that best reflects your feelings:

	Strongly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Neither Agree Nor	Slightly Agree	Moderately Agree	Strongly Agree
1. In general, I am satisfied with my current job	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2. I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career with this organization	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3. I enjoy discussing my organization with people outside it	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4. I really feel as if this organization's problems are my own	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5. I think that I could not easily become as attached to organization as I am to this one ®	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

6. I do feel like 'part of the family' at my organization®	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
7. I do feel emotionally attached to this organization ®	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8. This organization has a great deal of personal meaning for me	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
9. I do feel a strong sense of belonging to my organization ®	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

	Not at All	Slightly	Moderately	Very	To an Exceptional
1. I am someone who searches out new technologies, processes, techniques, and/or product ideas.	1	2	3	4	5
2. I am someone who generates creative ideas.	1	2	3	4	5
3. I promote and champions ideas to others,	1	2	3	4	5
4. Investigates and secures funds needed to implement new ideas.	1	2	3	4	5
5. I develop adequate plans and schedules for the implementation of new ideas.	1	2	3	4	5
6. I am innovative	1	2	3	4	5

	Totally disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Totally Agree
1. I come up with ideas how things could be organized differently here.	1	2	3	4	5	6
2. I make suggestions to my supervisor about a different working method.	1	2	3	4	5	6
3. I give my opinion about developments at work.	1	2	3	4	5	6
4. I call this organization's policy into question.	1	2	3	4	5	6
5. I put critical questions to my supervisor about the working of this organization.	1	2	3	4	5	6
6. I make suggestions to my colleagues about a different working method.	1	2	3	4	5	6

Thank you for your time and cooperation!!

## Appendix II

	<b>Self-Efficacy for Development ( 4 Items)</b> Maurer and Tarulli (1994) Five-point response scale ranging from “Strongly Disagree” to “Strongly Agree.”
1.	If I were to participate in a development activity (workshop, course, etc.), my success in that activity would be at least comparable to most other participants.
2.	If I took part in a career-related workshop, seminar, or course, I would probably learn at least as much as anyone else.
3.	I could succeed and learn as well as the next person in a class designed to improve skills.
4.	I could learn as well as most other participants in a developmental learning activity.
	<b>Learning Goal Orientation ( 6 Items )</b> VandeWalle (1997) Six scale ranging from “strongly agree to strongly disagree”
5.	I often read materials related to my work to improve my ability
6.	I am willing to select a challenging work assignment that I can learn a lot from
7.	I often look for opportunities to develop new skills and knowledge
8.	I enjoy challenging and difficult tasks at work where I'll learn new skills
9.	For me, development of my work ability is important enough to take risks
10.	I prefer to work in situations that requires a high level of ability and talents
	<b>Proactive Personality ( 10 Items)</b> Scale Seibert and colleagues (1999). ( Likert Scale from “absolutely false to absolutely true”
11.	I am constantly on the lookout for new ways to improve my life]
12.	Wherever I have been, I have been a powerful force for constructive change
13.	Nothing is more exciting than seeing my ideas turn into reality
14.	If I see something I don't like, I fix it
15.	No matter what the odds, if I believe in something I will make it happen
16.	I love being a champion for my ideas, even against others' opposition
17.	I excel at identifying opportunities
18.	I am always looking for better ways to do things
19.	If I believe in an idea, no obstacle will prevent me from making it happen
20.	I can spot a good opportunity long before others can
	<b>Top Management Support ( 7 Items)</b> D'Netto, Bakas and Bordia (2008) Seven Scale ranging from “Strongly Disagree to Strongly Agree”
21.	Management development programs are perceived as a priority

22.	Top management supports management development
23.	Senior managers conduct in-house management development programs
24.	My organization spends an adequate amount of money on management development programs
25.	Management development is perceived positively
26.	Senior management always chooses the right people for management development programs
27.	Management development programs are not perceived as perk
	<b>Perceived Benefits of Developmental Activities ( 11 Items)</b> Maurer and Taurlli (2003) Five Scale ranging from "Strongly Disagree to Strongly Agree"
28.	If I participate in training and learning activities, I will be more well rounded and a better person overall, at work and outside of work.
29.	Training and development activities are likely to help me develop and reach my full potential as a person.
30.	Training and development activity participation will help my personal development, self-esteem, self-confidence, etc. (R)
31.	I think learning and development activities related to my career would be very beneficial to me.
32.	Career-related training and development activities seem very worthwhile to me.
33.	If I participate in work-relevant learning activities, my work would likely be more interesting as a result.
34.	My participation in learning or training activities will make a difference in how interesting my work is.
35.	I am likely to get more interesting work assignments and more stimulating work if I participate in training and development activities.
36.	Better pay or other rewards are likely to result from my participation in training and development activities
37.	Training and learning activities helps me get better pay or other
38.	Participation in learning activities will help me get promotions into higher level jobs with better pay and rewards.
	<b>Management Development Satisfaction ( 1 Item)</b> Maurer et.al (2010) Seven Scale ranging from "Strongly Disagree to Strongly Agree"

39.	In general, I am satisfied with the management development program I am part of
	<b>Job Satisfaction ( 1 Item)</b> Hackman and Oldham (1976) Seven Scale ranging from "Strongly Disagree to Strongly Agree"
40.	In general, I am satisfied with my current job
	<b>Affective organization Commitment ( 5 Items)</b> Allen and Myer (1990, 1996) Seven Scale ranging from "Strongly Disagree to Strongly Agree"
41.	I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career with this organization
42.	I enjoy discussing my organization with people outside it
43.	I really feel as if this organization's problems are my own
44.	I think that I could easily become as attached to organization as I am to this one ®
45.	I do not feel like ' part of the family' at my organization®
46.	This organization has a great deal of personal meaning for me
47.	I do not feel a strong sense of belonging to my organization ®
	<b>Innovative Behavior ( 6 Items)</b> Scott and Bruce 1994 Five Scale ranging from "Not all to exceptional degree."
48.	I am someone who searches out new technologies, processes, techniques, and/or product ideas.
49.	I am someone who generates creative ideas.
50.	I promote and champions ideas to others,
51.	Investigates and secures funds needed to implement new ideas.
52.	I develop adequate plans and schedules for the implementation of new ideas.
53.	I am innovative