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Abstract

The Importance of training and development practices cannot be denied. It is a well established fact that these practices contribute significantly in the enhancement of the bottom line benefits of organizations either financial or non-financial. The dynamism of environment has brought new challenges for organizations. To cope effectively with these challenges, organizations have established T&D department with the pivotal aim of developing and fostering human skills and intellectual capital. This paper attempts to highlight the importance of T&D practices and critically reviews the existing T&D department models. Another characteristic feature of this paper is that it not only reviews the existing T&D department models developed by previous researchers, but also suggests an integrative perspective based on the commonalities of previously available models. In the end, certain theoretical and practical implications are discussed.
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**Introduction**

Time proved training and development (T & D) as an important component of organizational system. Earlier research identified organizations did not consider T&D practices as effective as they view it today (Noe, 2009). They believed training practices were only a waste of time and money. They introduced them as formalities and for developing good image. Nevertheless, their progressive impact has changed the prospect and today organizations envision T&D as a means to survival. Companies started to take an interest in it as it revealed to generate immense values (both tangible and intangible) (Edralin, 2004). Amit and Belcourt (1999) stated that tangible resources are the creation of intangible assets that an organization holds and vice versa. The key of an organization is human capital (most promising and eminent intangible asset). Human capital makes companies reach the heights of success. This is the reason management started to invest in it. They realized that small investments can yield large benefits (Abdullah, 2009). The investment in human capital grooms the intellectual workforce where knowledge crafts a workforce intellect. Consequently, T&D is one of the best practices to enhance skills, capabilities and knowledge of employees. Training has a number of benefits and its importance cannot be denied in enhancing organizational stability, performance, commitment, and productivity (Benobou, 1996). It facilitates organizations to expand market shares (locally/ globally) by producing additional ROI, a path to achieve competitive edge (Swanson, 1998). It also helps to reduce cost, meet organizational goals, and enhance employee growth, morale and skills (Edralin, 2004). Training contributes in a flexible adaptation of environmental, social and technological change. The research conducted by Abdullah (2009) specified that despite the benefits, support, incentives and initiatives, there have been lack of consideration on behalf of the organization and employees on effective management of Human Resource T&D. Thus, organizations should move towards the creation of a separate department for application of T&D practices. These departments subsist to meet the needs, goals and objectives of organizations. The organization needs drastic changes as the environment expands. Environmental, economic, global, social, technological, and cultural challenges changed the vision and horizon of organizations (Abdullah,
In order to meet the challenges, T&D departments act like a bridge that direct training programs specific to organizational activities (Barrett & O’Connell, 2001). Organizations short and long term needs are assessed with respect to dynamic environmental demands (Laird, Holton, & Naquin, 2003). The T&D departments visualize, analyze and evaluate the needs with respect to the training process and activities. The T&D departments strategically align the needs. It makes imminent to the organization the perspective for arranging training events, programs and services. The activities enhance employee KSA’s that helps in the fulfillment of strategic needs, removal of deficiencies and the progression of the workforce (Barbazette, 2008).

**Interpretive questions of the study**

Businesses have to make choices and changes are necessary, especially when there is a need for innovation and competitive edge (Choi & Sung, 2014). Training professionals must regulate organizational working and performance by organizing and enhancing knowledge intellectuals (Bersin, Haïms, Pelster & van der Vyver, 2014; Ramazani & Jergeas, 2014). This may be persuaded by advance learning techniques. Although, earlier comprehensive research identified no one right way to be progressive but many researchers have proposed T&D models to be effective (Lim, 2000). Indeed, such models if endowed with relevance and purpose may help to create intellectual capital. How businesses will incept T&D models? How these models will be developed to tackle business challenges, opportunities and hindrances? Which model is the best? Would the new T&D departments function permanently? Or will it eventually replace the traditional ways of training? Or the current models serve to be beneficial? To gain a competitive edge T&D departments has to emerge and serve as guardians of standardize training. Before establishment of T&D models it is recommended to professionals to look beyond typical operations of T&D programs. As, if this structural transformation help to accomplish great deal of work, it may also transmit challenges. Therefore, a keen analysis is required before adopting any model.

**Objective of the study**

The study instigates the traditional and modern models of T&D departments with an aim to empower the intellectual capital
through learning processes and also to foster the growth and development of business organization.

Significance of the study

This paper significances the importance of T&D department models that an organization adopts for carrying out its practices. It instigates a brief introduction of T&D models revealing the advantages and disadvantages of each model. The methodology used is review of prior literature. The criterion of literature is restricted to studies that include T&D models proposed by Neo (1999-2009). Further, it elucidates the modern training models designed to be more effective and productive; as these models aligned with business strategies (Tannir, 2002; Hasan & Subhani 2011; Eggleston, 2012; Lui Abel & Li, 2012; Bersin, Haims, Pelster & van der Vyver, 2014; Prahalad , 2015; Rhéaume & Gardoni, 2015). The latest models, corporate university is introduced with the prospect of centralized training i.e. T&D program, resources and people are operated in same arena (de Rosenroll, 1990; Lim, 2000; Neo, 2009; Doseck, 2015). Centralized training ensures the alignment of training programs with business mission, objectives and strategies (Neo, 2009). It also specifies the initiatives, metrics, delivery, monitoring and evaluation of training programs (Oakes, 2005; Neo, 2009; Doseck, 2015). Thus, it provides more valuable T&D opportunities, quality services and competitive bench mark. Therefore, the paper critically analyzes different aspects of modern and traditional models.

Every organization has different T&D needs. Likewise the resources and finance available to create training programs may also vary. Accordingly, the organizations take up the ability to recognize specific needs before initiating T&D models. To make easy for organizations and practitioners, the paper provides a knowledgeable understanding of T&D models that best fits with criterion of organizations.

Four T&D Department Models

Undoubtedly, training programs develop a motivated and committed workforce that helps management to focus on building new strong business with loyal customers, growing profits and enhanced competitive edge (Uselton, 2014). To succeed T&D
department must be organized properly by incorporating best training model. The choice of model depends on the organization, i.e. large or small, centralized or decentralized. The organization can choose to adopt one or multiple blend of models to groom, grow and develop their workforce. Mostly, organizations adopt the models of T&D department when they need to comprehend immense benefits. Its contribution in organizational welfare, growth, productivity and success is evident (Blundell et al., 1999). T&D department model proposed training as part of learning design to enhance skills, capabilities, as well as to create and share knowledge (Neo, 2007). Training is indispensable (Edralin, 2004) and continuous process with different phases and levels T&D departments assist to shape the process into reality by overcoming different challenges and problems that may arise while incorporating the programs and practices (Neo, 2009). It examines learning styles, design materials, delivering methodologies, transfer processes and also evaluate training programs (Johnston, 2014). This paper assesses four models of T&D department developed by Neo (2009) each fulfills its place in the organization to the needs and demands. Based on his explanation, table 1 illustrates a brief description of each model of the training department. The four basic models have its unique characteristics.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Faculty Model</td>
<td>Headed by a director who extends specialized knowledge of a particular topic</td>
<td>Specialized employees in particular domains.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>or skill area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Customer Model</td>
<td>Headed by a director, responsible for the training needs of a division or</td>
<td>Training programs align with the particular needs of a business group. Run</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>function of the company.</td>
<td>programs based on popularity and demand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Matrix Model</td>
<td>Involves trainers reporting to both a manager in the training department</td>
<td>Merge T&amp;D needs with organizational vision, mission and objectives. Focus on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and a manager in a particular functional area.</td>
<td>managers and employees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Corporate University Model</td>
<td>Focuses on the employees, managers and stakeholders. Offering wide range of</td>
<td>Align learning opportunities with the organization’s initiatives and strategies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>courses and programs.</td>
<td>Actively involves in the learning process.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Adopted from Noe, R. A., 2009, pp. 79-82
Research
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The faculty model is being criticized due to its incapability to meet the requirement of the organization as headed by a single person. Even with a specialized staff of experts, the model left no impact on the knowledge and skills of the trainers which are needed to meet the dynamic challenges of the current environment. Therefore, the model must focus on advance training practices rather than traditional styles. The customer model is also headed by a director whose responsibilities headed towards one division. It adopts and aligns training practices after assessing particular needs of a business group. Unlike the faculty model, the development of training content and courses are up to date, which proves that the organizing group is willing to adopt new training material and procedures. Similar to customer model, matrix model ensures that training practices are linked with the needs of the organization. On the contrary, the model is governed by two managers; one belonging to the T&D department and other to functional department. The benefit of involving two managers helps trainers to gain expertise in broader areas being both a training and functional expert. The most prominent of these models is corporate university, also named “centralized strategic training model” (Hearn, 2001). Initially, it was incorporated as an alternative to the training department. A corporate university ranges from a training department and offer its services to the divisions of organizations that offer accredited degree programs (Frazee, 2002). It distributes the programs in the form of catalogues among the staff members (employees, managers as well as stakeholders). The staff enrolls in the corresponding training courses. These courses were subcontracted with the universities or trainers with an approach of aligning the training practices with the organization’s vision, mission, goals and strategies. This approach evolved the model as more basic, imminent and strategic. It is proposed as one of the best for its continuous learning, disseminating culture aspects and driving change in the entire organization. It is applicable worldwide as it induces learner’s growth and development (Akram, 2002).

Scope of T&D Department Models

The table covers the scopes of each model. As every organization is different in its size, structure, resources, expertise and functions hence the adaptation of a model is purely based on organization choice. Each model has its distinction feature and
management goal is to identify the best model according to its requirements.

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Core Focus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Model</td>
<td>Focus on the expertise and specialized knowledge of a particular topic or area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Model</td>
<td>Focus on linking the needs of the business group or division and the application of professional expertise and business functions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matrix Model</td>
<td>Focus on active participation of the trainees and reinforcement of learning through interspersed line exchange.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Model</td>
<td>Focus on the departmental and the organizational level of the business, focusing on enhancing trainee knowledge, skills, abilities, and competency in learning.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The primary distinction between traditional training models (faculty, customer, matrix) and corporate university is that the former is designed to align the strategic initiatives of the corporation, while the others tend to be more centered on offering open-enrollment classes. The corporate model differs as it focuses on workforce and stakeholder inclusion in community colleges, universities, high and primary schools. It offers a wider range of programs and courses than other models that emphasize on cultural values ensuring best learning practices (Hearn, 2001).
Advantages and Disadvantages of T&D Department Models

Each model has several advantages and disadvantages. The significant characteristics are listed in Table 4. Beginning with the faculty model, the trainers are experts in the areas they train. The customer model fulfills the demand of establishing the training programs with respect to the needs of the particular organization group or whole organization. Further, matrix model ensure that the training programs are linked to the organization as it involves the trainers to report to two managers. The corporate university aligns programs with strategic initiatives. In the faculty model the training plans primary easy to make as the content and timings of the training programs primarily depend on the needs and expertise availability. On the contrary, the customer model provides a training program that is quite meaningful to the trainees as trainers are expected to be aware of the business needs and up to date content and courses that be a sign of the needs. Similarly, the matrix model also makes the trainers gain expertise in their profession, as they are well aware of the new training delivery mechanism and the content as well. Whereas the corporate model, facilitates a wide range of programs and courses for the trainers in the form of catalogues (Neo, 2009).

The faculty model clearly defines the career paths as it introduces detailed training programs on a particular topic or skill areas. Similarly, the customer model clearly defines the responsibilities and enhances the accountability. The matrix model involves the trainers, managers and trainee and motivate them to play a dominate role on their part. It can be assumed that this model is a forced type model (Doseck, 2015). The trainers are answerable to the director and the functional manager that increases the level of coordination and involvement. In contrast, corporate model demands a high level of involvement and commitment of the senior management. It focuses on continuous learning and advancement. The senior management must inline the training programs with business strategy initiatives and visions (Kolo, Strack, Cavat, Torres & Bhalla, 2013). The fourth advantage of faculty model is that it needs a minimum level of internal co-ordination as most of the responsibility is on the expertise and training staff whereas, the customer model allows fulltime concentration on tasks (Neo, 2009). The matrix model stimulates interdisciplinary cooperation whereas the corporate model compels
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its trainers and trainees to grow, learn and develop (Doseck, 2015). The faculty model is suitable in a stable environment as compared to other models, whereas the customer model is compatible to the environment with rapid changes. The matrix model gives flexibility to the business. The corporate model, the most complex of all models provides a more inductive learning environment.

The advantages of each model are apparent. However, operation of any model is not without its challenges. In any change, initiative or meaningful culture shift, there is bound to be resistance. The disadvantages must be identified before they can be overcome. The major disadvantages of the models are illustrated in table 5. The foremost drawback of faculty model it may help to create expertise, but it doesn’t align the training with the business goals. Similarly, the customer model draws a responsibility on the trainer to be aware of the needs of the business and current ongoing content and course. The trainer in matrix model consumes more time as he is accountable to two managers. The trainers of the corporate university are obliged to demonstrate a wide range of courses and programs for the trainees.

The faculty model may create conflicts over priorities, as the trainers may be unaware of the problems or unwilling to adapt the materials that are in accordance with the needs. The customer model may also create conflicts between tasks and priorities as it becomes difficult for the training director to oversee each function as the need of the organization as well best instructional design. In matrix model conflicts rises as there is reporting to two managers. In the corporate
Table 4:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Model</th>
<th>Customer Model</th>
<th>Matrix Model</th>
<th>Corporate University Model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Create expertise, but not aligned with business goals.</td>
<td>Trainers need to be aware of the business needs and fully understand the business functions in order to design courses and content that reflect the needs.</td>
<td>Trainers may have more time demands as they have to report to two managers: a functional manager and a trainer director.</td>
<td>Trainers have to demonstrate a wide range of courses and programs that may fulfill each aspect to become a corporate university.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. May create conflicts over priorities.</td>
<td>Requires good interpersonal skills, especially in conflict management.</td>
<td>Trainers become cynical about learning as naming corporate university does more harm than good.</td>
<td>Demand strong co-ordination on behalf of trainers and trainees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Places strong demands for co-ordination on the director of training.</td>
<td>Does not foster co-ordination of activities.</td>
<td>Encourage power struggles.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The learners or trainees may feel that the learning has become cynical as an organization’s commitment to learning is insignificant and not an area of focus. Next disadvantage deals with co-ordination. The faculty model demands a strong co-ordination on behalf of the director of training likewise the corporate university demands the same from its managers, employees and stakeholders. However, the customer model doesn’t promote the co-ordination of activities. It has inadequate practice opportunities. The matrix model encourages power struggle. The faculty model decreases the level of innovation due to narrow perspective. The customer model lesser the in-depth competencies. Due to more discussion between the managers there may exist a lack of action, whereas corporate university assumed to be impractical and idealistic approach.

The risk is always associated with every aspect. Similarly, the risks are associated with these models (Zakarevičius, & Župerkienė, 2015). The faculty model faces the risk of slow response time and potential bottlenecks due to sequential task performance. Customer model may generate conflict in the allocation of resources, whereas the matrix model creates a feeling of disorder and anarchy. The corporate university is an expensive and costly model. The cost will be justified when get the return on investment. The associated risk will diminish if best results are met.
Conclusion

Earlier T&D was based on professional and pedagogical procedures (Masalimova & Nigmatov, 2015). The training ideas, concept and approaches focused only the vocational education system that fails to provide the specialist full training to cope with the modern, intellectual and the emerging high-tech environment. As a result, more than half of the professional knowledge doesn’t overcome the challenges of a new era (Masalimova & Sabirova, 2015). The modern, dynamic competition, sophisticated information technology, knowledge economy, market globalization and other challenges have changed overlook of organizations towards T&D (Abdullah, 2009). T&D as a vast subject is growing with prodigious rapidity. It proved to cope with the major challenges. It is a continuous, meaningful and logical approach that effectively manages the HR T&D activities. An organization needs to surmount the challenges by developing and implementing appropriate policies and procedures for HR management and development. The organizations should broaden T&D programs and designs aligned with its vision, mission, goals and objectives in order to enter knowledge economy and be competitive.

The T&D department actively play its role for organizational success, profitability and retention of intellectual workforce by enhancing KSA’s and professional assistance. Organizations can adopt any of the models according to its requirements. It may be concluded none of the training model is perfect, each has its advantages, disadvantages and can be applied according to the demands and situation. The selection of T&D department model depends on a number of factors like the organization size, structure, needs, objectives, strategic plans, availability of financial resources, availability of trainers and training material. It is recommended that before incorporating model, organization should evaluate the associated cost and benefit. In faculty model the trainers are experts and possess specialized knowledge in their respective area, but the training is not in accordance to the needs of the organization. This leads to demotivation of the trainees as the course content lack meaning. It is eliminated in the customer model the trainers are from the functional areas that provide practical training according to the needs of the organization but lacks learning design and theory development. The matrix model eliminates the disadvantages of both the previous models (faculty and customer model). The trainers
are not only experts in their areas, but also give training according to the organization needs. The shortcoming of matrix model is dual bosses as there are chances that conflicts may occur. The most effective method with distinguished features is corporate university, it uses centralize training with multiple separate training functions. Although this model is advantageous but its major disadvantage is that it’s costly. Another shortcoming is of building an echo chamber i.e. explosion to others personal ideas and thoughts, this may impinge risks on career development (The Economist, 2015). Examining the differences between corporate university and other models elucidated many weaknesses that may often exist in an organization learning model. The organizational focus should always be on long-term results and benefits as it challenges the executives to think about how learning can affect the organizations. Rather than following traditional models becoming a corporate university can strengthen the focus on life-long learning (Veillard, 2015). However, the corporate model delivers the best practices, yet it depends on organization for its applicability. It is important that the model should be appropriate, as it fulfill the needs and demands of the business. Much can be accomplished by an organization through a powerful T&D model. Better alignment with the company’s goals and initiatives, buy-in throughout the organization to emphasize learning and the utilization of a powerful brand concept to promote ongoing development are all possible. Customers and shareholders can also benefit from training programs. Therefore, it is recommended to be cautious in model selection and its inference. It is suggested that organizations first become a learning organization, than train the employees and be transfer the training skills. Accordingly, organization as a whole need to explore the ways to originate, motivate and encourage learning and development (Massalimov & Nigmatov, 2015). The need of systematic organization introduces a new business-embedded model of T&D that focus on the alignment of business strategy, design, curriculum, delivery and metrics. A further critical analysis of business environment and organizational needs within the prospect of this model is encouraged. As it may enables organizations to recognize the needs of initiating T&D department and also facilitates in selection of best fit T&D model.
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