

## EMPLOYEES' TRAINING IN IT SECTOR – AN EMPIRICAL STUDY

*P. Mohanraj<sup>1</sup> & P. Latha<sup>2</sup>*

*<sup>1</sup>Associate Professor and Research Supervisor, Department of Management Studies, Nandha Arts and Science College,  
Erode, Tamil Nadu, India*

*<sup>2</sup>Research Scholar, Nandha Arts and Science College, Erode, Tamil Nadu, India*

---

**Received: 12 Jan 2018**

**Accepted: 12 Mar 2018**

**Published: 31 Mar 2018**

---

### **ABSTRACT**

*This article aims “To identify the concept of human resource training and how to effectively and efficiently train employees in the IT Sector”. Training the employees correctly is a vital piece of whether or not the business will be successful. If the employees are trained right and perform in a way that grows the business, ultimately they will also be successful. It was evident that in this, competitive world, training plays an important role in the competent and challenging format of business. Therefore every organization needs to study the role, importance, and advantages of training and its positive impact on development for the growth of the organization. Hence, training implies constructive development in such organizational motives for optimum enhancement of the effectiveness of the employees and helps in improving the employee behavior and attitude towards the job and also uplift their morale. Effectively trained employees are the key to any successful business. Finally, describes several key factors which determine how employee training programmes can best support company profitability.*

**KEYWORDS:** *Training, Organization, Effectiveness, Training and Development, Human Capital*

### **INTRODUCTION**

Training can be stated as the methods which are imparted to the employee in fulfilling the organizational goals. Organizations involving in the evaluation of training effectiveness are not only responsible for what the employees learn but they need to see that the knowledge which the employee gained is being applicable in their work performance. so, Training and its regular evaluation would definitely make an organization to stand in the limelight in achieving the objectives. Organizations invest huge amounts in their employee training ex: Infosys and many other MNC's. The unique nature of the market, all organizations are required to grab the opportunities to meet the underlying challenges. In this dynamic environment, the organizations are facing many challenges. In order to face a lot of pressure to attract and retain competent and talented workforce, the management needs to understand the importance of the effectiveness of training. Hence training is considered as the process of upgrading the knowledge, developing skills, bringing about attitude and apparent behavioral changes and improving the ability of the employee or trainee to perform tasks effectively and efficiently in firms (Wills, 1994; Palo et al, 2003; Robert et al, 2004). Training and development refer to the obtaining or transferring knowledge, skills, and ability process need to carry out a specific activity or functions. To meet the current and future challenges of organizations, training and development assume a wide range of learning actions, ranging from training of the individual for their present tasks and moreover, knowledge sharing to improve the organization horizon and

customers service. Which focus on their career development and enrichment, thus expanding individual, group and organizational effectiveness?

On the job Individual

↓↑

Drivers → Methods → Benefits → Evaluation → Outcomes (Organizational effectiveness)

↑↓

Off the job Organization

**Figure 1, conceptual Framework training and development of employees**

### Materials and Methods

The choice of evaluation criteria (i.e., the dependent measure used to operational the effectiveness of training) is a primary decision that must be made when evaluating the effectiveness of training. Although newer approaches to, and models of, training evaluation have been proposed (e.g., Day, Arthur, & Gettman, 2001; Kraiger, Ford, & Sales, 1993), Kirkpatrick's (1959, 1976, 1996) four-level model of training evaluation and criteria continues to be the most popular. Learning Criteria are measures of the learning outcomes of training; they are not measures of job performance. They are typically operationalized by using paper and pencil and performance tests. According to Tannenbaum and Yuki (1992) "the trainee learning appears to be a necessary but not sufficient prerequisite for behavior change". In contrast, behavioral criteria are measures of actual on-the-job performance and can be used to identify the effects of training on actual work performance. Although learning and behavioral criteria are conceptually linked, researchers have had limited success in empirically demonstrating this relationship (Alliger Et Al., 1997; Quinones, Ford, Segó & Smith, 1995; Tracey, Tannenbaum and Kavanagh, 1995). Finally results criteria (e.g., productivity, company profits) are the most distal and macro criteria used to evaluate the effectiveness of training.

The methodology of this study consists of primary data. These data are collected from the respondents through questionnaires. The Primary data were collected from the respondent. Problem definition is the first step towards any research project. The problem in the project report was the attrition rate of the organization seems to be increasing day by day, hence affecting the productivity and overall growth of the organization. The research design used in this study is an exploratory research design. The data was collected by distributing the questionnaires to the employees. The sampling frame is the pool from which the interviewees are chosen. All the items consideration in any field of inquiry constitutes a universe of the population. In this research, only a few items can be selected from the population for our study purpose. The items selected constitute what is technically called a sample. Here our sample size is 80 employees from the total population of the employees. The samples are selected on the basis of the simple random sampling technique.

### RESULT AND DISCUSSIONS

The T-test accesses whether the means of two groups are statistically different from each other. This analysis is appropriate whenever you want to compare the means of two groups, and especially appropriate as the analysis for the design. The T-test is used to determine whether there's a significant difference between two group means.

**Hypothesis Statement 1:** There is a significant difference of employee training levels between male and female

**Table 1**

	Gender	N	Mean	Std.Deviation	Std. Error	Mean
Total W	Male	51	15.63	2.020	2.283	
	Female	29	13.00	2.632	4.489	
Total S	Male	51	16.02	1.954	2.274	
	Female	29	14.24	2.182	4.405	
Total T	Male	51	12.27	3.753	5.525	
	Female	29	12.62	3.821	7.710	
Total B	Male	51	12.69	2.943	4.412	
	Female	29	9.93	2.492	4.463	
Total P	Male	51	12.94	2.611	3.366	
	Female	29	11.28	3.663	6.680	
Total TS	Male	51	14.96	2.332	3.327	
	Female	29	13.03	2.897	5.538	
Total G	Male	51	14.69	2.510	3.351	
	Female	29	13.31	2.189	4.407	
Total CP	Male	51	14.29	2.500	3.350	
	Female	29	13.31	2.392	4.444	
Total CC	Male	51	15.06	2.284	3.320	
	Female	29	13.45	2.959	5.549	
Final Total	Male	51	128.55	14.719	2.061	
	Female	29	114.17	17.021	3.161	

**Independent Sample Test**

**Table 2**

Levene's test for t-test for Equality of Means						
Equality of Variances						
	F	Sig.	T	df	Sig.	Mean Std. Error 95% confidence In- (2-tailed) Difference Difference terval of Difference
			Lower	Upper		
Total W	3.130	.081	5.002	78.000	.025	2.63525 1.582 3.673
Total S	4.653	.033	46.936	78.000	.000	2.63565 1.491 3.764
Total T	1.059	.307	3.750	78.000	.584	1.78474 1.834 2.722
Total B	3.637	.061	53.176	78.000	.000	1.78489 1.798 2.759
Total P	1.107	.294	-.394	78.695	.529	-.35879 -2.095 1.403
Total TS	1.107	.294	-.394	78.695	.529	-.35879 -2.095 1.403
Total G	1.288	.260	4.247	78.000	.262	2.76649 1.464 4.047
Total CP	4.447	.033	66.572	78.000	.000	2.76620 1.518 3.992
Total CC	9.806	.002	2.362	78.021	.013	1.67705 1.262 3.069
Final Total	2.156	.144	44.433	78.000	.001	1.67772 1.109 3.221
Total TS	3.846	.053	3.249	78.002	.019	1.93593 1.746 3.107
Total G	3.061	.081	48.733	78.004	.000	1.93629 1.662 3.191
Total CP	0.085	.771	2.465	78.016	.613	1.38558 1.265 2.487
Total CC	2.560	.113	65.101	78.013	.003	1.38537 1.303 2.449
Final Total	0.065	.799	1.718	78.090	.608	-.156 2.124
Total CC	1.739	.089	60.519	78.566	.002	-.147 2.115
Final Total	5.675	.020	2.719	78.008	.001	1.61592 1.431 2.790
Final Total	2.533	.115	47.150	78.015	.001	1.61636 1.332 2.889
Final Total	934.337		3.966	78.000		14.38 3.625 7.161 21.593
Final Total	3.810		51.646	78.000		14.38 3.773 6.804 21.950

### Significant Level – Less than 0.05

As per our T-test result in above tables, there was no significant difference in employee training level between male and female. However, it was found that the total performance management was significant, where the male's satisfaction level was higher than for females. It was also found that the total corporate culture was significant, where the male's satisfaction level was higher than for females.

**Hypothesis Statement 2:** There is a significant difference of employee training levels between male and female

### Group Statistics

**Table 3**

	TP	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	Mean
Total W	Temporary	37	14.05	2.828	2.465	
	Permanent	43	15.21	2.242	3.342	
Total S	Temporary	37	15.05	2.592	4.26	
	Permanent	43	15.65	1.785	2.272	
Total T	Temporary	37	12.68	3.496	5.575	
	Permanent	43	12.16	3.994	6.09	
Total B	Temporary	37	11.08	2.702	4.44	
	Permanent	43	12.21	3.306	5.04	
Total P	Temporary	37	11.84	3.354	5.551	
	Permanent	43	12.77	2.869	4.37	
Total TS	Temporary	37	14.11	2.503	4.12	
	Permanent	43	14.40	2.880	4.39	
Total G	Temporary	37	14.03	2.166	3.356	
	Permanent	43	14.33	2.732	4.17	
Total CP	Temporary	37	13.86	2.299	3.78	
	Permanent	43	14.00	2.673	4.08	
Total CC	Temporary	37	14.14	2.859	4.70	
	Permanent	43	14.77	2.448	3.73	
Final Total	Temporary	37	120.84	16.779	2.758	
	Permanent	43	125.49	17.044	2.599	

### Independent Sample Test

Table 4

Levene's test for t-test for Equality of Means						
Equality of Variances						
	F	Sig.	T	df	Sig.	Mean Std. Error 95% confidence In-
(2-tailed)	Difference	Difference	Difference	terval of Difference		
Lower	Upper					
Total W	1.828.180	-2.037	78.045	-1.16.567	-2.284	-.026
	-2.002	68.338.049	-1.16.577	-2.307	-.004	
Total S	4.679.034	-1.213	78.229	-.60.492	-1.577.383	
	-1.181	62.450.242	-.60.506	-1.608.414		
Total T	1.129.291.606	78.546.51.846	-1.171	2.197		
	.612	77.971.542.51.837	-1.154	2.180		
Total B	3.114.082	-1.654	78.102	-1.13.682	-2.486.230	
	-1.679	77.810.097	-1.13.672	-2.466.210		
Total P	1.025	314	-1.336	78.185	-.93.696	-2.315.455
	-1.321	71.353.191	-.93.704	-2.333.474		
Total TS	.871.354	-.472	78.638	-.29.608	-1.498.924	
	-.477	77.989.634	-.29.602	-1.485.911		
Total G	1.480.227	-.535	78.594	-.30.558	-1.409.812	
	-.545	77.519.588	-.30.548	-1.390.793		
Total CP	.498.482	-.240	78.811	-.14.562	-1.254.984	
	-.243	78.000.809	-.14.556	-1.242.972		
Total CC	1.239.269	-1.066	78.290	-.63.593	-1.813.549	
	-1.053	71.389.296	-.63.600	-1.829.564		
Final Total	.003.954	-1.226	78.224	-4.65	3.795	-12.205 2.904
	-1.227	76.569.224	-4.65	3.790	-12.198	2.897

**Significant Level – Less than 0.05**

As per our T-test result in above tables, there was no significant difference between permanent and temporary employees. However, none of the factors of satisfaction showed significant level below 0.05. So our Hypothesis statement 2 is rejected.

**SUGGESTION AND CONCLUSIONS**

The study on employees' satisfaction in the organization is a result of full co-operation of the employees and management. As far as possible within the given limits the study is completed with the satisfaction of many people. The data collected are analyzed scientifically and the results obtained are free to nearly 80%. It is assured that the company may get high boosted morale in the organization provided some of the suggestions made in the report is carried out. We have identified the significant factors of employee training and also tested two hypothesis statements. The main message here is that effective training plays a vital role in any organization. It occurs by hard work. It also occurs by building an attitude for training and then measuring its progress. These ideas redefine how the companies train its employees. Since businesses spend large sums of money on training and education, anything that can accelerate or enhance learning will save both time and money.

## REFERENCES

1. Kirkpatrick, D. L. (1975). *Techniques for Evaluating Training programs*. Evaluating training programs D.L. Kirkpatrick (ed.) Alexandria, VA: ASTD
2. Craig, Robert L., ed. *Training and Development Handbook: A Guide to Human Resource Development*. 3rd edition. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1987
3. Arthur, W., Jr., Tubre, T. C., Paul, D. S., & Edens, P. S. (in press). *Teaching effectiveness: The relationship between reaction and learning criteria*. *Educational Psychology*, 23, 275–285.
4. Burke, M. J., & Day, R. R. (1986). *A cumulative study of the effectiveness of managerial training*. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71, 232–245. Campbell, J. P. (1971). *Personnel training and development*. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 22, 565–602.
5. Amirtharaj, S. M. D., Cross, K. R., & Vembar, V. (2011). *HR concepts in hotel industry towards employee training and development*. *Int J Hum Res*, 1, 44-56.
6. Patrick, J. (1992). *Training Research and Practice*. London: Academic Press.
7. Alliger, G. M., Janak, E. A. (1989). *Kirkpatrick's levels of training criteria: Thirty years later*. *Personnel Psychology*, 42 (2), 331-342
8. Warr, P. B. (2002). *Learning and training*. In P.B. Warr, (ed) *Psychology at Work*. London: Penguin Books.
9. Morrison, J. E. (1991). *Training for performance*. Chichester: John Wiley and Sons Ltd.
10. Quinones, M. A. (1995). *Pretraining context effects: Training assignment as feedback*. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 80, 226–238.
11. Burke, M.J, Day, R.R (1986), "A Cum ulative Study o f the Effectiveness of Managerial T raining", *Journal o f Applied Psychology*, vol 71, pp 232- 246.
12. Schalock, R. (2001). *Outcome based evaluations (2nd edition)*. Boston: Kluwer Academic/Plenum.
13. Facticeau, J. D., Dobbins, G. H., Russell, J. E. A., Ladd, R. T., & Kudisch, J. D. (1992). *Noe's model of training effectiveness: A structural equations analysis*. Paper presented at the Seventh Annual Conference of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Montreal, Quebec, Canada.