

CHAPTER – IV

TRAINING AND DEVELOPMENT IN SERVICE

SECTOR: EMPLOYEE’S PERCEPTION,

QUALITY OF TRAINING

In today’s era of Technology it is important to have competent and polished employees who can handle and market the thus obtained output effectively. Industries cannot ensure this kind of competitiveness without Training & Development. They spent huge amount of funds, time and resources to achieve the set target. However the fact cannot be ignored that perception of employee largely affects the results of Training & Development programs. Perception largely varies in accordance with the tenure of employees, age group, level of work and nature of Industry (Rigg 1989)¹. Noe and Schmitt (1986)² mentions that the involvement of employees in their job and work environment is the factor that decides the perception of employee towards the training & Development programs. Santos and Stuart’s (2003)³ further added and mentioned that the nature and amount of award or reward is also one of the major sources of employee perception in an organization and accordingly employee will transfer the thus obtained benefit in his work.

The next phase of this chapter deals with whether assessment of Training and development leads to job satisfaction and job delight of employees. Nancy C Morse (1997)⁴ mentions Satisfaction is temporary and its level and contentment received through it keeps on varying in degree. However it cannot be ignored that employee satisfaction can be judged through the level of performance and productivity of performing the job and the decreased accidents thus occurring in job. Hunter and Tietyen (1997)⁵ further quoted that satisfied employee delivers loyalty and their work and in turn results in satisfied customers.

Richard Chang Associates, INC⁶. mentions that perception of employee, his performance and the performance of Organization are all inter linked and Training plays an important role in binding them all and to bring effectiveness in its tasks. In

order to improve the Organizational performance it is foremost important to train and develop its employees at proper intervals. Planned Trainings result in effectiveness of employees work and results in managerial effectiveness. Managerial effectiveness can be judged with the help of availability of a Manager to achieve the pre decided goal. This is equally important in a manufacturing as well as a service Organization where Human resources play a key role in achieving the tasks.

4.1 Employees Perception Towards Training & Development

Table 4.1 exhibits the perception of employees towards Training & Development imparted to them in their service industry. 600 respondents working in the service industry were surveyed viz. Banking, Insurance, Telecom and IT industry. The respondents were subjected to a series of statements regarding the need, importance and effectiveness of Training & Development in terms of enhancing the skills, job performance and generating satisfaction amongst employees. They were also questioned whether Training & Development was being practiced by their organizations regularly and if it was being conducted by a competent person in a professional manner or not. The respondents were made to respond on the Likert's 5 point scale. They were further probed on satisfaction towards these Training & Development programs, gaining of additional operational knowledge, time period of training programs and its frequency. It is often believed that Training & Development is one of the most important component of human resource management and it must be regularly practiced in organizations as it increases the productivity of employees. The below given table throws light on employees' perception towards Training & Development.

Table 4.1
Descriptive Analysis of Employees Perception for Training & Development

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Training and development is essential for all employees	600	4.09	.678
Training and development programmes are enough to update my skill and knowledge	600	3.00	1.421
T & D in our Organisation is fair and thorough	600	3.15	1.163
Training programme is conducted by a competent faculty	600	3.22	1.269
I feel the Training and Development Opportunities are enough for career development.	600	3.16	1.455
The resource used in the training programme is satisfactory	600	3.48	1.104
The information gained from the training programme is effective	600	3.34	1.278
I feel comfortable with the training environment	600	4.20	.670
The training and Development programme is well planned	600	3.17	1.262
Sufficient personal importance is given the training programme	600	3.29	1.098
Training helps me to develop my career	600	3.12	1.422
The training imparted is towards organization development	600	3.36	1.278
The training programme is related to self development	600	3.47	1.111
The training programme provided by the company has improved my job performance	600	3.43	1.394
Training enables me to work better with job satisfaction	600	3.05	1.355
The training programme is related to work development	600	3.64	1.064
Employee enhancement comes through Training & Development	600	3.35	1.257
Training and development teach the technique of performing better job to employees	600	3.37	1.432
I am satisfied with time interval between various training programmes	600	3.05	1.372
Most of the employees consider training and development is vital for job	600	3.48	1.218

Training and development is wastage of time and money	600	3.25	1.273
Competency level of employees increases due to T&D	600	3.20	1.449
Training and development boosts the morale of the employees	600	3.48	1.129
Training and development reduces the stress of the employees	600	3.30	1.300
T & D gives High morale to employees and leads to better performance	600	4.25	.650
Performance and productivity of employees greatly depends on T&D	600	3.34	1.220
T&D enhances the performance and productivity of the employees as well as of the organization	600	3.51	1.129
T&D reduces consumption of time and cost and increases performance and productivity	600	3.14	1.453
Training and Development develops positive attitude in employees	600	3.51	1.113
With training and development job knowledge increase in employees	600	3.08	1.383
Training and development teaches the technique of performing a job to employees	600	3.09	1.389
Our organization conducts extensive training programs for its employees in all aspects of quality	600	3.27	1.208
Employees in each job will normally go through the training programs every year	600	3.13	1.431
I believe that more career paths will emerge and more opportunities will come in my way after participating in the training program.	600	3.34	1.309
Training has helped me in improving my overall required skills for work.	600	3.44	1.078
Valid N (listwise)	600		

In Table 4.1 it clearly exhibits the mean and standard deviation value of 600 respondents. The average mean of the statements is 3.33 and its value when compared with the actual mean of each statement enabled to examine the significance level of each parameter. The statements with higher actual mean are

significant while the statements with lesser value are not significant. Therefore they should be properly treated to increase their significance. When asked in the first statement if Training & Development is essential for all the employees the actual mean is 4.09 which is higher than the average mean of 3.03 which indicates that Training & Development is important for employees.

Where as in case of the second statement, the sample of the selected respondents responded that the current Training & Development programs imparted in their organization were not sufficient and it was not increasing their skills and knowledge up to the desired level. So the frequency of such Training and Development programs must be increased. They also mentioned that the Training & Development programs thus practiced are not thorough and fair as they are not being conducted by a competent faculty. They further mentioned that the Training & Development programs provided to them are not enough for the career development of the employees as they are not well planned. It is therefore, that despite of appropriate use of resources used, comfortable environment provided and sufficient information and individual attention gained; an individual's career development is not happening. It is very clearly stated that the training programs conducted in service industry are designed for bringing organizational development and result in self development and improved job performance; employees are not able to achieve job satisfaction.

It is further stated that the Training & Development programs is conducted with the intention of bringing work development, work enhancement and it teaches employees the technique of performing better job. However employees are not satisfied with the duration and time interval of Training programs. It is further stated that Training & Development programs organized in their industry are not increasing the competency of employee however it is not wastage of time and money but it must be conducted in more organized manner and more efficient and competent faculty must conduct them.

It is further mentioned that Training & Development in service industry is not able to reduce the stress of performing the job amongst the employees. However better and effective Training and development session boosts the employee morale

and leads to better job performance. They further quoted that the productivity and performance greatly depends upon Training & Development and develops positive attitude amongst the employees. They quoted that since every individual is not being equally benefitted by Training & Development it is therefore not resulting in time and cost reduction of task performance although it leads to the development of positive attitude. Since every employee working in each job is not imparted with the training every year, the job knowledge of employees does not increase and the employees are not able to perform their jobs in an effective manner. They further mentioned that their organization is not providing extensive training programs to them in all aspects of quality i.e. companies design Training programs in such a manner that only their organizations get benefitted and might not result in the overall development of the employees. However the employees believe that they will get better career opportunities and will be able to develop their career paths if they are given chance to participate in more training programs. They further mentioned that the training has resulted in developing the overall required skills for their work.

Descriptive Analysis of Perception of Employees with Respect to the Areas Surveyed

In this section the descriptive analysis of employees working in Banking, Insurance, Telecom and IT industry was assessed. The purpose of this section was to find out if there is any difference in the perception of Employees towards the Training & Development programs offered by their Organizations.

H0: There is no significant difference between the scores on the employee perception dimension towards training & development with respect to the Place

H1: There is a significant difference between the scores on the employee perception dimension towards training & Development with respect to the Place

Table 4.2

Employee Perception Dimension Towards Training & Development with Respect to the Place

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean	
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Employee perception	Punjab	250	100.3320	9.84283	.62252	99.1059	101.5581
	Haryana	250	166.6720	4.92233	.31132	166.0589	167.2851
	Chandigarh	100	98.5000	5.91096	.59110	97.3271	99.6729
	Total	600	127.6683	33.83736	1.38140	124.9553	130.3813

Table 4.3

ANOVA Employee perception dimension towards training & Development with respect to the Place

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Employee Perception	Between Groups	652219.450	2	326109.725	5791.591	0.000
	Within Groups	33615.548	597	56.307		
	Total	685834.998	599			

A one- way ANOVA between Groups analysis of variance was conducted to explore the impact of selected employee perception with regard to different areas. The respondents belong to Punjab, Haryana and Chandigarh working in the Banking, Insurance, Telecom and IT industry. There was a statistically significant difference at the $p < .000$ level in employee perception at these three places. Post – hoc comparisons using the Bonferroni test were further performed. It indicated that H_0 must be rejected. Thus the perception of employees working in the service industry in the state of Punjab, Haryana and Chandigarh are not the same and hence there is a significant difference. It is obtained that the perception of employees working in the service industry in Haryana greatly varies from the perception of employees working in Punjab and Chandigarh.

Table 4.4

Post Hoc Multiple Comparisons with the Help of Bonferroni Test

Multiple Comparisons						
Dependent Variable: Employee Perception						
Bonferroni						
(I) Place		Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Punjab	Haryana	-66.34000*	.67116	0.000	-67.9513	-64.7287
	Chandigarh	1.83200	.88787	.119	-.2995	3.9635
Haryana	Punjab	66.34000*	.67116	0.000	64.7287	67.9513
	Chandigarh	68.17200*	.88787	0.000	66.0405	70.3035
Chandigarh	Punjab	-1.83200	.88787	.119	-3.9635	.2995
	Haryana	-68.17200*	.88787	0.000	-70.3035	-66.0405

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

Table 4.4 indicates the tabulation of post hoc multiple comparisons with the help of Bonferroni test. It indicates that Punjab Haryana – Sig. level is 0.000, which is lower than the Sig. level of 0.05. These groups vary. Punjab Chandigarh– Sig. level is 0.119, which is higher than the Sig. level of 0.05. These groups do not vary. Chandigarh Haryana– Sig. level is 0.000, which is lower than the Sig. level of 0.05. These groups vary.

Employee Perception on the Aspect of Training & Development with Reference to Their Demographics

ANOVA analysis was performed on the scores obtained from the responses on the statements of the third objectives of the research study and were assessed for the significant difference with reference to their demographics. The purpose was to assess the effect of demographics of the employees on each dimension of the Training & Development provided to them in terms of significance of the scores.

Post hoc analysis and descriptive analysis was performed further where in the ANOVA analysis significances of the results were obtained. In order to obtain the results the null hypothesis was framed considering that there is no significant difference between the scores on the perception of employees working in the Banking, IT, Telecom and Insurance sector towards Training & Development dimension of different age groups and ANOVA was applied. Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) is an extremely useful technique which is used for testing the difference among the different groups of the data for homogeneity. The essence of ANOVA is that the total amount of variation in a set of data is broken down into two types, that amount which can be attributed to chance and that amount which can be attributed to the specified causes. There may be a variation between the samples and also within the sample items. ANOVA consists in splitting the variance for analytical purposes. Hence, it is a method of analyzing the variance to which a response is subjected into its various components corresponding to various sources of variation. Thus, through ANOVA we can investigate any number of factors which are hypothesized or said to influence the dependent variable. One may as well investigate the difference amongst various categories within each of these factors which may have a large number of possible values. There are two techniques of applying ANOVA. One is called One-Way ANOVA and the other is called Two – Way ANOVA. Under one way ANOVA, we consider only one factor and then observe that the reason for said factor to be important is that several possible types of samples can occur within that factor. We then determine if there are differences within that factor. Two – Way ANOVA technique is used when the data is classified on the basis of two factors.

Table 4.5 was the output of the ANOVA analysis performed for the scores obtained by the employees working in Banking, Insurance, Telecom and IT industry with different age groups and for that the following null hypothesis was framed.

H3: There is no significant difference between the scores on the ‘perception’ dimension of the employees towards training & Development with different age groups

H4: There is a significant difference between the scores on the ‘perception’ dimension of the employees towards training & Development with different age groups

Table 4.5
Employees Perception Towards Training & Development with Different Age Groups

		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Perception	Between Groups	411813.061	3	137271.020	298.566	.000
	Within Groups	274021.937	596	459.768		
	Total	685834.998	599			

The analysis showed that the null hypothesis assumed is rejected as p – value = $*0.000 < 0.05$ and we accept the alternative hypothesis. This signifies that there is significant difference in the employee’s perception towards Training and Development with respect to the age of employees.

Descriptive Analysis of Perception of Employees with Respect to the Sectors Surveyed

In this section the descriptive analysis of employees working in the Banking, Insurance, Telecom and IT industry was assessed. The purpose of this section was to find out if there is any difference in the perception of Employees towards Training & Development programs provided by their Organizations with respect to the industry in which they are working. Tables 4.6 and 4.7 show the output of the ANOVA analysis performed for the scores obtained by the female executives with different service sectors. And for this purpose the following null hypothesis was framed.

H5: There was no significant difference between the scores on the employee perception towards Training & Development with respect to the Sector.

The analysis showed that the null hypothesis assumed in H5 was accepted as p – value = $0.647 > 0.05$ signifies that the ANOVA analysis was not significant which explains that the employees perception towards Training & Development is statistically equivalent irrespective of the sector in which they work. In other terms there was no effect of the sector in which the employees are working towards the Training & Development programs.

Table 4.6
Perception of Employees Towards Training & Development with Sector

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Employee Perception	Between Groups	1898.637	3	632.879	.552	.647
	Within Groups	683936.361	596	1147.544		
	Total	685834.998	599			

Since the results obtained from the ANOVA analysis were not significant thus further post hoc analysis was performed to analyze the scoring pattern in different service sectors. Further post hoc test with Bonferroni test was performed.

The analysis indicates that the maximum mean scores obtained regarding the perception of employees towards the Training & Development programs was in the IT sector i.e. 130.2333 which was significantly higher than the mean scores obtained by the employees working in the Banking sector (128.4056), Telecom sector (127.5500) and Insurance sector (125.3000) respectively.

Table 4.7
Post Hoc Analysis of the Scores of the Perception of Employees Towards Training and Development with Sector

	Sector	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Homogeneity Test
Employee Perception	Banking	180	128.4056	32.93751	Levene = 2.240, p > 0.05
	Insurance	180	125.3000	33.83874	
	I.T	120	130.2333	33.50348	
	Telecom	120	127.5500	35.64551	
	Total	600	127.6683	33.83736	

Table 4.7 exhibits the mean, standard deviation, standard error and homogeneity test of variance for 600 respondents working in the Banking, Insurance, I.T. and Telecom industry.

Table 4.8**Post Hoc Analysis (Multiple Comparisons with Bonferroni) for the Perception of Employees Towards Training & Development with Sector**

Multiple Comparisons						
Dependent Variable: Employee Perception						
Bonferroni						
(I) Sector		Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Banking	Insurance	3.10556	3.57078	1.000	-6.3466	12.5578
	I.T	-1.82778	3.99226	1.000	-12.3957	8.7401
	Telecom	.85556	3.99226	1.000	-9.7123	11.4234
Insurance	Banking	-3.10556	3.57078	1.000	-12.5578	6.3466
	I.T	-4.93333	3.99226	1.000	-15.5012	5.6345
	Telecom	-2.25000	3.99226	1.000	-12.8179	8.3179
I.T	Banking	1.82778	3.99226	1.000	-8.7401	12.3957
	Insurance	4.93333	3.99226	1.000	-5.6345	15.5012
	Telecom	2.68333	4.37330	1.000	-8.8932	14.2599
Telecom	Banking	-.85556	3.99226	1.000	-11.4234	9.7123
	Insurance	2.25000	3.99226	1.000	-8.3179	12.8179
	I.T	-2.68333	4.37330	1.000	-14.2599	8.8932

Table 4.8 indicates the tabulation of post hoc multiple comparisons with the help of Bonferroni test. It indicates that the significance level of banking sector with Insurance sector is 1.000, which is higher than the Sig. level of 0.05. These groups do not vary in their perception towards Training & Development. The significance level of banking sector with the IT sector is 1.000 which is higher than the Sig. level of 0.05. These groups do not vary in their perception towards Training & Development. Significance level of banking sector with Telecom sector is 1.000 which is higher than the Sig. level of 0.05. These groups do not vary in their perception towards Training & Development. This indicates that there is no

significant difference in the perception level off employees working in different service sectors towards Training & Development programs.

Table 4.9 is the output of the ANOVA analysis applied on the scores obtained by the employees working in selected sectors with age and for that the following null hypothesis was framed.

H6: There was no significant difference between the scores on the ‘Employee perception’ towards Training & Development with different age groups

The analysis showed that the null hypothesis assumed in H6 was rejected as $p \text{ value} = 0.000 < 0.05$ signifies that ANOVA analysis was significant which explains that the employee perception towards Training & Development programs is significantly different with their age groups. In other terms, there was an effect of the age group of the employees on their perception regarding Training & Development programs.

Table 4.9
Perception of Employees Towards Training & Development with Age Groups
w.r.t. Employees Working in Different Sectors

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	411813.061	3	137271.020	298.566	.000
Within Groups	274021.937	596	459.768		
Total	685834.998	599			

Since the results obtained from the ANOVA analysis were significant thus further post hoc analysis was performed to analyze the scoring pattern in different age groups. The significance of the test of homogeneity suggests that for the post hoc analysis Bonferroni was performed.

The analysis indicates that the maximum mean scores obtained regarding the employee perception towards Training & Development working in the service sector was in the age group of above 45 years i.e. (167.078)1 which was significantly higher than the mean scores obtained by the employees in the age groups of 25 – 35 years (110.1087), less than 25years (166.0250) and 36 – 45 years (166.8537) respectively.

Table 4.10

Post Hoc Analysis of the Scores of the Perception of Employees Towards Training & Development with Age

Employee Perception					
Age Groups	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	Homogeneity Test
Less than 25	40	166.0250	5.32766	.84238	
25 to 35 years	414	110.1087	25.53818	1.25513	
36 to 45 years	82	166.8537	5.12106	.56553	
above 45 years	64	167.0781	4.76863	.59608	
Total	600	127.6683	33.83736	1.38140	

Table 4.10 exhibits the mean, standard deviation, standard error and homogeneity test of variance for 600 respondents with respect to age groups.

Table 4.11

Post Hoc Analysis (Multiple Comparisons with Bonferroni) for the Perception of Employees Towards Training & Development with Age

Multiple Comparisons						
Dependent Variable: Employee Perception						
Bonferroni						
(I) Age		Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Less than 25 years	25 to 35 years	55.91630*	3.55032	.000	46.5183	65.3143
	36 to 45 years	-.82866	4.13535	1.000	-11.7753	10.1180
	above 45 years	-1.05312	4.32182	1.000	-12.4934	10.3871
25 to 35 years	Less than 25	-55.91630*	3.55032	.000	-65.3143	-46.5183
	36 to 45 years	-56.74496*	2.59181	.000	-63.6057	-49.8842
	above 45 years	-56.96943*	2.88001	.000	-64.5931	-49.3458
36 to 45 years	Less than 25	.82866	4.13535	1.000	-10.1180	11.7753
	25 to 35 years	56.74496*	2.59181	.000	49.8842	63.6057
	Above 45 years	-.22447	3.57642	1.000	-9.6916	9.2427
Above 45 years	Less than 25	1.05312	4.32182	1.000	-10.3871	12.4934
	25 to 35 years	56.96943*	2.88001	.000	49.3458	64.5931
	36 to 45 years	.22447	3.57642	1.000	-9.2427	9.6916
*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.						

Table 4.11 indicates the tabulation of post hoc multiple comparisons with the help of Bonferroni test. It indicates that the significance level of employees when

compared with the age group of Less than 25 years with 25 to 35 years is 0.000, which is lower than the Sig. level of 0.05. These groups vary in their perception towards Training & Development. Whereas the significance level of employees when compared with the age group Less than 25 years with 36 to 45 years is 1.000 which is higher than the Sig. level of 0.05 which implies that the perception of employees with the said age group does not vary. However the significance level of employees when compared with the age group Less than 25 years with above 45 years is 1.000 which is higher than the Sig. level of 0.05 which implies that the perception of employees with the said age group does not vary. The significance level of employees when compared with the age group of above 45 years with 36 to 45 years is 1.000 which is higher than the Significant level of 0.05 which implies that the perception of employees with the said age group does not vary. This indicates that there is a variation in the perception of employees towards various age groups with respect to different age groups.

Table 4.12 is the output of the ANOVA analysis applied on the scores obtained by the employees working in selected sectors with respect to Education and for that the following null hypothesis was framed.

H7: There was no significant difference between the scores on the ‘Employee perception’ towards Training & Development with Education

The analysis showed that the null hypothesis assumed in H7 was rejected as p – value = 0.013 < 0.05 signifies that the ANOVA analysis was significant which explains that employee perception towards Training & Development programs is significantly different with their Educations. In other terms, there was an effect of the Educational Qualification of the employees on their perception regarding Training & Development programs.

Table 4.12**Perception of Employees Towards Training & Development with Education**

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	12294.668	3	4098.223	3.626	.013
Within Groups	673540.330	596	1130.101		
Total	685834.998	599			

The analysis indicates that the maximum mean scores obtained regarding employees perception towards Training & Development working in the service sector with respect to the employees having done Diploma/Advance Diploma i.e. (130.0971) which was significantly higher than the mean scores obtained by the employees holding Graduate Degree (112.9091), employees having under graduate degree (124.6341) and up to 12th (128.5636) respectively.

Table 4.13**Post Hoc Analysis of the Scores of the Perception of Employees Towards Training & Development with Education**

Employee Perception					
	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	Homogeneity Test
Upto 12 th	165	128.5636	34.50809	2.68645	Levene = 13.958, p > 0.05
Diploma/Advance Diploma	309	130.0971	34.00053	1.93422	
Under Graduate	82	124.6341	32.53735	3.59315	
Graduate	44	112.9091	29.10911	4.38836	
Total	600	127.6683	33.83736	1.38140	

Table 4.13 exhibits the mean, standard deviation, standard error and homogeneity test of variance for 600 respondents with respect to education.

Table 4.14
Post Hoc Analysis (Multiple Comparisons with Bonferroni) for the Perception
of Employees Towards Training & Development with Education

Multiple Comparisons						
Dependent Variable: Employee Perception						
Bonferroni						
(I) Education		Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Upto 12th	Diploma/Advance diploma	-1.53345	3.24136	1.000	-10.1136	7.0467
	Under Graduate	3.92949	4.54212	1.000	-8.0939	15.9529
	Graduate	15.65455*	5.70379	.037	.5561	30.7530
Diploma/ Advance diploma	Upto 12th	1.53345	3.24136	1.000	-7.0467	10.1136
	Under Graduate	5.46294	4.17600	1.000	-5.5913	16.5172
	Graduate	17.18800*	5.41677	.010	2.8493	31.5267
Under Graduate	Upto 12th	-3.92949	4.54212	1.000	-15.9529	8.0939
	Diploma/Advance diploma	-5.46294	4.17600	1.000	-16.5172	5.5913
	Graduate	11.72506	6.28218	.375	-4.9045	28.3546
Graduate	Upto 12th	-15.65455*	5.70379	.037	-30.7530	-.5561
	Diploma/Advance diploma	-17.18800*	5.41677	.010	-31.5267	-2.8493
	Under Graduate	-11.72506	6.28218	.375	-28.3546	4.9045

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

Table 4.14 indicates the tabulation of post hoc multiple comparisons with the help of Bonferroni test. It indicates that the significance level of employees when compared with the Educational qualification Up to 12th with Diploma/Advance diploma is 1.000, which is higher than the Sig. level of 0.05, which implies that the perception of employees with the said age group does not vary with education. Whereas the employees possessing the education up to 12th level when compared with the employees having an Under Graduate degree, their significance level is 1.000 which implies that the perception of employees with the said age group does

not vary with education. When compared with the graduates their significance level came as .037 which is lower than the Sig. level of 0.05 which implies these groups vary in their perception towards Training & Development. The value of significance level of the Graduates with the Under Graduate students is .375 which is higher than the significance level of 0.05, which further indicates that the perception of employees with the said age group does not vary with education. This indicates that there is a variation in the perception of employees towards Training & Development with respect to different age groups.

H8: There was no significant difference between the scores on the ‘Employee perception’ towards Training & Development with different Employment status

The analysis showed that the null hypothesis assumed in H8 was accepted as $p - \text{value} = 0.860 > 0.05$ signifies that the ANOVA analysis was not significant which explains that the employees perception towards Training & Development is statistically equivalent irrespective of the Employment status i.e. Full time, part time and Management Trainee. In other terms there was no effect of the Employment status towards Training & Development programs.

Table 4.15
Perception of Employees Towards Training & Development with
Employment Status

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	347.520	2	173.760	.151	.860
Within Groups	685487.479	597	1148.220		
Total	685834.998	599			

The analysis indicates that the maximum mean scores obtained regarding employees perception towards Training & Development working in the service sector with respect to their education i.e. Management Trainee (128.5929) which was significantly higher than the mean scores obtained by the employees performing Part Time jobs (128.4790), employees working Full time (127.0059) respectively.

Table 4.16**Post Hoc Analysis of the Scores of the Perception of Employees Towards Training & Development with Employment Status**

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	Homogeneity Test
Full time	341	127.0059	33.71524	1.82578	
Part time	119	128.4790	34.57217	3.16923	Levene = 0.858, p > 0.05
Management trainee	140	128.5929	33.71119	2.84912	
Total	600	127.6683	33.83736	1.38140	

Table 4.16 exhibits the mean, standard deviation, standard error and homogeneity test of variance for 600 respondents with respect to employment status.

Table 4.17**Post Hoc Analysis (Multiple Comparisons with Bonferroni) for the Perception of Employees Towards Training & Development with Employment Status**

Multiple Comparisons						
Dependent Variable: Employee Perception						
Bonferroni						
(I) Employment Status		Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Full time	Part time	-1.47313	3.60779	1.000	-10.1345	7.1883
	Management trainee	-1.58699	3.40129	1.000	-9.7526	6.5786
Part time	Full time	1.47313	3.60779	1.000	-7.1883	10.1345
	Management trainee	-.11387	4.22498	1.000	-10.2570	10.0292
Management trainee	Full time	1.58699	3.40129	1.000	-6.5786	9.7526
	Part time	.11387	4.22498	1.000	-10.0292	10.2570

Table 4.17 indicates the tabulation of post hoc multiple comparisons with the help of Bonferroni test. It indicates that the significance level of employees when compared with the Employment status i.e full time employees when compared with the part time employees, management trainee has the significance level of 1.000,

which implies that there is a variation in the perception level of employees with respect to their employment status.

H9: There was no significant difference between the scores on the ‘Employee perception’ towards Training & Development with Supervisory Responsibility

The analysis showed that the null hypothesis assumed in H9 was rejected as $p - \text{value} = 0.000 < 0.05$, which clearly signifies that the ANOVA analysis was significant which explains that the employee perception towards Training & Development programs is significant differently with their Supervisory responsibility. In other words the Employee perception towards Training & Development programs varies with respect to the Supervisory responsibility.

Table 4.18
Perception of Employees Towards Training & Development with Supervisory Responsibility

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	183820.570	3	61273.523	72.745	.000
Within Groups	502014.429	596	842.306		
Total	685834.998	599			

The analysis indicates that the maximum mean scores obtained regarding employees perception towards Training & Development working in service sector with respect to their Supervisory responsibilities. It is observed that the employees working as Team leader has the mean score of (152.3795) which was significantly higher than the mean scores of employees working at Managerial level (108.1321), Supervisory level (113.5349), Executive level (120.1556).

Table 4.19

Post Hoc Analysis of the Scores of the Perception of Employees Towards Training & Development with Supervisory Responsibility

Supervisory Responsibility	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	Homogeneity Test
Manager	53	108.1321	23.71549	3.25757	Levene = 13.293, p > 0.05
Supervisor	172	113.5349	28.12824	2.14476	
Executive	180	120.1556	32.21260	2.40099	
Team leader	195	152.3795	27.96665	2.00273	
Total	600	127.6683	33.83736	1.38140	

Table 4.19 exhibits the mean, standard deviation, standard error and homogeneity test of variance for 600 respondents with respect to supervisory responsibility.

Table 4.20

Post Hoc Analysis (Multiple Comparisons with Bonferroni) for the Perception of Employees Towards Training & Development with Supervisory Responsibility

Multiple Comparisons						
Dependent Variable: Employee Perception						
Bonferroni						
(I) Supervisory Responsibility		Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Manager	Supervisor	-5.40281	4.55957	1.000	-17.4724	6.6668
	Executive	-12.02348*	4.53564	.049	-24.0298	-.0172
	Team leader	-44.24741*	4.49579	.000	-56.1482	-32.3466
Supervisor	Manager	5.40281	4.55957	1.000	-6.6668	17.4724
	Executive	-6.62067	3.09461	.197	-14.8124	1.5711
	Team leader	-38.84460*	3.03589	.000	-46.8809	-30.8083
Executive	Manager	12.02348*	4.53564	.049	.0172	24.0298
	Supervisor	6.62067	3.09461	.197	-1.5711	14.8124
	Team leader	-32.22393*	2.99983	.000	-40.1648	-24.2831
Team leader	Manager	44.24741*	4.49579	.000	32.3466	56.1482
	Supervisor	38.84460*	3.03589	.000	30.8083	46.8809
	Executive	32.22393*	2.99983	.000	24.2831	40.1648

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

Table 4.20 indicates the tabulation of post hoc multiple comparisons with the help of Bonferroni test. During the multiple comparisons the significance value of

employees working at different levels are compared with each other. When a manager working at supervisory level was compared with employees working at the supervisory level their significance came as 1.000 which implies that the perception of employees working at these levels does not vary from each other. Whereas in case of the perception of Managers and Executives towards Training and Development varies, although very minutely. However in case of the Manager and the Team Leader, the employee perception varies a lot. In case of comparison , the Team leader and the Executive’s perception varies a lot.

H10: There was no significant difference between the scores on the ‘Employee perception’ towards Training & Development with the Division size

The analysis showed that the null hypothesis assumed in H10 was rejected as $p - \text{value} = 0.000 < 0.05$ signifies that the ANOVA analysis was significant which explains that the employee perception towards Training & Development programs is significant differently with their division size. In other words the Employee perception towards Training & Development programs varies with respect to the division size.

Table 4.21

Perception of Employees Towards Training & Development with Division Size

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	216445.834	4	54111.459	68.592	.000
Within Groups	469389.164	595	788.889		
Total	685834.998	599			

The analysis indicates that the maximum mean scores obtained regarding employees perception towards Training & Development working in the service sector with respect to their division size. The analysis shows that the mean score of employee perception of the employees working with the division size of above 200 employees (147.6866) is much higher than the employees handling the team of less than 50 employees with the mean score of (102.1316), 50 – 100 employees (107.3486), 101 -150 employees (136.5133) and employees handling the division size of 151 – 200 employees (146.3432) respectively.

Table 4.22
Post Hoc Analysis of the Scores of the Perception of Employees Towards Training & Development with Division Size

Division Size	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	Homogeneity Test
Less than 50	76	102.1316	11.94135	1.36977	Levene = 60.031, p > 0.05
50 to 100	175	107.3486	22.83420	1.72610	
101 to 150	113	136.5133	33.58069	3.15901	
151 to 200	169	146.3432	32.50459	2.50035	
above 200	67	147.6866	31.18188	3.80947	
Total	600	127.6683	33.83736	1.38140	

Table 4.22 exhibits the mean, standard deviation, standard error and homogeneity test of variance for 600 respondents with respect to division size.

Table 4.23
Post Hoc Analysis (Multiple Comparisons with Bonferroni) for the Perception of Employees Towards Training & Development with Division Size

Multiple Comparisons						
Dependent Variable: Employee Perception						
Bonferroni						
(I) Division size		Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Less than 50	50 to 100	-5.21699	3.85851	1.000	-16.0885	5.6545
	101 to 150	-34.38170*	4.16671	.000	-46.1216	-22.6418
	151 to 200	-44.21162*	3.87919	.000	-55.1414	-33.2818
	above 200	-45.55499*	4.70687	.000	-58.8168	-32.2932
50 to 100	Less than 50	5.21699	3.85851	1.000	-5.6545	16.0885
	101 to 150	-29.16470*	3.38958	.000	-38.7150	-19.6144
	151 to 200	-38.99462*	3.02918	.000	-47.5295	-30.4598
	above 200	-40.33800*	4.03515	.000	-51.7072	-28.9688
101 to 150	Less than 50	34.38170*	4.16671	.000	22.6418	46.1216
	50 to 100	29.16470*	3.38958	.000	19.6144	38.7150
	151 to 200	-9.82992*	3.41311	.041	-19.4465	-.2133
	above 200	-11.17329	4.33080	.101	-23.3755	1.0289
151 to 200	Less than 50	44.21162*	3.87919	.000	33.2818	55.1414
	50 to 100	38.99462*	3.02918	.000	30.4598	47.5295
	101 to 150	9.82992*	3.41311	.041	.2133	19.4465
	above 200	-1.34337	4.05493	1.000	-12.7683	10.0816
Above 200	Less than 50	45.55499*	4.70687	.000	32.2932	58.8168
	50 to 100	40.33800*	4.03515	.000	28.9688	51.7072
	101 to 150	11.17329	4.33080	.101	-1.0289	23.3755
	151 to 200	1.34337	4.05493	1.000	-10.0816	12.7683

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

Table 4.23 presents the analysis of multiple comparisons made amongst the employees with respect to their division size. The significance value of employees

with the division size less than 50 and division size 50 – 100 has the significance of 1.000 i.e. their perceptions do not vary. However when the significance level of employees with the division size less than 50 and 101 – 150, 151 – 200 and employees with the division size above 200 has the significance value 1.000 which means their perception towards Training & Development varies from each other. However the perception of employees with the division size above 200 when compared with employees working in division size of 151 – 200 does not vary from each other.

H11: There was no significant difference between the scores on the ‘Employee perception’ towards Training & Development with Tenure of job at present position

Table 4.24 showed the ANOVA analysis with the values of Sum of squares, df, mean square, F – value and sig. value. The significance value regarding employee perception in respect to employee’s job tenure came as 0.000 which is less than the significance value of 0.05, hence H11 was rejected. Hence it could be said that employee’s perception with respect to his job tenure at a particular position changes for training & Development programs.

Table 4.24

Perception of Employees Towards Training & Development with Tenure of Job at Present Position

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	85142.914	4	21285.729	21.084	.000
Within Groups	600692.084	595	1009.567		
Total	685834.998	599			

It can be clearly observed from Table 4.20 that the maximum mean score is obtained by the employees working with the tenure of 12 to 16 years at their present position. The mean score for the employees with 12 – 16 years is (141.5284) which is quiet higher than the employees holding their present position from 4 – 8 years (114.6561), below 4 years of experience at their present job position (118.2034), 8 – 12 years (132.1837) and the employees working at their present position from last 16 years and above (139.6739) respectively.

Table 4.25

**Post Hoc Analysis of the Scores of the Perception of Employees Towards
Training & Development with Tenure of Job at Present Position**

Tenure of Job	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	Homogeneity Test
Below 4 years	59	118.2034	30.74297	4.00239	Levene = 10.247, p > 0.05
4 to 8 years	221	114.6561	29.88005	2.00995	
8-12 years	98	132.1837	34.15288	3.44996	
12 to 16 years	176	141.5284	32.62741	2.45938	
16 years and above	46	139.6739	33.33870	4.91552	
Total	600	127.6683	33.83736	1.38140	

Table 4.25 exhibits the mean, standard deviation, standard error and homogeneity test of variance for 600 respondents with respect to tenure of job at present position.

Table 4.26

Post Hoc Analysis (Multiple Comparisons with Bonferroni) for the Perception of Employees Towards Training & Development with Tenure of Job at Present Position

Multiple Comparisons						
Dependent Variable: Employee Perception						
Bonferroni						
(I) Tenure of Job at this position		Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Below 4 years	4 to 8 years	3.54728	4.65612	1.000	-9.5715	16.6661
	8-12 years	-13.98028	5.23574	.078	-28.7322	.7716
	12 to 16 years	-23.32502*	4.77990	.000	-36.7926	-9.8574
	16 years and above	-21.47052*	6.24967	.006	-39.0792	-3.8618
4 to 8 years	below 4 years	-3.54728	4.65612	1.000	-16.6661	9.5715
	8-12 years	-17.52756*	3.85615	.000	-28.3924	-6.6627
	12 to 16 years	-26.87230*	3.21004	.000	-35.9167	-17.8279
	16 years and above	-25.01780*	5.14930	.000	-39.5262	-10.5094
8-12 years	below 4 years	13.98028	5.23574	.078	-.7716	28.7322
	4 to 8 years	17.52756*	3.85615	.000	6.6627	28.3924
	12 to 16 years	-9.34474	4.00473	.200	-20.6282	1.9388
	16 years and above	-7.49024	5.67880	1.000	-23.4905	8.5100
12 to 16 years	below 4 years	23.32502*	4.77990	.000	9.8574	36.7926
	4 to 8 years	26.87230*	3.21004	.000	17.8279	35.9167
	8-12 years	9.34474	4.00473	.200	-1.9388	20.6282
	16 years and above	1.85450	5.26149	1.000	-12.9700	16.6790
16 years and above	below 4 years	21.47052*	6.24967	.006	3.8618	39.0792
	4 to 8 years	25.01780*	5.14930	.000	10.5094	39.5262
	8-12 years	7.49024	5.67880	1.000	-8.5100	23.4905
	12 to 16 years	-1.85450	5.26149	1.000	-16.6790	12.9700

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

Table 4.26 shows the analysis of multiple comparisons made with the help of Bonferroni test. The table indicates that the significance value of employees having the tenure of experience below 4 years at their present position is similar to the employees with 4 – 8 years; employees with the experience of 8 – 12 years of experience at their present position and with the experience of 16 years and above. Whereas it varies for the employees with experience of 12 – 16 years and employees

of experience less than 4 years. When we compare the perception of the employees working from 16 years and above with those working for 12 to 16 years at the present situation have similar perception towards the Training and development programs.

Independent ‘t’ test

An independent sample t-test examines whether there is a significant difference on a quantitative/numerical variable between the two groups or categories of respondents. The independent variable must be categorical with only two categories (dichotomous), the dependent variable must be quantitative/numerical. Two group means are compared to determine whether they are significantly different from each other. You need to examine several statistics, one of which is the p-value. This value must be .05 or below to determine whether a significant difference between the two groups exist.

Table 4.27

**‘t’ Test Employee Perception Towards Training & Development
with Respect to Gender**

Group Statistics

Gender		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Employee Perception	Male	332	129.6386	34.14376	1.87388
	Female	268	125.2276	33.35605	2.03754

Table 4.27 describes the means and standard deviation of Male and female. The means represent the employee perception towards Training & Development on a five-point scale. One can see clearly that the average satisfaction score for the male is 129.64, whereas for the female employees it is 125.22. We cannot arrive at any conclusions that one category is more significantly more satisfied than another category without examining the statistical significance of the result (t-test information).

Table 4.28

‘t’ Test Employee Perception Towards Training & Development with Respect to Gender and Equality of Variances

		Independent Samples Test								
		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
Employee Perception	Equal variances assumed	3.806	.052	1.589	598	.112	4.41094	2.77513	-1.03924	9.86112
	Equal variances not assumed			1.593	576.811	.112	4.41094	2.76822	-1.02607	9.84796

Table 4.28 shows the analysis of Independent t test for employee perception with respect to equal variance assumed and equal variance not received. Here, you see there are two results from two different t-tests, one assumed equal variance and the other unequal variances which results to the use depending on the results from Levene's test. The p-value of Levene's test is 0.52; which means we can assume that the variances of both the genders are same. Since the p-value is 0.112, we accept the null hypothesis and conclude that there is no significant difference between the employee perception of male and females towards the Training & Development programs provided in service sector 5% significance level.

Table 4.29

‘t’ Test Employee Perception Towards Training & Development with Respect to Marital Status

Group Statistics					
Marital Status		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Employee Perception	Married	181	126.8508	32.84551	2.44139
	Unmarried	419	128.0215	34.28954	1.67515

Table 4.29 describes the means and standard deviations of married and unmarried employees. The means represent the employee perception towards

Training & Development on a five-point scale. One can see clearly that the average satisfaction score for the married employees is 126.8508, whereas for the unmarried employees it is 128.0215.

Table 4.30

‘t’ Test Employee Perception Towards Training & Development with Respect to Marital Status & Equality of Variances

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F		t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
Employee Perception	Equal variances assumed	8.326	.004	.389	598	.698	-1.17065	3.01185	7.08575	4.74444
	Equal variances not assumed			.395	355.457	.693	-1.17065	2.96083	6.99360	4.65230

Table 4.30 shows the analysis of Independent t test for the employee perception with respect to the equal variance assumed and equal variance not received. Here, you see there are two results from two different t-tests, one assumed equal variance and the other unequal variances which results to use, depending on the result from Levene's test. The p-value of Levene's test is 0.004; which means we can assume that the variances of employees with different marital status are not the same. Since the p-value is 0.693, we reject the null hypothesis and conclude that there is a significant difference between the employee perception of married and unmarried employees towards the Training & Development programs provided in the service sector at 5% significance level.

Table 4.31

‘t’ Test Employee Perception Towards Training & Development with Respect to Nature of Organisation

Group Statistics					
Nature of Organisation		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Training and development is essential for all employees	Private	149	4.13	.732	.060
	Public	451	4.07	.660	.031
Training and development programmes are enough to update my skill and knowledge	Private	149	2.78	1.546	.127
	Public	451	3.07	1.372	.065
T & D in our Organisation is fair and thorough	Private	149	2.82	1.157	.095
	Public	451	3.26	1.145	.054
Training programme Conducted by competent faculty	Private	149	2.85	1.293	.106
	Public	451	3.34	1.238	.058
I feel enough Training and Development Opportunities for career development.	Private	149	2.71	1.392	.114
	Public	451	3.31	1.446	.068
The resource used the training programme is satisfactory	Private	149	3.16	1.027	.084
	Public	451	3.59	1.109	.052
The information gained from the training programme is effective	Private	149	2.98	1.233	.101
	Public	451	3.46	1.272	.060
I feel comfortable with the training environment	Private	149	4.15	.597	.049
	Public	451	4.22	.693	.033
The training and Development programme is well planned	Private	149	2.80	1.225	.100
	Public	451	3.29	1.252	.059

Sufficient personal importance is given the training programme	Private	149	3.09	.968	.079
	Public	451	3.62	1.107	.052
Training helps me to develop my career	Private	149	2.70	1.314	.108
	Public	451	3.25	1.431	.067
The training imparted is towards organization development	Private	149	2.87	1.189	.097
	Public	451	3.39	1.281	.060
The training programme is related to self development	Private	149	3.13	1.063	.087
	Public	451	3.59	1.105	.052
The training programme provided by the company improve my job performance	Private	149	2.72	1.356	.111
	Public	451	3.14	1.392	.066
Training makes me to work better with job satisfaction	Private	149	2.66	1.318	.108
	Public	451	3.18	1.345	.063
The training programme is related to work development	Private	149	3.54	1.030	.084
	Public	451	3.67	1.074	.051
Employees enhancement come through Training & Development	Private	149	2.88	1.213	.099
	Public	451	3.43	1.242	.059
Training and development teach the technique of performing a job to employees	Private	149	2.77	1.397	.114
	Public	451	3.18	1.431	.067
Training and development enhance the skills of job of employees	Private	149	4.07	.648	.053
	Public	451	4.15	.654	.031
I am satisfied with time interval between various training programmes	Private	149	2.60	1.399	.115
	Public	451	3.19	1.333	.063
Most of the employees	Private	149	2.80	1.191	.098

consider training and development vital for job	Public	451	3.30	1.202	.057
Training and development waste of time and waste of money	Private	149	2.89	1.231	.101
	Public	451	3.37	1.266	.060
Competency level of employees increases due to T&D	Private	149	2.77	1.416	.116
	Public	451	3.34	1.433	.067
Training and development boost up the morale of the employees	Private	149	3.17	1.087	.089
	Public	451	3.58	1.125	.053
Training and development reduce the stress of the employees	Private	149	3.00	1.230	.101
	Public	451	3.40	1.309	.062
T & D gives High morale to employees and leads to better performance	Private	149	4.17	.601	.049
	Public	451	4.27	.664	.031
Performance and productivity greatly depend on T&D	Private	149	2.91	1.193	.098
	Public	451	3.32	1.213	.057
T&D enhance the performance and productivity of the employees as well as of the organization	Private	149	3.21	1.098	.090
	Public	451	3.61	1.123	.053
T&D reduce consumption of time and cost and increase performance and productivity	Private	149	2.65	1.461	.120
	Public	451	3.30	1.415	.067
Employees enhancement come through Training & Development	Private	149	2.96	1.219	.100
	Public	451	3.42	1.246	.059
Training and Development brings positive attitude in employees	Private	149	3.22	1.039	.085
	Public	451	3.60	1.122	.053
With training and	Private	149	2.66	1.427	.117

development job knowledge increase in employees	Public	451	3.22	1.341	.063
Training and development teach the technique of performing a job to employees	Private	149	2.70	1.287	.105
	Public	451	3.22	1.399	.066
Training and development enhance the skills of job of employees	Private	149	3.42	1.066	.087
	Public	451	3.61	1.108	.052
Our organization conducts extensive training programs for its employees in all aspects of quality	Private	149	2.96	1.138	.093
	Public	451	3.51	1.201	.057
Employees in each job will normally go through training programs every year	Private	149	2.66	1.441	.118
	Public	451	3.28	1.396	.066
I believe that more career paths will emerge and more opportunities will come my way after participating in the training program?	Private	149	2.79	1.226	.100
	Public	451	3.39	1.303	.061
Training has helped me in improving my overall required skills for work?	Private	149	3.10	1.038	.085
	Public	451	3.55	1.068	.050

Table 4.31 represents the group statistics details of the employees working in the private and the public sector service industries with respect to job satisfaction. The table describes the mean, standard deviation and standard error value of the total number of employee respondents from public and private sector,

Table 4.32

't' Test Employee Perception Towards Training & Development with Respect to Nature of Organization Equality of Variances

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
Training and development is essential for all employees	Equal variances assumed	5.037	.025	.987	598	.324	.063	.064	-.063	.189
	Equal variances not assumed			.937	232.511	.350	.063	.068	-.070	.196
Training and development programmes are enough to update my skill and knowledge	Equal variances assumed	.280	.597	-2.168	598	.031	-.290	.134	-.553	-.027
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.041	229.909	.042	-.290	.142	-.570	-.010
T & D in our Organisation is fair and thorough	Equal variances assumed	.195	.659	-4.041	598	.000	-.438	.108	-.651	-.225
	Equal variances not assumed			-4.020	250.681	.000	-.438	.109	-.653	-.224
Training programme Conducted by competent faculty	Equal variances assumed	.316	.574	-4.192	598	.000	-.496	.118	-.728	-.264
	Equal variances not assumed			-4.101	243.822	.000	-.496	.121	-.734	-.258
I feel enough Training and Development Opportunities for career development.	Equal variances assumed	1.686	.195	-4.441	598	.000	-.601	.135	-.867	-.335
	Equal variances not assumed			-4.528	261.485	.000	-.601	.133	-.863	-.340
The resource used the training programme is satisfactory	Equal variances assumed	8.674	.003	-4.122	598	.000	-.424	.103	-.626	-.222
	Equal variances not assumed			-4.284	270.755	.000	-.424	.099	-.619	-.229
The information gained from the training programme is effective	Equal variances assumed	5.085	.024	-4.035	598	.000	-.481	.119	-.716	-.247
	Equal variances not assumed			-4.099	259.838	.000	-.481	.117	-.713	-.250

I feel comfortable with the training environment	Equal variances assumed	10.663	.001	-1.170	598	.243	-.074	.063	-.198	.050
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.260	289.990	.209	-.074	.059	-.190	.042
The training and Development programme is well planned	Equal variances assumed	1.066	.302	-4.181	598	.000	-.492	.118	-.723	-.261
	Equal variances not assumed			-4.227	257.682	.000	-.492	.116	-.721	-.263
Sufficient personal importance is given the training programme	Equal variances assumed	9.006	.003	-5.211	598	.000	-.529	.102	-.729	-.330
	Equal variances not assumed			-5.575	286.078	.000	-.529	.095	-.716	-.342
Training helps me to develop my career	Equal variances assumed	4.553	.033	-4.202	598	.000	-.557	.133	-.817	-.297
	Equal variances not assumed			-4.387	273.012	.000	-.557	.127	-.807	-.307
The training imparted is towards organization development	Equal variances assumed	5.009	.026	-4.371	598	.000	-.520	.119	-.754	-.286
	Equal variances not assumed			-4.538	270.230	.000	-.520	.115	-.746	-.294
The training programme is related to self development	Equal variances assumed	3.899	.049	-4.361	598	.000	-.451	.103	-.654	-.248
	Equal variances not assumed			-4.446	261.515	.000	-.451	.101	-.651	-.251
The training programme provided by the company improve my job performance	Equal variances assumed	.481	.488	-3.209	598	.001	-.419	.131	-.676	-.163
	Equal variances not assumed			-3.251	258.607	.001	-.419	.129	-.673	-.165
Training makes me to work better with job satisfaction	Equal variances assumed	.088	.766	-4.056	598	.000	-.513	.126	-.761	-.265
	Equal variances not assumed			-4.097	257.249	.000	-.513	.125	-.759	-.266
The training programme is related to work development	Equal variances assumed	.325	.569	-1.276	598	.203	-.128	.100	-.326	.069
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.303	262.409	.194	-.128	.098	-.322	.065

Employees enhancement come through Training & Development	Equal variances assumed	2.786	.096	-4.739	598	.000	-.553	.117	-.782	-.324
	Equal variances not assumed			-4.797	258.149	.000	-.553	.115	-.780	-.326
Training and development teach the technique of performing a job to employees	Equal variances assumed	.503	.478	-3.051	598	.002	-.410	.134	-.674	-.146
	Equal variances not assumed			-3.088	258.173	.002	-.410	.133	-.672	-.149
Training and development enhance the skills of job of employees	Equal variances assumed	3.636	.057	-1.284	598	.200	-.079	.062	-.200	.042
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.290	254.787	.198	-.079	.061	-.200	.042
I am satisfied with time interval between various training programmes	Equal variances assumed	1.054	.305	-4.600	598	.000	-.587	.128	-.837	-.336
	Equal variances not assumed			-4.490	242.919	.000	-.587	.131	-.844	-.329
Most of the employees consider training and development vital for job	Equal variances assumed	.460	.498	-4.417	598	.000	-.501	.113	-.723	-.278
	Equal variances not assumed			-4.438	254.933	.000	-.501	.113	-.723	-.279
Training and development waste of time and waste of money	Equal variances assumed	1.094	.296	-4.020	598	.000	-.478	.119	-.711	-.244
	Equal variances not assumed			-4.077	259.081	.000	-.478	.117	-.708	-.247
Competency level of employees increases due to T&D	Equal variances assumed	.441	.507	-4.286	598	.000	-.579	.135	-.844	-.313
	Equal variances not assumed			-4.311	255.426	.000	-.579	.134	-.843	-.314
Training and development boost up the morale of the employees	Equal variances assumed	3.649	.057	-3.940	598	.000	-.415	.105	-.622	-.208
	Equal variances not assumed			-4.009	260.616	.000	-.415	.104	-.619	-.211
Training and development reduce the stress of the employees	Equal variances assumed	7.524	.006	-3.312	598	.001	-.404	.122	-.643	-.164
	Equal variances not assumed			-3.416	267.045	.001	-.404	.118	-.636	-.171

T & D gives High morale to employees and leads to better performance	Equal variances assumed	6.922	.009	-1.529	598	.127	-.094	.061	-.214	.027
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.608	276.715	.109	-.094	.058	-.209	.021
Performance and productivity greatly depend on T&D	Equal variances assumed	3.294	.070	-3.620	598	.000	-.413	.114	-.637	-.189
	Equal variances not assumed			-3.650	256.482	.000	-.413	.113	-.636	-.190
T&D enhance the performance and productivity of the employees as well as of the organization	Equal variances assumed	.692	.406	-3.828	598	.000	-.404	.106	-.611	-.197
	Equal variances not assumed			-3.870	257.685	.000	-.404	.104	-.609	-.198
T&D reduce consumption of time and cost and increase performance and productivity	Equal variances assumed	.523	.470	-4.826	598	.000	-.651	.135	-.915	-.386
	Equal variances not assumed			-4.749	246.186	.000	-.651	.137	-.920	-.381
Employees enhancement come through Training & Development	Equal variances assumed	6.834	.009	-3.962	598	.000	-.464	.117	-.694	-.234
	Equal variances not assumed			-4.006	257.707	.000	-.464	.116	-.692	-.236
Training and Development brings positive attitude in employees	Equal variances assumed	6.148	.013	-3.645	598	.000	-.379	.104	-.584	-.175
	Equal variances not assumed			-3.788	270.775	.000	-.379	.100	-.577	-.182
With training and development job knowledge increase in employees	Equal variances assumed	2.257	.134	-4.362	598	.000	-.562	.129	-.815	-.309
	Equal variances not assumed			-4.227	240.184	.000	-.562	.133	-.824	-.300
Training and development teach the technique of performing a job to employees	Equal variances assumed	3.847	.050	-3.970	598	.000	-.515	.130	-.769	-.260
	Equal variances not assumed			-4.141	272.598	.000	-.515	.124	-.760	-.270
Training and development enhance the skills of job of employees	Equal variances assumed	.239	.625	-1.909	598	.057	-.198	.104	-.402	.006
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.947	261.620	.053	-.198	.102	-.398	.002

Our organization conducts extensive training programs for its employees in all aspects of quality	Equal variances assumed	6.417	.012	-4.872	598	.000	-.546	.112	-.766	-.326
	Equal variances not assumed			-5.005	265.029	.000	-.546	.109	-.761	-.331
Employees in each job will normally go through training programs every year	Equal variances assumed	.268	.605	-4.625	598	.000	-.615	.133	-.876	-.354
	Equal variances not assumed			-4.552	246.235	.000	-.615	.135	-.881	-.349
I believe that more career paths will emerge and more opportunities will come my way after participating in the training program?	Equal variances assumed	3.739	.054	-4.949	598	.000	-.601	.121	-.839	-.362
	Equal variances not assumed			-5.102	266.721	.000	-.601	.118	-.832	-.369
Training has helped me in improving my overall required skills for work?	Equal variances assumed	2.933	.087	-4.481	598	.000	-.449	.100	-.646	-.252
	Equal variances not assumed			-4.546	259.259	.000	-.449	.099	-.644	-.255

Table 4.32 shows the analysis of Independent t test for employee perception with respect to the equal variance assumed and equal variance not received. Here, you see that there are two results from two different t-tests, one assumed equal variance and the other unequal variances which results to use depending on the result from Levene's test. The statements of job satisfaction are analyzed with the help of independent t test and the significance level of each statement is analyzed in the light of its significance level and to know the variance of each statement. The statement with p-value of Levene's test less than 0.05 value of significance interprets that we have to consider unequal variance result while the statements with higher value than 0.05 value signifies that we have to consider the result of equal variance assumed. However if the p-value is greater than the 0.05 level of significance we reject the null hypothesis and conclude that there is a significant difference between the job satisfaction of employees with respect to the nature of organization (Private & Public) in which they are working. Whereas if the value is less than 0.05 %, it implies that we accept the null hypothesis.

Table 4.33

Descriptive Statistics Training and Development Leads to Job Satisfaction and Job Delight of Employees

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
The type of training conducted in my organization is satisfactory	600	1	5	3.12	1.184
The overall training programme in my organization is satisfactory	600	1	5	2.99	1.287
Training develop new skill	600	1	5	2.37	1.068
The training & development offered to me minimize the accident and damages to equipment	600	1	5	2.81	.994
Training and development teach the technique of performing a job to employees	600	1	5	3.21	1.309
I was evaluated after the training programme	600	1	5	3.29	1.354
T & D enhanced my technical skill	600	1	5	2.83	.983
Performance and productivity increase due to the enhanced competency of the employees	600	1	5	3.32	1.380
There are formal training programs to teach new employees the skills they need to perform their jobs?	600	1	5	3.24	1.433
I feel job satisfaction is attained through T & D	600	1	5	3.22	1.433
Valid N (listwise)	600				

Table 4.33 describes the descriptive analysis of respondents regarding “Training and development leads to job satisfaction and job delight of employees”. The table describes the minimum, maximum, mean and standard deviation values for the various statements.

Table 4.34
Training and Development Leads to Job Satisfaction and Job Delight of
Employees

Group Statistics					
Nature of Organization		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
The type of training conducted in my organization is satisfactory	Private	149	2.87	1.181	.097
	Public	451	3.20	1.175	.055
The overall training programme in my organization is satisfactory	Private	149	2.51	1.245	.102
	Public	451	3.15	1.262	.059
Training develop new skill	Private	149	2.35	1.071	.088
	Public	451	2.37	1.068	.050
The training & development offered to me minimize the accident and damages to equipment	Private	149	2.57	.960	.079
	Public	451	2.88	.994	.047
Training and development teach the technique of performing a job to employees	Private	149	3.00	1.305	.107
	Public	451	3.28	1.304	.061
I was evaluated after the training programme	Private	149	2.83	1.288	.106
	Public	451	3.44	1.343	.063
T & D enhanced my technical skill	Private	149	2.60	.965	.079
	Public	451	2.90	.978	.046
Performance and productivity increase due to the enhanced	Private	149	2.87	1.337	.110

competency of the employees	Public	451	3.47	1.363	.064
There are formal training programs to teach new employees the skills they need to perform their jobs?	Private	149	2.93	1.300	.107
	Public	451	3.35	1.461	.069
I feel job satisfaction is attained through T & D	Private	149	2.78	1.389	.114
	Public	451	3.37	1.418	.067
Job satisfaction	Private	149	27.30	8.079	.662
	Public	451	31.41	8.964	.422

Table 4.34 exhibits the analysis of T test with respect to responses of respondents towards Training and development, which leads to job satisfaction and job delight for the employees. The table describes the results of respondents with respect to the public and private service sector i.e. the nature of organization. It is also gauged that out of the total sample of 600 respondents 149 employees are from the private sector service industry and rest of the 451 respondents belong to the public sector service industries. The observed mean scores of private and public sector employees with reference to the Training & Development leads to job satisfaction and job delight of the employees i.e. 2.730 and 3.141 respectively. In case of the private sector the actual mean of 4 statements i.e. “The overall Training programme in my organization is satisfactory”, “Training develops new skill”, “The Training & Development offered to me minimized the accident and damages to the equipment” and “T & D enhanced my technical skill” is less than the observed mean. Hence it implies that these statements are insignificant in order to bring job satisfaction and job delight for the employees. More focus should be laid on these factors in order to get better results in terms of job satisfaction and job delight of the employees working in the private sector. While the rest of the statements have their actual mean scores greater than the observed mean thus these statements are significant in terms of job satisfaction and job delight.

Table 4.35

Independent Samples Test Training and Development Leads to Job Satisfaction and Job Delight of Employees

Independent Samples Test								
		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means				
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference
The type of training conducted in my organization is satisfactory	Equal variances assumed	1.122	.290	-2.922	598	.004	-.325	.111
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.914	251.721	.004	-.325	.111
The overall training programme in my organization is satisfactory	Equal variances assumed	.145	.703	-5.372	598	.000	-.638	.119
	Equal variances not assumed			-5.410	255.976	.000	-.638	.118
Training develop new skill	Equal variances assumed	.312	.576	-.233	598	.816	-.024	.101
	Equal variances not assumed			-.232	252.235	.816	-.024	.101
The training & development offered to me minimize the accident and damages to equipment	Equal variances assumed	.916	.339	-3.349	598	.001	-.312	.093
	Equal variances not assumed			-3.408	260.598	.001	-.312	.092

Training and development teach the technique of performing a job to employees	Equal variances assumed	2.293	.130	-2.302	598	.022	-.284	.123
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.302	252.791	.022	-.284	.123
I was evaluated after the training programme	Equal variances assumed	2.331	.127	-4.885	598	.000	-.614	.126
	Equal variances not assumed			-4.988	262.234	.000	-.614	.123
T & D enhanced my technical skill	Equal variances assumed	2.928	.088	-3.288	598	.001	-.303	.092
	Equal variances not assumed			-3.311	255.808	.001	-.303	.091
Performance and productivity increase due to the enhanced competency of the employees	Equal variances assumed	2.373	.124	-4.661	598	.000	-.598	.128
	Equal variances not assumed			-4.707	257.151	.000	-.598	.127
There are formal training programs to teach new employees the skills they need to perform their jobs?	Equal variances assumed	12.624	.000	-3.122	598	.002	-.420	.134
	Equal variances not assumed			-3.310	281.075	.001	-.420	.127
I feel job satisfaction is attained through T & D	Equal variances assumed	.657	.418	-4.422	598	.000	-.590	.133

	Equal variances not assumed			-4.468	257.376	.000	-.590	.132
Job satisfaction	Equal variances assumed	36.599	.000	-4.964	598	.000	-4.106	.827
	Equal variances not assumed			-5.231	277.776	.000	-4.106	.785

Table 4.35 exhibits the Independent Sample Test details of the statements designed for gauging the satisfaction level and job delight of the employees towards the Training & Development programs practiced in their service sector. Table 4.35 shows the analysis of the Independent t test for the employee perception with respect to an equal variance assumed and equal variance not received. Here we see that there are two results from two different t-tests, one assumed equal variance and the other unequal variances which result into the use depending on the result from Levene's test. The statements of job satisfaction are analyzed with the help of independent t test and the significance level of each statement is analyzed in the light of its significance level and to know the variance of each statement. The statement with p-value of Levene's test less than 0.05 value of significance interprets that we have to consider unequal variance results while the statements with higher value than 0.05 value, signifies that we have to consider results of equal variance assumed. However if the p-value is greater than 0.05 level of significance we reject the null hypothesis and conclude that there is a significant difference between the job satisfaction of employees with respect to the assessment of training and development leads to the job satisfaction and job delight of employee. Whereas if the value is less than 0.05 %, it implies that we accept the null hypothesis.

Job satisfaction and Job Delight with respect to Training & Development

The regression analysis was performed on the scores obtained from the responses on the statements of fourth objective of the research study i.e. *job satisfaction and job delight with reference to Training & Development*. The purpose was to assess the effect of Training & Development on the discussed dimension along with the job satisfaction and to draft the mathematical model for it. To assess the same ANOVA analysis was performed and t – test was used for the significances of the independent variable and its regression coefficient. To assess the model following hypothesis was framed.

H12: Regression analysis model of dependent variable “job satisfaction and job delight” over the independent variables “Training and Development” was significant

Table 4.36

The “Job Satisfaction and Job Delight” As Dependent Variable and “Training and Development” as Independent Variable

	Un Standardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	27.942	10		2.89311	0.00395
Training and development	0.028	0	0.010364455	0.25347	0.79999

The above table was the output for the dependent variable job satisfaction and job delight. The regression model developed was not significant as ANOVA analysis showed F – test = 0.800, $p > 0.05$. Thus it was analyzed that the aspects regarded by the employees working in the service sector for job satisfaction and job delight was independent of any considered variables i.e. they were not affected by Training & Development. Moreover t – test analysis for the regression coefficient reveals no independent variable was significant enough to be considered in the model for job satisfaction and job delight.

Table 4.37
Descriptive Analysis of Impact of Assessment on Organizational Performance and Managerial Effectiveness

Descriptive Statistics					
	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Enough opportunities are available to continue in the organization	600	1	5	3.33	1.291
Skilled employees performance and productivity is more than the unskilled employees	600	1	5	3.32	1.309
Performance and productivity increase due to the T & D of the employees	600	1	5	3.23	1.373
Performance and productivity increase due to the job knowledge	600	1	5	3.22	1.369
Performance and productivity increase due to the positive attitude of employees	600	1	5	3.27	1.316
I believe my promotion is a result of induction of the training program	600	1	5	3.28	1.362
I believe that my set targets and objective are attained and identified by the firm through training program?	600	1	5	3.38	1.432
In our organization, Training motivates employees to be more committed towards organizational goals?	600	1	5	3.31	1.312
My career path is more in shape due to my participation in the training program?	600	1	5	2.84	1.036
My organization provides a positive feedback for good performance	600	1	5	3.24	1.414
Valid N (listwise)	600				

Table 4.38

Group Statistics					
Nature of Organisation		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Enough opportunities are available to continue in the organization	Private	149	2.87	1.313	.108
	Public	451	3.48	1.248	.059
Skilled employees performance and productivity is more than the unskilled employees	Private	149	2.93	1.266	.104
	Public	451	3.44	1.299	.061
Performance and productivity increase due to the T & D of the employees	Private	149	2.71	1.342	.110
	Public	451	3.41	1.341	.063
Performance and productivity increase due to the job knowledge	Private	149	2.73	1.293	.106
	Public	451	3.38	1.357	.064
Performance and productivity increase due to the positive attitude of employees	Private	149	2.91	1.168	.096
	Public	451	3.38	1.342	.063
I believe my promotion is a result of induction of the training program	Private	149	2.70	1.256	.103
	Public	451	3.47	1.342	.063
I believe that my set targets and objective are attained and identified by the firm through training program?	Private	149	2.91	1.355	.111
	Public	451	3.54	1.424	.067
In our organization, Training motivates employees to be more committed towards organizational goals?	Private	149	2.95	1.207	.099
	Public	451	3.43	1.324	.062
My career path is more in shape due to my participation in the training program?	Private	149	2.69	1.065	.087
	Public	451	2.89	1.023	.048
My organization provides a positive feedback for good performance	Private	149	2.78	1.288	.106
	Public	451	3.39	1.423	.067
Organizational performance and managerial effectiveness	Private	149	28.18	9.392	.769
	Public	451	33.81	10.855	.511

Table 4.39

Independent Samples Test										
		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
Enough opportunities are available to continue in the organization	Equal variances assumed	.406	.524	-5.133	598	.000	-.613	.119	-.848	-.379
	Equal variances not assumed			-5.002	242.321	.000	-.613	.123	-.855	-.372
Skilled employees performance and productivity is more than the unskilled employees	Equal variances assumed	3.684	.055	-4.185	598	.000	-.511	.122	-.750	-.271
	Equal variances not assumed			-4.240	258.512	.000	-.511	.120	-.748	-.273
Performance and productivity increase due to the T & D of the employees	Equal variances assumed	.714	.398	-5.480	598	.000	-.694	.127	-.943	-.446
	Equal variances not assumed			-5.477	252.624	.000	-.694	.127	-.944	-.445
Performance and productivity increase due to the job knowledge	Equal variances assumed	2.085	.149	-5.111	598	.000	-.648	.127	-.896	-.399
	Equal variances not assumed			-5.237	263.833	.000	-.648	.124	-.891	-.404
Performance and productivity increase due to the positive	Equal variances assumed	12.121	.001	-3.812	598	.000	-.469	.123	-.710	-.227

attitude of employees	Equal variances not assumed			-4.087	287.301	.000	-.469	.115	-.694	-.243
I believe my promotion is a result of induction of the training program	Equal variances assumed	4.906	.027	-6.185	598	.000	-.772	.125	-1.017	-.527
	Equal variances not assumed			-6.395	268.171	.000	-.772	.121	-1.010	-.534
I believe that my set targets and objective are attained and identified by the firm through training program?	Equal variances assumed	11.739	.001	-4.692	598	.000	-.624	.133	-.885	-.363
	Equal variances not assumed			-4.810	264.038	.000	-.624	.130	-.879	-.368
In our organization, Training motivates employees to be more committed towards organizational goals?	Equal variances assumed	13.209	.000	-3.952	598	.000	-.484	.122	-.724	-.243
	Equal variances not assumed			-4.140	274.755	.000	-.484	.117	-.714	-.254
My career path is more in shape due to my participation in the training program?	Equal variances assumed	3.293	.070	-2.072	598	.039	-.202	.098	-.394	-.011
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.030	244.540	.043	-.202	.100	-.399	-.006
My organization provides a positive feedback for good performance	Equal variances assumed	9.671	.002	-4.638	598	.000	-.610	.131	-.868	-.351
	Equal variances not assumed			-4.875	276.531	.000	-.610	.125	-.856	-.363

Organizational performance and managerial effectiveness	Equal variances assumed	66.264	.000	-5.664	598	.000	-5.626	.993	-7.577	-3.675
	Equal variances not assumed			-6.090	288.925	.000	-5.626	.924	-7.444	-3.808

Table 4.40
Regression

Coefficients^a					
	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	19.104	11.655		1.639	.102
Training and development	.155	.136	.047	1.142	.254

a. Dependent Variable: Organizational performance and managerial effectiveness

Table 4.41
Regression

Coefficients^a					
	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	-6.121	.552		-11.098	.000
Employee perception towards training	.302	.004	.947	72.271	.000

a. Dependent Variable: Organizational performance and managerial effectiveness

SUMMARY

The whole chapter focuses on the identification of the training and development practices, their implications and perception of the employees towards training and development practices imparted to them in their service sector. Further the study is being carried out with collection of review of literature. On the basis of the results obtained from the study, it is found that the T&D practices followed have deep impact on employees psychology and motivate the employees towards their job in a commendable manner, but if it is done on regular basis and also by a very competent and professional one. It is also concluded that whether the training and development programs are so much effective that by this the employees can enhance their skills, their performance in the job and also satisfied with such training and development practices.

REFERENCE

- ¹ Rigg M (1989): Training in Britain: a study of funding, activity and attitudes—individuals perspectives Sheffield, Training agency.
- ² Noe RA (1986): 'Trainees' attributes and attitudes: neglected influences on training effectiveness'. *Academy of Management Review*, 11: 4, 736-749.
- ³ Santos A and Stuart M (2003): 'Employee perceptions and their influence on training effectiveness' *Human Resource Management Journal*, 13(1), 27-45.
- ⁴ Nancy C Morse (1977): *Satisfactions in the white - collar job*, Ayer publishing.
- ⁵ Hunter W and Tietzen D (1997): *Business to business marketing: Creating a community of customers*. Lincolnwood - Illinois, McGraw - Hill Professional.
- ⁶ Richard Chang Associates, INC.: "Measuring the impact of training, demonstrate the measurable results and return on investment."