

The Effects of Different Managerial Levels on Training Effectiveness



Mohammad Tamzid

Assistant Professor, Green Business School Green University of Bangladesh

ABSTRACT

Purpose: The main focus point of this research is to look into the effectiveness of training at various levels of management. It will aid firms in developing more effective training techniques for various levels of management.

Methodology: The quantitative technique is used in this study. The survey approach is used in the study to obtain data. The replies were collected using a random sampling method. Managers from various private firms in Dhaka, Bangladesh, who have undergone various training and are also involved in the training of their employees, are among the respondents. We utilized Cochran's method to determine the proper sample size for the survey. One-Way ANOVA (Analysis of Variance) was used to evaluate the gathered data.

Findings: The value of F is 45.153, which has a p-value of .000 which is less than the .05 alpha level, indicating that it is significant. As a result, there is a statistically significant variation in the effectiveness of training at various levels of managers.

Originality/Value: When developing training for the organization's various levels of managers, it's important to remember that the training's outcomes will change owing to the variances in the managers' levels. Training will undoubtedly increase the general performance of managers at all levels, but not at a very high level for top management.

KEYWORDS: *Level; Manager; Training Effectiveness. JEL Code: M1, M5*

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Study

Employees are regarded as a business's most important asset since the performance of its employees determines whether the firm succeeds or fails (Shahzadi, Javed, Pirzada, Nasreen & Khanam, 2014). Employees are needed in businesses because their skills allow them to do a certain task (Vukajlović, Brzaković & Ćurčić, 2016). Individuals with certain skills are either hired or developed through companies that offer training opportunities (Kuruppu, Kavirathne & Karunarathna, 2021). Every industry must deal with activities that assist them in meeting their goals. Many researches have indicated that there are strong links between training techniques and various indicators of employees' output (Niazi, 2011). Performance is defined as the attainment of predetermined goals in precision, fullness, budget, and speed (Sultana et al., 2012).

Top-level, middle-level, and first-level management are the three levels of management in most businesses. These three major staff levels constitute a hierarchy in which they are rated in order of significance (Jones, & Jennifer, 2006). Additionally, there are variances in the sorts of work that each level performs and the functions that they play in their occupations (DuBrin, 2016).

A person's training requirements cannot be identical to those of another, because people with low credentials need a lot of training and a lot of motivation to perform beside those who have higher credentials (Newton, 2006). As a result, it is critical for businesses to provide structured training to their various levels of employees, as they are the ones who make up the company (Hassan, Razi, Qamar, Jaffir & Suhail, 2013).

1.2 Problem Statement

Several research (Harel & Tzafirir, 1999; Deros, Saibani, Yunos, Rahman & Ghani, 2012) have shown a strong link between training costs and organizational effectiveness. The authors of a research (Karim, Abduh, Manda, & Yunus, 2018) discuss a professional approach to training that is practice-based. In another research (Aragón-Sánchez, Barba-Aragón, & Sanz-Valle, 2003), the authors claim that owing to a lack of funding, time, and measurement mechanisms for identifying the changes that arise from training, many organizations' training evaluations are not carried out professionally or at all. Few studies focused on the efficacy of training (Urbancová, Vrabcová, Hudáková & Petru, 2021; Karim et al., 2018; Deros et al., 2012), but none on the influence of different levels of management. As a result, this subject needs to be better explored, and therefore more study should be done.

The Effects of Different Managerial Levels on Training Effectiveness

1.3 Objective of the Study

The purpose of this study is to look into the effectiveness of training at various levels of management. It will assist firms in developing better training programs, which will increase the competences of various levels of management, allowing the organization to function better in order to meet its objectives.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

The human resources quality of a company has a substantial influence on its performance. Managers are members of an organization who are accountable for the work performance of other members of the organization (Koontz, Weihrich and Cannice, 2020). Managers have formal authority to take decisions and allocate resources inside the company. Among hr techniques, training seems to be a more formidable weapon, because it promotes the growth of employees' expertise and talents (Urbancová et al., 2021).

2.1 Management Levels

Of course, not all managers are the same, and neither is the work that they do. We may categorize managers based on their organizational level, among other factors. Despite the fact that large corporations frequently have several levels of management, the most common strategy consists of top level, middle level, and first-line managers (Griffin, 2021).

2.1.1 Top Managers

High-level managers, often known as top managers, are referred to as senior management or executives. The top managers are a limited group of executives that oversee the whole organization (Koontz et al. 2020). At the top levels of an organization some of the titles held by these individuals are President, Vice President, Chief Executive Officer (CEO), Chief Financial Officer (CFO), Chief Operational Officer (COO), Chief Information Officer (CIO), Chairperson of the Board, and Corporate Head (Williams, 2000; Griffin, 2021). The goals, overarching strategy, and operating policies of a company are created by top administrators. In order to represent the company in the outside world, they also contact with government officials, CEOs from other firms, and so on (Lee & Teece, 2013). Top executives make decisions that have far-reaching consequences for the whole organization. Top executives aren't in control of daily operations. Rather than, they set organizational objectives and direct the firm toward achieving them (Mintzberg, 1975).

2.1.2 Middle Managers

In most businesses, middle management is the largest category of managers. Plant manager, regional manager, operations manager, and division head are all common middle-management roles (Koontz et al. 2020; Griffin, 2021). Middle managers are in charge of putting senior managers' policies and plans into action, as well as monitoring and coordinating the actions of lower-level managers (Rue & Lloyd, 2003).

The aims of higher management are carried out by middle managers. They achieve this by creating goals for their sections and other corporate units (Mintzberg, 1975). By inspiring and assisting first-line managers, middle managers could assist them achieve their objectives. Top management can also interact with middle managers through recommendations and criticism (Lee & Teece, 2013). As they're more engaged in the daily organizational activities, middle managers may be able to provide helpful information to senior managers in order to help improve the organization's bottom line. The tasks and salary for mid-level management roles vary significantly. Based on the scale of the company and the quantity of middle-level managers on staff, middle managers may oversee a small group of individuals or manage outsized groups, such as an entire business location. Middle managers could have been raised from first-level management positions within the organization or appointed externally. In the future, many middle managers may be considered joining the executive team (Griffin, 2021).

Many companies have reduced the number of middle managers in recent years in order to cut expenses and eliminate unnecessary bureaucracy (DuBrin, 2016). Nonetheless, middle managers are required to bridge the gap between the higher and lower levels of the company and to put top-down policies into action. Although many businesses have discovered that they can thrive with fewer middle managers, those who remain have an even greater influence in deciding the organization's success (Lee & Teece, 2013).

2.1.3 First Line Managers

Managers on the first line are also known as supervisors or first-level managers. The actions of operational personnel are overseen and coordinated by first-line supervisors (Griffin, 2021). Supervisors, coordinators, office managers, department managers, foremen, crew leaders, and store managers are all common titles for first-line managers (Koontz et al. 2020; Griffin, 2021). Employees who go into management from the ranks of operating people frequently start in positions like this. First-line managers, in contrast to top and middle managers, often spend a significant percentage of their time supervising the work of subordinates (Williams, 2000; Rue & Lloyd, 2003).

On a regular basis, first-line managers oversee line workers, who are also the ones who actually produce a product or give the service (DuBrin, 2016). A first-line manager is assigned to each work unit in the firm. Despite the fact that first-level managers rarely create objectives of the organization, they have a substantial effect on the company. Most workers have regular interaction with these supervisors, and if they perform poorly, they may underperform, lack motivation, or leave the company (Mintzberg, 1975). Most

The Effects of Different Managerial Levels on Training Effectiveness

first-line managers used to be elevated from lower-level positions for example, production or clerical jobs. Most of these workers just have a little formal education. On the other hand, many first-line managers have a trade school diploma, a two-year associates degree, or a four-year bachelor's degree (Koontz et al. 2020).

2.2 Training

Training and development is indeed one of the HRM tasks that aims to improve performance of its employees (Kuruppu et al., 2021). Several occupations and titles in businesses have gotten redundant and excessive as a result of modern technology developments. As a result, businesses demand highly skilled employees, and people must be competent and trained in way to sustain their jobs. Training has been characterized in a variety of ways by different scholars. Many authors have defined training as just a way of enhancing employment skills and expertise so that a person can do their present job more successfully. As an illustration, Training, according to Becker (1962), is an initiative that improves work efficiency (Somasundaram & Egan, 2004). They didn't see training as a tool for bringing about a long-term transformation in employee attitudes in such a situation. After 1970, several writers defined training as a systematic way of imparting knowledge to employees and even an instrument for influencing employee behavior. Campbell, Dunnette, Lawler, and Weich (1970) define training as an intentional learning process aiming at permanently transforming an employee's talents, expertise, and mindsets. (Somasundaram & Egan, 2004). Training was defined by Holder (1985) as "a process of learning to improve job performance that is directly related to a particular job" (Somasundaram & Egan, 2004). A more current definition of training, according to Hassan et al. (2013), is an organized approach targeted at improving people's job efficiency. As per Kulkarni (2013), training is a mechanism that promotes employee performance and organizational progress by assisting in the smooth and flawless operation of work.

Employee training is a tool that businesses may use to mold their employees' abilities and help them reach their full capacity. It is a systematic method of improving employee motivation as well as work behavior and competency levels (knowledge, talents, and skills) (Shahzadi et al.2014; Demerouti & Peeters, 2018). This contributes to closing the gap between subjective qualifications (the capacity to act and use competences to achieve the organization's goals) and objective qualifications (the highest degree of education achieved and requirements imposed on employees) and increasing labor productivity (Kijek, Kijek & Nowak, 2020).

So, we can say that training is an organizational process that tries to improve the behavior of the employees so that they can develop their decision making which helps them to make less error in work, which in return improve the performance of the employees and thus they will be more positively motivated in the workplace.

2.3 Training Effectiveness

In a 1959 publication for the US Development and Training Journal, Donald L. Kirkpatrick suggested the idea of assessing training performance for the first time (Aragón-Sánchez et al. 2003; Hrmo, Mistina, Jurinova, & Kristofiakova 2019). This essential approach covers four levels or components of training: satisfaction with the activities of training; evaluation of the impact of training on attitudes, knowledge and skills; noticeable improvements in performance after training and assessment of business outcomes. The most crucial factor, according to (Kirkpatrick, 1996), is to look at the last component, i.e., improving productivity, sales, lowering expenses, and reducing mistakes, to see if the training was effective. The modified Kirkpatrick framework has been studied in several papers (Mollahoseini, & Farjad, 2012; Farjad, 2012; Tseng, & Hsu, 2020). So, we may conclude a training is effective if the participants' performance improves, their behavior changes for the better, their decision-making improves, they are more motivated at work after the training, and they make less mistakes than before.

Because various levels of managers are responsible for different tasks in the company (Vukajlovi et al. 2016), the efficiency of training for them will vary depending on their position. As a result, we may conclude that managerial level has an impact on training effectiveness.

Thus, we can hypothesize

H₁: *There is a significant difference in the training effectiveness by the different level of managers*

3. METHODOLOGY

3.1 Research Design

The two main methodologies that might be employed are qualitative and quantitative research strategies. The meanings of words are reflected in qualitative data (Fossey, Harvey, McDermott & Davidson, 2002). Quantitative data, on the other hand, implies conclusions based on statistics (Saunders Lewis and Thornhill, 2019). Quantitative information is frequently particular (Collis & Hussey, 2014). Several tools, such as statistics, charts, and graphs, are accessible for studying and interpreting the received quantitative data (Saunders et al. 2019). This study takes a quantitative method.

The Effects of Different Managerial Levels on Training Effectiveness

3.2 Data Collection Process

The survey approach is used in the study to collect data. The demographics of the people who will be surveyed were unknown. Using the findings of the literature research, it was decided to create a survey questionnaire. From the literature we selected 5 items (*improved performance; improved behavior; reduced error; improved decision making; improved motivation*) to determine the training effectiveness. The survey questionnaire has seven-point Likert scale. The respondents are offered two moderate opinions along with two extremes, two intermediate, and one neutral opinion where point 1 means low and point 7 is high. The replies were collected using a random sampling method. Managers from various private firms in Dhaka, Bangladesh, who have undergone various training and are also involved in the training of their employees, are among the respondents. The information was gathered in the year 2021.

3.3 Sample Size

How to compute the sample size for a survey from a population has been demonstrated in several books e.g. Cochran (1977), Kish (1995), Lohr (1999), McLennan, W. (1999). The goal of the estimation is to determine an adequate sample size that will allow us to forecast outcomes for the complete population properly. We utilized Cochran's method to figure out how many people should participate in the survey.

$$\text{Necessary Sample Size} = (Z\text{-score})^2 \times \text{Std. Dev.} \cdot (1 - \text{StdDev}) / (\text{Margin of error})^2$$

Here we choose a 95% confidence level, 0.5 standard deviation, and a margin of error (confidence interval) of +/- 7.5%.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Necessary Sample Size} &= \{(1.96)^2 \times .5(.5)\} / (.075)^2 \\ &= (3.8416 \times .25) / 0.0056 \\ &= 0.9604 / 0.0056 \\ &= 170.74 \\ &= 171 \text{ respondents are needed} \end{aligned}$$

So, for our study, we need at least 171 replies to have a representative outcome. Respondents for this research came from a variety of firms and represented various levels of management. There was a total of 181 valid responses for the study.

3.4 Data Analysis Method

The data was analyzed using a one-way ANOVA (Analysis of Variance) test. The one-way ANOVA examines the means of two or more independent groups to see if statistical evidence exists that the related population means are substantially different (Fisher, 1992). Both the Independent Samples *t*-Test and the One-Way ANOVA may be used to compare two groups' means. In contrast, only the One-Way ANOVA may compare the means of three or more groups. The One-Way ANOVA is the ideal method for data analysis since the study aims to determine the influence of the three levels of managers on training effectiveness.

4. RESULT AND FINDINGS

In table 1 we can see that for measuring training effectiveness we receive 35 responses for top management, 87 responses for middle managers and 59 responses for first line managers. In the mean column we can see that the mean score of training effectiveness for top managers is 3.45, for middle managers 4.10 and for first line managers 4.95. So, there is a disparity in the average score among the three levels of managers. The statistical study, in instance, reveals that in training effectiveness first line managers are ahead than the other two level of management. Again, from training middle managers have also gained more than the top management. But the key question is whether the difference in mean scores reaches significance.

Table 1. Descriptive

Training Effectiveness

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Top	35	3.4514	.87628	.14812	3.1504	3.7524	1.40	4.80
Middle	87	4.1034	.75628	.08108	3.9423	4.2646	2.40	5.80
First Line	59	4.9559	.72309	.09414	4.7675	5.1444	3.60	6.60
Total	181	4.2552	.94047	.06990	4.1173	4.3932	1.40	6.60

The Effects of Different Managerial Levels on Training Effectiveness

The variances of each comparison group must be equivalent before the ANOVA test can be performed. We put this to the test using the Levene statistic (Levene, 1960; Derrick, Ruck, Toher & White, 2018). What we are looking for here is a significance value that is greater than .05. A significant result would suggest a real difference between variances. The significant value of the Levene statistic based on a mean comparison is 0.979 shown in table 2. This is a non-significant result, indicating that the homogeneity of variance criteria has been fulfilled, and the ANOVA test may be regarded robust.

Table 2. Test of Homogeneity of Variances Training Effectiveness

Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
.021	2	178	.979

Table 3 shows that we have a statistically significant outcome. F has a value of 45.153 and a pvalue of .000, indicating that it is significant (which is less than the .05 alpha level). This indicates that there is a statistically significant difference in the means of the training effectiveness of the managers at various levels.

Table 3. ANOVA

Training Effectiveness

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	53.586		26.793	45.153	.000
Within Groups	105.622	2	.593		
Total	159.208	178			

The significant values for the mean differences between pairs of the various levels of the management variable have been computed, according to the Multiple Comparisons table.

The Tukey HSD (Honest Significant Difference) (Tukey, 1949) shows that mean difference between the top and middle, top and first-line, middle and first-line manager reaches significance (see the Sig. column). The *p*-value is .000, which is less than the standard .05 alpha level. This indicates that there is a statistically significant difference among the means of training effectiveness at various levels of management.

Table 4. Multiple Comparisons

Dependent Variable: Training Effectiveness

Tukey HSD

(I)	(J)	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
MGT_LVL	MGT_LVL					
Top	Middle	-.65202*	.15419	.000	-1.0164	.2876
	First Line	-1.50450*	.16435	.000	-1.8929	-1.1161
Middle	Top	.65202*	.15419	.000	.2876	1.0164
	First Line	-.85248*	.12991	.000	-1.1595	.5454
First Line	Top	1.50450*	.16435	.000	1.1161	1.8929
	Middle	.85248*	.12991	.000	.5454	1.1595

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

The Effects of Different Managerial Levels on Training Effectiveness

Table 5. Training Effectiveness Tukey HSD^{a,b}

MGT_LVL	N	Subset for alpha = 0.05		
		1	2	3
Top	35	3.4514	4.1034	
Middle	87		1.000	
First Line	59	1.000		4.9559
Sig.				1.000

Means for groups in homogeneous subsets are displayed.

5. DISCUSSION

There was a statistically significant difference between groups as demonstrated by one-way ANOVA ($F = 45.153, p = .000$). A Tukey post hoc test showed that the first-line managers' training effectiveness statistically significantly more than the middle level managers ($p = .000$). There was also statistically significant difference between the middle level managers and top-level managers ($p = .000$) and between the first-line managers and top-level managers ($p = .000$). That means middle managers' training effectiveness is more than the top-level managers and again first-line managers' training effectiveness is more than the top-level managers.

So, while designing training for the different levels of employees of the organization we have to keep in mind that the outcome of training will be different due to the differences in the level of managers. As first-line managers involve in less decision making and more in day to day activities, a training can easily improve the performance of these employees a lot. But decision making is a challenging task where top level managers are involved. Training will certainly improve the overall performance of all level of managers but for top management not at very high level. So, organizations should be careful while hiring for the top management as if wrong hire happens at top level a training may not improve the performance a lot.

6. CONCLUSION

Because managers are the ones who drive the organizations, providing comprehensive training programs for them is a crucial obligation of all organizations. The goal of the study was to see if there is an impact of level of managers over training effectiveness in the organizations of Bangladesh. Using the theoretical data, a hypothesis was developed to test the impact of level of managers on training effectiveness. The findings of the empirical investigation revealed that training effectiveness differ significantly by the level of managers. Training effectiveness for the first line managers are more than the middle and top managers. Again, middle managers training effectiveness is more than the top managers. Top managers training effectiveness has found less compare to the other level of managers in this study.

The results of this research project will be useful to a variety of other organizations as well as to do further studies. This study not focused on the specific private industries, rather it takes into consideration of different private organizations. Again, perception about training effectiveness of the different levels of managers are considered here. Therefore, there is a scope for further study focusing on a specific organization or industry. It is also possible to conduct more study to identify other factors that may affect the training effectiveness which are not studied yet.

REFERENCES

- 1) Aragón-Sánchez, A.; Barba-Aragón, I.; Sanz-Valle, R. (2003). Effects of training on business results. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 14, 956–980. <http://doi.org/10.1080/0958519032000106164>
- 2) Becker, G. (1962) Investment in Human Capital: A Theoretical Analysis. *Journal of Political Economy*, 70, 9-49. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1086/258724>
- 3) Campbell, J. J., Dunnette, M. D., Lawler, E. E., & Weick, K. E. (1970). *Managerial behavior, performance, and effectiveness*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- 4) Cochran, W.G. (1977) *Sampling Techniques*. 3rd Edition, John Wiley & Sons, New York.
- 5) Collis, J. & Hussey, R. (2014). *Business Research*. 4th ed. PALGRAVE MACMILLAN.
- 6) Demerouti, E.; Peeters, M.C.W. (2018). Transmission of reduction-oriented crafting among colleagues: A diary study on the moderating role of working conditions. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 91,209–234. <http://doi.org/10.1111/joop.12196>

The Effects of Different Managerial Levels on Training Effectiveness

- 7) Deros, B.M.; Saibani, N.; Yunos, B.; Rahman, M.N.A. (2012). Ghani, J.A. Evaluation of Training Effectiveness on Advanced Quality Management Practices. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Science*, 56, 67–73.
<http://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.09.633>
- 8) Derrick, B; Ruck, A; Toher, D; White, P (2018). Tests for equality of variances between two samples which contain both paired observations and independent observations. *Journal of Applied Quantitative Methods*. **13** (2): 36–47.
http://jaqm.ro/issues/volume-13,issue-2/pdfs/3_BE_AN_DE_PA_.pdf
- 9) DuBrin, A. J. (2016). *Essentials of Management* (10th ed). Peterborough, Ontario: Thomson South-Western.
- 10) Farjad, S. (2012). The Evaluation Effectiveness of Training Courses in University by Kirkpatrick Model (Case Study: Islamshahr University). *Procedia Social and Behavioral Science*, 46, 2837–2841.
<http://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.05.573>
- 11) Fisher, R. (1992). *Statistical Methods for Research Workers*. Springer-Verlag: New York.
https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-1-4612-4380-9_6
- 12) Fossey, E., Harvey, C., Mcdermott, F., & Davidson, L. (2002). Understanding and Evaluating Qualitative Research. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Psychiatry*, 36(6), 717- 732.
<https://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.475.7319&rep=rep1&type=pdf>
- 13) Griffin, R.W. (2021). *Management* (13th ed.). Cengage Learning.
- 14) Harel, G.H.; Tzafirir, S.S.(1999). The effect of human resource management practices on the perceptions of organizational and market performance of the firm. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 38, 185–199.
[http://doi.org/10.1002/\(SICI\)1099-050X\(199923\)38:3<185::AID-HRM2>3.0.CO;2-Y](http://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1099-050X(199923)38:3<185::AID-HRM2>3.0.CO;2-Y)
- 15) Hassan, W., Razi, A. Qamar, R., Jaffir, R., Suhail, S. (2013). The Effect of Training on Employee Retention. *Global Journal of Management and Business Research Administration and Management*, 13(6), 17-20.
- 16) Hrmo, R.; Mistina, J.; Jurinova, J.; Kristofiakova, L. (2019). Software Platform for the Secondary Technical School E-Learning Course. In *Proceedings of the Advances in Intelligent Systems and Computing*; Springer International Publishing: Berlin/Heidelberg, Germany, 2019; pp. 855–865.
- 17) Jones, G. R. and Jennifer, M. G. (2006). *Contemporary Management* (4th ed.). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill Irwin.
- 18) Karim, A.A.; Abduh, A.; Manda, D.; Yunus, M. (2018). The effectivity of authentic assessment based character education evaluation model. *TEM Journal*, 7, 495.
- 19) Kijek, A.; Kijek, T.; Nowak, A. (2020). Club convergence of labour productivity in agriculture: Evidence from EU countries. *Agricultural Economics. (Zem'ed. Ekon.)*, 66, 391–401. <http://doi.org/10.17221/178/2020-agricecon>
- 20) Kirkpatrick, D.L. (1999). Invited reaction: Reaction to holton article. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 7, 23–25.
<http://doi.org/10.1002/hrdq.3920070104>
- 21) Kish, L. (1995) *Survey Sampling*. Wiley International Science.
<https://www.wiley.com/en-bd/Survey+Sampling-p-9780471109495>
- 22) Koontz, H., Weihrich, H., and Cannice, M. V. (2020). *Essentials of Management - An International, Innovation and Leadership Perspective* (11th ed.). McGraw Hill.
- 23) Kulkarni, P. P. (2013). A Literature Review on Training & Development and Quality of Work Life. *Journal of Arts, Science and Commerce*, 4(2),136-143.
- 24) Kuruppu, C.L., Kavirathne, C.S. & Karunarathna, N. (2021). The Impact of Training on Employee Performance in a Selected Apparel Sector Organization in Sri Lanka. *Global Journal of Management and Business Research*, 21(2), 4-12.
- 25) Lee, S. and Teece, D. J. (2013). The Functions of Middle and Top Management in the Dynamic Capabilities Framework. *Kindai Management Review*. Vol. 1, 28-40.
- 26) Levene, H. (1960). Robust tests for equality of variances. *Contributions to Probability and Statistics: Essays in Honor of Harold Hotelling*. Stanford University Press. pp. 278– 292.
- 27) Lohr, S.L. (1999) *Sampling: Design and Analysis*. Duxbury Press.
- 28) McLennan, W. (1999). *An Introduction to Sample Surveys*. Canberra: A.B.S. Publications.
- 29) Mintzberg, H. (1975). The Manager's Job: Folklore and Fact. *Harvard Business Review*, July-August 1975, 56–62.
- 30) Mollahoseini, A.; Farjad, S. (2012). Assessment Effectiveness on the Job Training in Higher Education (Case Study: Takestan Uni-versity). *Procedia Social and Behavioral Science*, 47, 1310–1314.
<http://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.06.817>
- 31) Newton, B., (2006). Training an age-diverse workforce. *Industrial and Commercial Training*, 38(2), 93-97.
- 32) Niazi, A. S., (2011). Training and development strategy and its role in organizational performance. *Journal of Public Administration and Governance*, 1(1), 42-57.
- 33) Rue, L. W. and Lloyd, L. B. (2003). *Management: Skills and Applications* (10th ed.). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill Irwin.
- 34) Saunders, M., Lewis, P., & Thornhill, A. (2019). *Research Methods for Business Students* (8th ed.). Harlow: Pearson Education Limited.

The Effects of Different Managerial Levels on Training Effectiveness

- 35) Shahzadi, I.; Javed, A.; Pirzada, S.S.; Nasreen, S.; Khanam, F (2014). Impact of Employee Motivation on Employee Performance. *European Journal of Business and Management*, 6, 159–166.
- 36) Sultana, A., Irum, S., Ahmed, K. & Mehmood, N., (2012). Impact of training on employee performance: A study of telecommunication sector in Pakistan. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business*, October, 4(6), 646-661.
- 37) Tseng, Y., Hsu, H. (2020). Investigating the influence of experiential training on the ability to anticipate risks of caught-in accidents. *International Journal of Occupational Safety and Ergonomics*, 1–7.
<http://doi.org/10.1080/10803548.2020.1785183>
- 38) Tukey, J. (1949). Comparing Individual Means in the Analysis of Variance. *Biometrics*. 5 (2): 99–114.
<https://www.jstor.org/stable/3001913>
- 39) Urbancová, H., Vrabcová, P., Hudáková, M. and Petru, G.J. (2021). Effective Training Evaluation: The Role of Factors Influencing the Evaluation of Effectiveness of Employee Training and Development. *Sustainability*, Vol. 13, 2721.
<https://doi.org/10.3390/su13052721>
- 40) Vukajlović, D., Brzaković, M., Čurčić, N. (2016). Assessment of Employees Competences Carried Out by Different Management Levels. *Ekonomika Scientific Review Article*, Vol. 62, 47-56. doi:10.5937/ekonomika1603047V
- 41) Williams, C. (2000). *Management*. Cincinnati, OH: South-Western College Publishing.



There is an Open Access article, distributed under the term of the Creative Commons Attribution – Non Commercial 4.0 International (CC BY-NC 4.0) (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>), which permits remixing, adapting and building upon the work for non-commercial use, provided the original work is properly cited.