



www.eprawisdom.com

Research Paper

EFFECT OF EMPLOYEES TRAINING ON ORGANIZATIONAL PERFORMANCE IN BANKING SERVICE

S. Purna Chandra Shekher¹

¹Research Scholar, Reg. No:SVUCCMCS/Ph.D./Executive/2015, Department of Management Studies, SVU College of Commerce, Management & Computer Science, Tirupati – 517502, A.P, India

Dr.P.Raghunadha Reddy²

²Professor, Department of Management Studies, SVU College of Commerce, Management & Computer Science, Tirupati – 517502, A.P, India

ABSTRACT

The importance of training has become more obvious given the growing complexity of the work environment, the rapid change in organizations and technological advancement which further necessitates the need for training and development of employees to meet the challenges. Training helps to ensure that organizational members possess the knowledge and skills they need to perform their jobs effectively, take on new responsibilities, and adapt to changing conditions. The present study focus on effect on employees training on organisation performance, for this purpose data is collected from 97 respondents by administration of questionnaire base on stratified random sampling and collected data is analysed with the help of statistical package for social sciences using the person product moment correlation coefficient and the one-sample test were used to test the hypotheses formulated in the study. From the study, it is found that there is a positive relationship between employee perception of training and organisational performance and productivity.

KEYWORDS: Development, Knowledge, Organisational Performance, Productivity, Skills and Training.

BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

The history of training in business organizations is as long as the entire history of business organizations (Miller, 1996). This is because the knowledge base or skills of the normal employees in the labour market is not sufficient for the specialized tasks within the organizations. However, the academic study of various forms of training did not start until about a century ago, when researchers started a branch of research under the name of “vocational training” (Salas & Cannon-Bowers, 2001).

Today, we are witnessing an overwhelming number of research studies from both descriptive and prescriptive traditions, focusing on several characteristics of training programs as well as their costs and benefits for business organizations (Becker & Gerhart, 1996). At the sametime, organizations have come to better understand the significance of training for their survival in knowledge-intensive and volatile markets of this era, and thus have increasingly acknowledged the profitability of developing their human resources through various forms of training (Becker & Gerhart, 1996; Salas & Cannon-Bowers, 2001). Human resource capital of any organization plays an important role, thus training and retraining helps in fortifying employees (Khan, Khan, & Khan, 2011).

Despite the obvious significance of training, the enormous expansion in the content of training programs over time has largely been taken for granted. Some Human Resources Departments rarely question the necessity and appropriateness of training a particular employee at a particular time. Often times, there are ulterior motives why employees are sent on training. Mourdoukoutas (2012) found out that some of those organizations that neglect employee training do so because of the huge cost of training and the fear of losing those employees after training them.

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Training has been defined differently by different authors. It is “a systematic acquisition and development of the knowledge, skills, and attitudes required by employees to adequately perform a task or job or to improve performance in the job environment” (Tharenou, Saks, & Moore, 2007). Another concept opines that training primarily focuses on teaching organizational members on how to perform their current jobs and helping them acquire the knowledge and skills they need to be effective performers (Jones, George, & Hill, 2000).

Other scholars view training as, “a planned process to modify attitude, knowledge or skill behaviour through



learning experience to achieve effective performance in any activity or range of activities” (Beardwell & Holden, 2001). Its purpose is to develop the abilities of the individual and to satisfy the current and future needs of the organization.

These definitions did not consider the dynamic and changing nature of the environment in which organizations operate (Okanya, 2008). It also implies that training automatically translate to organizational performance. Skills needed by employees are continuously changing; besides, the ever-changing improvement on information and technology makes knowledge and skills obsolete in a short while. This implies that employees should align their needs to that of the organization’s requirements and their own long-term development and the Human Resources Department should consider the current and future needs of the organization when planning for employee training (Holden, 2001).

A number of authors recognize the purpose of training as being to develop capacities of employees and by extension represents an investment in human resources (Ulrich & Lake, 1990). The quality of employees and their development through training and education are major factors in determining long-term profitability of any business venture.

Human Resource professionals also believe that an organization is only as good as its employees, and this understanding suggests that training should be more specifically responsive to employees’ training needs (Noe, 2008). Arguing in the same line, Bratton and Gold (2000) affirm that successful corporate leaders recognize that their competitive edge in today’s market place is their people. They also acknowledge that few organization know how to manage human resources effectively, primarily because traditional management models are inappropriate in today’s dynamic work environment.

The effectiveness and success of an organization lies on the people who form and work within the organization. It follows therefore that for the employees in an organization to be able to perform their duties and make meaningful contributions to the success of the organizational goals, they need to acquire the relevant skills and knowledge (Ospina & Watad, 1999). In the appreciation of this fact therefore, it becomes imperative for organizations to ascertain the training and development needs of its employees, through its training need analysis and align such needs to the organizational overall needs and objectives in order to actualize the organizational vision and mission.

Smith (2010) opines that training motivates employee and make them more productive and innovative. Smith asserts further that the reasons why training makes sense include, well-trained employees are more capable and willing to assume more control over their jobs; they need less supervision, with free management for other tasks; employees are more capable to answer questions from customers which enhances customer loyalty. Furthermore, employees who understand their job, complain less, are more satisfied and more motivated and thus improve management-employee relationships. Heathfield arguing in the same direction opines that the opportunity to continue to grow and develop through training and development is one of the most important factors in employee motivation (Heathfield, 2011).

Luo (2000) opined that the confusion about employee training comes in the following four ways. First, it

is not inherently or immediately related to the technical aspects of specific job tasks. Second, prior need analysis is rarely conducted for such training, despite suggestions to do so in many training handbooks. Third, organizations and trainers seldom conduct evaluations of behaviour or outcome changes brought out by such training. Evaluation, when there is one, is often about how one feels about the training or what one has learned. The evaluation questionnaire is often called a “smile sheet,” as trainees often respond happily to the questions. But the impact of the training remains uncertain. Fourth, the rapid expansion of personal development training has taken place in the absence of scientific evidence of any link between such training and improvement in organizational bottom lines.

The knowledge and skills of workers acquired through training have become important in the face of the increasingly rapid changes in technology, products, and systems (Thang, Quang, & Buyens, 2010). Most organizations invest in training because they believe that higher performance will result (Alliger, Tannenbaum, Bennett, Traver, & Shortland, 1997; Kozlowski, Brown, Weissbein, Cannon-Bowers, & Salas, 2000). Devanna, Formbrun and Tichy (1984) proposed the Michigan School model also known as the ‘soft’ Human Resource Management (HRM). This model’s emphasis is on treating employees as a means to achieving the organization’s strategy. Its assumption is that ‘what is good for the organization is equally good for the employee’. According to Devanna, Formbrun, and Tichy (1984), training and other HRM activities aim to increase individual performance, which is believed to lead to higher organizational performance. Although the Michigan School model acknowledges the importance of motivating and rewarding people, it concentrates most on managing human assets to achieve strategic goals (Pinnington & Edwards, 2000).

Kozlowski and Klein (2000) offered an excellent analytical framework, which uses a multi-level approach to training. This model bridges the gap between theoretical models of training needs assessment, design, and evaluation, and the higher levels at which training must have an impact if it is to contribute to organizational effectiveness (Kozlowski & Salas, 1997). The model focuses on training transfer. There are two types of training transfer namely horizontal and vertical transfer. Horizontal transfer concentrates on traditional models of training effectiveness, while the vertical transfer examines the link between individual training outcomes and organizational outcomes. The vertical transfer processes are composition and compilation. Composition concentrates on individual contribution at the same content, while compilation focuses on individual contribution at the different or diverse content.

There has been a general resistance to investment in training in organizations until recently because of the presumption that employees hired under a merit system are qualified and trained for their jobs (Okotoni & Erero, 2005). It was further assumed that if that was not the case then it means that initial selection of personnel was faulty (Stahl, 1956). This assumption no longer holds as the need for training became evident in all sectors (Okotoni & Erero, 2005). Training offers a way of “developing skills, enhancing productivity and quality of work, and building worker loyalty to the firm”

Training has become the Holy Grail to some organizations, an evidence of how much the management truly cares about its workforce (Hamid, 2011). Hamid (2011) went further to say that the effectiveness with which organizations manage, develop, motivate, involve and engage the willing contribution of those who work in them is a key determinant of how well these organizations perform.

The importance of training has become more obvious given the growing complexity of the work environment, the rapid change in organizations and technological advancement which further necessitates the need for training and development of employees to meet the challenges. Training helps to ensure that organizational members possess the knowledge and skills they need to perform their jobs effectively, take on new responsibilities, and adapt to changing conditions (Jones, George, & Hill, 2000). Similarly, training helps improve quality, customer satisfaction, productivity, morale, management succession, business development, profitability and organizational performance.

Usually, before training programmes are organized efforts are made through individuals and organization's appraisals to identify the training needs (Olaniyan & Ojo, 2008). After the training programmes, an evaluation is carried out to ascertain the effectiveness of the programme in line with the need, which had been identified (Olaniyan & Ojo, 2008).

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The perception of employees on training has a greater impact on the success of any organization. If the employees are satisfied with the training policies of the organization, this will have a positive impact on the organization's productivity. The perception or attitude of employees is transformed into positive or negative behaviour. How do the employees see employee training policies of the organization? How seriously does the Management take the Training Policy of its organization? Some see training and development as a waste of time and resources that would have been employed in the production of goods and services that will yield profit to the organization. Sometimes, the fear that an employee could leave the organization after training affects the employees training and sometimes makes it unplanned and unsystematic.

The procedure and process usually adopted by some Human Resource Departments in the identification of those employees that require training are worrisome. Employees sometimes go for training for personal reasons which include enriching themselves; preparing themselves for other positions in other organizations; power play/politics; because he/she knows the person in-charge of training and not necessarily because there is an identified skillgap which needs to be filled through training. Often times, the HR Department does not conduct training needs assessment. Employees' training selection criteria ought to be systematic and free from bias. It must follow a lay down procedure to ensure that the right candidates are sent for training for positive effect on organizational performance.

Table 1 Population of the study

Bank Name	Manager	Clerks	Total
Andhra Bank Main Branch	6	12	18
Other Branches	14	65	79
Total	20	77	97

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The main objective of the study is to investigate the effect of employee training on organizational performance with focus on the processes and procedures of selection employees for training. However, specific objectives of the study are as follows:

- To ascertain the extent to which selection procedure of employee for training affects organizational productivity;
- To determine the extent of effect of training design on employee productivity;
- To find out the relationship between employee perceptions of training and organizational productivity; and
- To determine the extent to which employee training affects organizational performance.

HYPOTHESIS

To achieve the objectives of this study, the following hypotheses were formulated for testing.

H₀₁: Selection procedure of employee for training does not have a high effect on organizational productivity.

H₀₂: The training design affects organizational productivity is not significant.

H₀₃: There is no substantial relationship between employee perception of training and organizational productivity.

H₀₄: The extent to which employee training affects organizational productivity is not significant.

SCOPE OF THE STUDY

The study focused on the investigation of the effect of employees training on organizational performance. The study was delimited to training and development programmes, employee training design and delivery style.

RESEARCH DESIGN

The research design chosen for this study is survey method

SOURCES OF DATA

The researcher used primary and secondary sources of data in the data gathering and analysis.

Primary source

In collecting primary data for the study, personal interview and questionnaire were used.

Secondary source

In collecting secondary data, existing but related records like newsletters, annual reports, journals, thesis, books, publications etc. were used.

Population of the Study

The population of the study consists of employees working in Andhra bank main branch and its branches in Chittoor Town of Andhra Pradesh.

Sample Size

The sample size for the present study consists of 97 respondents.

Sampling method

Stratified random sampling method is use in the present study. The population of the study divided in to two strata manager and clerk cadre.

Reliability of The Instrument

In this study, the coefficient alpha analysis is performed on each subscale and on the entire scale. The coefficient alpha values are shown in the table no 2. The coefficient alpha for Selection Procedure of Employee Training is .914, Training Design .919, Training Delivery Style .792, Organizational Productivity .678 and Organizational Performance is .899.

Table 2 Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient for Constructs

S.no	Constructs	No.of items	Cronbach Alpha (α)
1	Selection Procedure of Employee Training	4	.914
2	Training Design	4	.919
3	Training Delivery Style	3	.792
4	Organizational Productivity	4	.678
5	Organizational Performance	3	.899

TOOLS OF ANALYSIS

The data analyses were carried out using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS), while the person product moment correlation coefficient and the one-sample test were used to test the hypotheses formulated in the study.

ANALYSIS AND RESULTS**Table 3 opinion on Reasons for employee training**

Reasons for sending employee on training			
		Frequency	Percent
Valid	To acquire more skills and improve employee performance	62	63.9
	To improve my financial wellbeing	9	9.3
	To enable me secure employment elsewhere	6	6.2
	Result of my loyalty to immediate boss	15	15.5
	To prepare for promotion within the organization	5	5.2
	Total	97	100.0

Table 3 show that 62(63.9%) of the respondents said that the reason for going on training is to acquire more skills and improve their performance; 9(9.3%) said it is to improve their financial wellbeing; 6(6.2%) said it is to enable them secure employment elsewhere; 15(15.5%) said, it is

the reward of their loyalty to their boss, while 5(5.2%) said it is to prepare them for promotion within the organization. This implies that the major reasons for going on training are to acquire more skills and improve performance.

Table 4 Effect of discrimination in selecting employees for training

Effect of discrimination in selecting employees for training					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	12	12.4	12.4	12.4
	Disagree	21	21.6	21.6	34.0
	Undecided	5	5.2	5.2	39.2
	Agree	16	16.5	16.5	55.7
	Strongly Agree	43	44.3	44.3	100.0
	Total	97	100.0	100.0	

Table 4 show that 43(44.3%) of the respondents strongly agreed that discrimination in identifying and selecting employees for training has a negative effect on organizational performance. In the same way, 16(16.5%) agreed that

discrimination has a negative effective on performance. While 5(5.2%) respondents were undecided, 21(21.6%) disagreed and only 12(12.4%) strongly disagreed.

Table 5 Extent to which unsystematic approach of employees training affect organizational productivity

Extent to which unsystematic approach of employees training affect organizational productivity					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Very low extent	6	6.2	6.2	6.2
	Low extent	12	12.4	12.4	18.6
	Undecided	4	4.1	4.1	22.7
	High extent	16	16.5	16.5	39.2
	Very high extent	59	60.8	60.8	100.0
	Total	97	100.0	100.0	

Table 5 show that 59(60.8%) of the respondents opined that unsystematic approach of employee training to a very high extent affects organizational productivity; while 16(16.5%) are of the view that unsystematic approach of employee training to a high extent affects organizational productivity. 4(4.1%) were undecided and 12(12.4%) said it has a low effect on organizational productivity, while 6(6.2%)

opined that its effect is very low and as such is insignificant. The implication of the above is that if the HR department did not follow the systematic approach in selecting employee for training, there is strong likelihood that it will affect the employee participation. And if the employee fails to participate effectively he/she is mostly likely to come back without acquiring any knowledge. The consequence will show on the overall performance of the organization.

Table 6 Extent to which training design affects organizational performance

Extent to which training design affects organizational performance					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Very low extent	7	7.2	7.2	7.2
	Low extent	12	12.4	12.4	19.6
	Undecided	3	3.1	3.1	22.7
	High extent	19	19.6	19.6	42.3
	Very high extent	56	57.7	57.7	100.0
	Total	97	100.0	100.0	

From Table 6 shows that,7(7.2%) of the respondents are of the opinion that training design to a very low extent have effect on organizational performance. 12(12.4%) said it has a low effect on organizational performance, while 3(3.1%) were undecided. Contrary to that, 56(57.7%) of the respondents believe that training design to

a very high extent affect organizational performance and 19(19.6%) said training design to a high extent affect organizational performance. Again, the implication is that if there is a good training design, it shows on employee's productivity which in turn impacts on organizational performance positively.

Table 7 opinion on Importance of training design on employee performance

Importance of training design on employee performance					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not important	9	9.3	9.3	9.3
	Somewhat important	13	13.4	13.4	22.7
	Undecided	6	6.2	6.2	28.9
	Important	14	14.4	14.4	43.3
	Very important	55	56.7	56.7	100.0
	Total	97	100.0	100.0	

Table 7 show that training design is important as acclaimed by 14(14.4%) of the total respondents, in like manner, 55(56.7%) said it is very important to organizational

performance. Only 9(9.3%) think that it is not necessary, 13(13.4%) said it is somewhat important and 6 (6.2%) are undecided.

Table 8 opinion on Extent to which training delivery style affects employee performance

Extent to which training delivery style affects employee performance					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Very low extent	5	5.2	5.2	5.2
	Low extent	13	13.4	13.4	18.6
	Undecided	6	6.2	6.2	24.7
	High extent	15	15.5	15.5	40.2
	Very high extent	58	59.8	59.8	100.0
	Total	97	100.0	100.0	

In Table 8, 15(15.5%) of the respondents opined that training delivery style to a high extent affects employee performance, while 58(59.8%) said to a very high extent it affects organizational performance. 6(6.2%) out of the total

respondents were undecided and 13(13.4%) said the extent to which it affects affect organizational performance is low, while 5(5.2%) said the effect is very negligible.

Table 9 opinion on Employee perception of training is correlated to organizational performance

Employee perception of training is correlated to organizational performance					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	5	5.2	5.2	5.2
	Disagree	13	13.4	13.4	18.6
	Undecided	8	8.2	8.2	26.8
	Agree	17	17.5	17.5	44.3
	Strongly Agree	54	55.7	55.7	100.0
Total		97	100.0	100.0	

Table 9 show that 54(55.7%) of the respondents strongly agreed that there is a relationship between employee perception of training and organizational performance. Similarly, 17(17.5%) agreed that there is a relationship

between employee perception of training and organizational performance. 8(8.2%) were undecided, 13(13.4%) disagree and only 5(5.2%) strongly disagree.

Table 10 opinion on Employee training affects organizational performance

Extent of employee training effect on organizational performance					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Very low extent	4	4.1	4.1	4.1
	Low extent	14	14.4	14.4	18.6
	Undecided	9	9.3	9.3	27.8
	High extent	15	15.5	15.5	43.3
	Very high extent	55	56.7	56.7	100.0
	Total		97	100.0	100.0

Table 10 show that 55(56.7%) of the respondents said that employee training to a very high extent affects organizational performance. 15(15.5%) opined that employee training to a high extent affect organizational performance.

9(9.3%) were undecided, 14(14.4%) opined that employee training to a low extent affect organizational performance, while, only 4(4.1%) opined that employee training to a very low extent affect organizational performance

Table 11 opinion on Relationship between employee training and employee performance

Relationship between employee training and employee performance					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	9	9.3	9.3	9.3
	Disagree	15	15.5	15.5	24.7
	Undecided	4	4.1	4.1	28.9
	Agree	17	17.5	17.5	46.4
	Strongly Agree	52	53.6	53.6	100.0
	Total		97	100.0	100.0

In Table 11, 52(53.6%) of the respondents strongly agreed that the more training employee attends the better his/her performance. Thus, employee training improves performance. 17(17.5%) agreed also that employee training

increases performance. On the other hand, 15(15.5%) disagreed, while 9(9.3%) strongly disagreed. Only 4(4.1%) of the total respondents were undecided.

HYPOTHESIS TESTING

Table 12 The One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test for unsystematic approach of employees training

One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test		
		Extent to which unsystematic approach of employees training affect organizational productivity
N		97
Normal Parameters ^{a,b}	Mean	4.1340
	Std. Deviation	1.30407
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	.355
	Positive	.253
	Negative	-.355
Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z		3.496
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
a. Test distribution is Normal.		
b. Calculated from data.		

Unsystematic approach of employee training has a high effect on organizational productivity. Therefore, we accept the null hypothesis and reject the alternate hypothesis.

Table 13 One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test for training design affects organizational performance

One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test		
		Extent to which training design affects organizational performance
N		97
Normal Parameters ^{a,b}	Mean	4.0825
	Std. Deviation	1.32814
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	.332
	Positive	.245
	Negative	-.332
Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z		3.275
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
a. Test distribution is Normal.		
b. Calculated from data.		

From the above, the Test Statistics, ($Z_c = 3.275 > Z_t = 0.730$; $\alpha = 0.05$) was observed and it was found that good training design could affect organizational performance as much as bad training design. Therefore, the extent to which

training design affects organizational performance is high. We reject the null hypothesis and accept the alternate hypothesis.

Table 14 Correlation between Employee perception of training and organizational performance

Correlations			
		Employee perception of training	organizational performance
Employee perception of training	Pearson Correlation	1	.628**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	97	97
organizational performance	Pearson Correlation	.628**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	97	97

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

From the above Pearson Correlation ($r = 0.628$; $\alpha = 0.05$) test, there is a positive relationship between employee perception of training and organizational performance.

Table 15 Correlation between Employee perception of training and organizational productivity

Correlations			
		Employee perception of training	Organizational Productivity
Employee perception of training	Pearson Correlation	1	.598**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	97	97
Organizational Productivity	Pearson Correlation	.598**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	97	97

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

From the above Pearson Correlation ($r = 0.598$; $\alpha = 0.05$) test, there is a positive relationship between employee perception of training and organizational productivity.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

- It is found that 62(63.9%) of the respondents said that the reason for going on training is to acquire more skills and improve their performance.
- It is reveals, that 43(44.3%) of the respondents strongly agreed that discrimination in identifying and selecting employees for training has a negative effect on organizational performance.

- From the results it is found that 59(60.8%) of the respondents opined that unsystematic approach of employee training to a very high extent affects organizational productivity.
- From the result it is inferred that 56(57.7%) of the respondents believe that training design to a high extent affect organizational performance.
- It is found that 15(15.5%) of the respondents opined that training delivery style to a high extent affects employee performance, while 58(59.8%) said to a very high extent it affects organizational performance.



- It is found that 54(55.7%) of the respondents strongly agreed that there is a relationship between employee perception of training and organizational performance.
- From the study it is reveal that 55(56.7%) of the respondents said that employee training to a very high extent affects organizational performance.
- It is found that there was a very strong positive relationship between employee perception of Training, organizational performance and organisational productivity.

RECOMMENDATIONS

In the light of the findings of the study the following recommendation are made.

- Recommending employees for training based on favoritism should be discouraged by the management.
- A mechanism should be created for proper assessment and evaluation of employee performance after training. Some of the employee performance indicators enumerated in this research work could be adopted by the organizations.
- The HR department should ensure also that adequate training design, rich in content is used for employee training. The content should be able to include all the identified skill gaps, while making sure that a trainer who is knowledgeable and experienced in that area is contracted for the training delivery.
- Employees should be encouraged to embrace other developmental courses that could impact on their general performance and increase organizational performance.

CONCLUSION

The study concludes that if the right employees are sent on training through the systematic training procedure of identifying and selecting employees for training, there would be a significant improvement on the organizational performance. Therefore, for organizations to become more productive and remain in business, especially in this era of increased global competitiveness and growing complexity of the work environment, adequate training need assessment should be conducted by the Human Resource (HR) department before sending employees on training.

REFERENCES

1. Alliger, G., Tannenbaum, S., Bennett, W., Traver, H., & Shortland, A. (1997). *A meta-analysis on the relations among training criteria*. *Personnel Psychology*, 50, 341-358.
2. Beardwell, L., & Holden, L. (2001). *Human Resource Management: A contemporary approach*. Essex: Pearson Education Limited.
3. Becker, B., & Gerhart, B. (1996). *The Impact of Human Resource Management on Organizational Performance: Progress and Prospects*. *Academy of Management Journal*, 39(4), 779-801.
4. Bratton, J., & Gold, J. (2000). *Human Resource Management: Theory and Practice*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
5. Devanna, M., Fombrun, C., & Tichy, N. (1984). *A framework for strategic human resource management*. In C. Fombrun, N. Tichy, & M. Devanna, *Strategic human resource management* (pp. 33-55). New York: Wiley.
6. Hamid, S. (2011). *A study of effectiveness of training and development programmes of UPSTDG, India – An Analysis*. *South Asian Journal of Tourism and Heritage*, 4(1), 74-82.
7. Heathfield, S. (2011, November). *Training and development for employee motivation and retention*. *About.com Human Resources*. Retrieved from http://humanresources.about.com/od/training/a/training_dev.html.
8. Holden, L. (2001). *Human resource development: the organization and the national framework*. In Beardwell et al, *Human Resource Management: a contemporary approach*. Essex : Pearson Education Limited.
9. Jones, G., George, J., & Hill, C. (2000). *Contemporary Management*. New York: Irwin and McGraw Hills.
10. Khan, R., Khan, F., & Khan, M. (2011, July). *Impact of Training and Development on Organizational Performance*. *Global Journal of Management and Business Research*, 11(7). Retrieved from http://globaljournals.org/GJMBR_Volume11/8-Impact-of-Training-and-Development-on-Organizational-Performance.pdf
11. Kozlowski, S., & Salas, E. (1997). *An organizational systems approach for the implementation and transfer of training*. In J. Ford, S. Kozlowski, K. Kraiger, E. Salas, & M. Teachout, *Improving training effectiveness in work organizations* (pp. 247-287). Mahwah, NJ : Erlbaum.
12. Kozlowski, S., Brown, K., Weissbein, D., Cannon-Bowers, J., & Salas, E. (2000). *A multilevel approach to training effectiveness*. In K. Klein, & S. Kozlowski, *Multi level Theory research, and methods in organizations: Foundations, extensions, and new directions* (pp. 157-210). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
13. Luo, X. (2000, June). *The Rise of Personal Development Training in Organizations: A Historical and Institutional Perspective on Workplace Training Programs in the U.S.* . *Perspectives*, 1(6). Retrieved from http://www.oycf.org/Perspectives2/6_063000/rise_of_personal_development_tra.htm.
14. Miller, V. (1996). *The History of Training*. In R. Craig, *The ADTS Training and Development Handbook: A Guide to Human Resource Development* (pp. 3-17). New York: McGraw-Hill.
15. Noe, R. (2008). *Employee Training and Development*. Irwin : McGraw-Hill.
16. Okanya, S. (2008). *Reconciling Organisational Performance and Employee Satisfaction through Training: The case of Soroti District Local Government*. *A Research Paper presented for the award of Masters of Arts in Development Studies, the Institute of Social Studies , Hague*.
17. Okotoni, O., & Erero, J. (2005). *Manpower training and development in the Nigerian public service*. *African Journal of Public Administration and Management*, 16(1).
18. Olaniyan, D., & Ojo, L. (2008). *Staff training and development: a vital tool for organizational effectiveness*. *European Journal of Scientific Research*, 24(3). Retrieved from . <http://www.eurojournals.com/ejsr.htm>
19. Ospina, S., & Watad, M. (1999). *Integrated Managerial Training: A Program for Strategic Management*. *Review of Public Personnel Management*, 28(2), 185-195.
20. Pinnington, A., & Edwards, T. (2000). *Introduction to Human Resource Management*. USA: Oxford University Press.
21. Salas, E., & Cannon-Bowers, J. (2001). *The Science of Training: A Decade of Progress*. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 52, 471-499.
22. Smith, G. (2010). *How to Increase Job Satisfaction and Improve Employee Engagement*. Retrieved from www.chartcourse.com/articlepride.htm.
23. Thang, N., Quang, T., & Buyens, D. (2010). *The relationship between training and firm performance: a literature review*. *Research and Practice in Human Resource Management*, 18(1).
24. Tharenou, P., Saks, M., & Moore, C. (2007). *A review and Critique of research on training and organizational-level outcomes*. *Human Resource Management Review*, 17, 251-273.
25. Ulrich, D., & Lake . (1990). *Organizational Capacity: Competing from the inside out*. New York: Wiley.