

Chapter 10: Training and education

We asked past and present implementers, “What kind of training did your organization have for the structured authoring environment?” Multiple responses were allowed, so the results do not add up to 100 percent. One-quarter of present implementers said that they had no formal training at all, and 27.6 percent of past implementers indicated they had no formal training.

Table 21: Training

Type of training	Past (n=76)	Present (n=24)
Private, customized training for all	48.7%	33.3%
Training provided to small group, who offered training to other staff members (“train-the-trainer”)	31.6%	45.8%
Staff attended public training (not customized)	10.5%	8.3%
Self-paced training/e-learning	18.4%	25%
No formal training	27.6%	25%
Other	9.2%	12.5%

For past implementers, the most common training approaches reported were private training for everyone (48.7 percent) and “train-the-trainer” training (31.6 percent). Past implementers reported more train-the-trainer training (45.8 percent) than private training (33.3 percent). The increased popularity in train-the-trainer education among present implementers may reflect the recent poor economic environment: a train-the-trainer approach is generally less expensive than private customized training. A quarter of present implementers opted for self-paced training/e-learning, which is usually the least expensive training option (other than having no training at all).

We then looked at the effects of training choices on implementation success. The following table shows the results. The first row of numbers shows the percentage of all past implementers who reported success for the specified goal. Next, we examined respondents who reported each type of training. For example, under Private training:

- The Yes row shows the results for all respondents who checked the Private training check box.
- The No row shows the results for all respondents who did not check the Private training check box.

Note: Because respondents were allowed to provide multiple answers, there is overlap among the respondents in the various training types.

Table 22: Effects of different training choices on goals: past implementers

	Consistency	Reuse	Localization costs	Information exchange	Compliance	Personalization	Cost reduction
All respondents	82.9%	78.9%	50.0%	34.2%	10.5%	26.3%	60.5%
Private training							
Yes	91.9%	81.1%	67.6%	43.2%	10.8%	29.7%	62.2%
No	82.8%	77.6%	46.6%	34.5%	12.1%	24.1%	63.8%
Train-the-trainer							
Yes	<i>75.0%</i>	<i>66.7%</i>	58.3%	33.3%	12.5%	29.2%	62.5%
No	88.4%	79.7%	52.2%	34.8%	11.6%	24.6%	62.3%
Public training							
Yes	100.0%	100.0%	50.0%	37.5%	<i>0.0%</i>	25.0%	<i>50.0%</i>
No	82.4%	78.4%	50.0%	35.1%	10.8%	27.0%	60.8%
Self-paced training/e-learning							
Yes	85.7%	<i>64.3%</i>	57.1%	<i>21.4%</i>	14.3%	14.3%	57.1%
No	84.0%	78.7%	49.3%	34.7%	10.7%	25.3%	60.0%
Formal training							
Yes	83.3%	80.0%	60.0%	36.7%	10.0%	28.3%	58.3%
No	85.7%	81.0%	<i>23.8%</i>	33.3%	9.5%	23.8%	71.4%
Private training <i>and</i> train-the-trainer							
Both	100%	<i>70.0%</i>	70.0%	50.0%	20.0%	30.0%	90.0%
Neither	88.6%	79.5%	<i>45.5%</i>	34.1%	13.6%	<i>18.2%</i>	63.6%

Bold text indicates numbers that are at least four percentage points higher than the average for all past implementers. *Italic* text indicates numbers that are at least four percentage points lower than the average.

Private training appears to have the most significant impact on overall success. Implementations that included private, customized training did much better than average on consistency, localization costs, and information exchange. The results also show that public training is a

strong contributor to success with consistency and reuse goals, but it fares badly in contributing to compliance and cost reduction objectives.

The train-the-trainer approach is particularly successful with localization. We speculate that because localization processes tend to be company specific, it makes sense that in-house staff would successfully explain and reinforce the importance of achieving localization goals. Interestingly, respondents who specified train-the-trainer education indicated less success in consistency and reuse. These lower success percentages may point to an inherent weakness in the train-the-trainer approach: not every organization has employees with training ability. Even if the employees selected as trainers learn a great deal from the initial training, they may not have the skills (or patience) to fully share that knowledge.

The 10 respondents who relied on both private training and the train-the-trainer approach had very good results, scoring significantly higher than average on five of the seven implementation objectives. The respondents who used neither approach reported above average success with consistency but average or lower than average results on all other factors.

Table 23: Change resistance factors by type of training: past implementers

	All respondents	Private training	Train-the-trainer	Public training	Self-paced training/e-learning	No formal training
Interest and excitement about new tools and technologies						
A lot	32.9%	27.0%	29.2%	50.0%	28.6%	38.1%
Some	61.8%	64.9%	70.8%	50.0%	71.4%	57.1%
None	5.3%	8.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.8%
Concerns about using new tools and processes						
A lot	34.2%	37.8%	54.2%	50.0%	50.0%	14.3%
Some	55.3%	54.1%	37.5%	50.0%	42.9%	66.7%
None	10.5%	8.1%	8.3%	0.0%	7.1%	19.0%
Concerns about productivity						
A lot	26.3%	21.6%	45.8%	25.0%	35.7%	9.5%
Some	38.2%	48.6%	29.2%	37.5%	21.4%	42.9%
None	35.5%	29.7%	25.0%	37.5%	42.9%	47.6%
Outright hostility						
A lot	8.0%	5.6%	17.4%	12.5%	0.0%	0.0%

	All respondents	Private training	Train-the-trainer	Public training	Self-paced training/e-learning	No formal training
Some	26.7%	27.8%	<i>39.1%</i>	<i>37.5%</i>	<i>35.7%</i>	14.3%
None	65.3%	66.7%	<i>43.5%</i>	<i>50.0%</i>	<i>64.3%</i>	85.7%
Staff turnover						
A lot	6.8%	2.9%	<i>13.6%</i>	<i>14.3%</i>	7.7%	4.8%
Some	32.9%	31.4%	<i>45.5%</i>	28.6%	<i>38.5%</i>	23.8%
None	60.3%	65.7%	<i>40.9%</i>	<i>57.1%</i>	<i>53.8%</i>	71.4%
<p>Bold text indicates numbers that are at least four percentage points from the average in a good way (for example, scoring a higher percentage for no outright hostility or a lower percentage for a lot of turnover). <i>Italic</i> text indicates numbers that deviate at least four percentage points from the average in a bad way.</p>						

The results showed that train-the-trainer education actually increased the levels of outright hostility and staff turnover. Respondents who specified the train-the-trainer approach tended to work on smaller implementations: 58.4 percent worked on implementations for groups of 15 employees or fewer. Budgets for these implementations tended to be smaller as well. It's possible the companies that selected train-the-trainer education did so to reduce costs. There were short-term savings with the reduced training budgets, but the companies likely paid higher mid- and long-term costs in dealing with elevated employee turnover. The two other less expensive options, public training and self-paced training/e-learning, also had mostly negative effects on staff turnover.

Past implementers with private training reported lower turnover; there was a similar trend among past implementers with no formal training. We wondered why the two ends of the training spectrum both reflected less employee turnover.

Not surprisingly, implementers who had private training also had more outside help with their implementations.