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ABSTRACT

The study focused on the effect of employee training on organizational performance. The process and procedure of identifying employee skill gap in most organizations pose a big challenge to the Human Resource Department (HRD). Employee training is based on various reasons which could be detrimental to the overall objective of the organization. The HRD ensure that sending an employee on training will translate to increase in productivity. Thus, adequate consideration should be taken by the HRD when selecting a candidate for training. The ability to manage and work around the challenges faced when carrying out this HR function will ensure a better training objective that will affect the productivity of the employee and the organization. Since the effect of these factors brings with it some negative implications and consequences of low productivity, high rate of employee turnover and high cost; this study therefore was aimed at identifying the effects of employee training on organizational performance with special emphasis on the process and procedure of selecting employee for training. Pursuant to this, some objectives were formulated by the researcher and these were to ascertain the extent to which unsystematic approach of employee training affects organizational productivity; to determine the extent of effect of training design on employee productivity; to ascertain the extent to which training delivery style affects employee productivity; to determine the relationship between employee perceptions of training and organizational productivity; and to determine the extent to which employee training affects organizational performance. In pursuit of the objectives, a survey research was carried out in Enugu State, Nigeria. The population used for the study was 694 staff of Nigerian Bottling Company and 7UP Bottling Company. Sample size was determined using Yamane (1964) formula. A sample size of 254 was drawn. The study made use of data from primary and secondary sources which were collected using questionnaire administered to the 254 staff of the selected Organizations. Personnel records and annual reports of the selected Organizations were used for secondary data. The data analyses was 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. Findings from the study reveal that the extent to which unsystematic approach of employee training affected organizational productivity was high. This was statistically supported by the one-sample test at 0.05 (Zc = 8.246 < Zt = 0.000). Again, the extent of effect of training design on employee productivity was high. The one-sample test (Zc = 0.679 < Zt = 0.730; α= 0.05) confirms this assertion. The extent to which training delivery style affected employee productivity was high as attested to by the result of one-sample test (Zc = 0.681 < Zt = 0.762; α= 0.05). Similarly, there was a very strong positive relationship between employee perception of training and organizational performance. This is confirmed with the Pearson Correlation coefficient value of 0.948 at 0.05level of significance. The extent to which employee training alone affected organizational performance was low, however, when other variables like training design, training delivery style were considered, its effect became significant. This is confirmed by the one-sample test at 0.05 (Zc = 0.705 > Zt = 0.665). Based on the finding, 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. Finally, it is recommended that a mechanism should be created for proper assessment and evaluation of employee performance after training as this will ensure that only employees who require training are sent on training.
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CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Study

The history of training in business organizations is as long as the entire history of business organizations (Miller, 1996:3). 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 and Cannon Bowers, 2001). The beginning of the twentieth century and especially after World War II saw the widespread of training programs among organizations, involving more and more employees and also expanding in content (Luo, 2000). In the 1910s, only a few large companies such as Westinghouse, General Electric, and International Harvester had factory schools that focused on training technical skills for entry-level workers. By the end of 1990, forty percent of the Fortune 500 firms in America had a corporate university or learning center (Meister, 1997).

Training in Nigeria could be traced back to 1960 when it was discovered that most of the top government and business positions were occupied by expatriates (Olalere and Adesoji, 2013). The departure of the whites after independence gave rise to a big vacuum of capable indigenous human capital. This prompted the Federal Government of Nigeria to set up a Manpower Board in 1962 following the Ashby Commissions Recommendations (Olalere and Adesoji, 2013:83). Consequently, the Federal Government of Nigeria established complimentary institutions like the Centre for Management Development (CMD), Administrative Staff College of Nigeria, Industrial Training Fund (ITF), and Federal Training
Centre to train and retrain employees as well as give orientation to fresh graduates of formal academic institutions (Olalere and Adesoji, 2013).

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 and Gerhart, 1996). At the same time, 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 (Berge, 2001; Salas and Cannon-Bowers, 2001). Human resource capital of any organization plays an important role, thus training and retraining helps in fortifying employees (Khan, Khan and 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.

To show the importance attached to employee training, Nigerian Bottling Company has a training school and 7UP Bottling Company conducts on-the-job and off-the-job training for employees from time to time. This notwithstanding HR Departments in these organizations still face challenges in the selection of employees for training. To assist in the possible
improvement of employee training in Soft Drinks Bottling Companies in particular and manufacturing companies in general, the research was embarked upon to investigate the effect of employee training on organizational performance vis-à-vis the processes of employee training and the challenges faced by the Human Resource Department in the selection of employees for training with reference to the employees of Nigerian Bottling Company and 7UP Bottling Company, 9th Mile Corner, Ngwo, Enugu.

1.2 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 skill gap 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.

It is found that previous researchers have concentrated on the importance and benefits of training and no study has been carried out on the challenges faced by the HR departments of Soft Drink Bottling Companies in the selection of employees for training. In order to fill this gap, the researcher is compelled to conduct a study on the effect of employee training on organizational performance with focus on processes and procedures of identifying skill gaps, training design and delivery style and employee perception towards training in Soft Drinks Bottling Companies in Enugu State.

1.3 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:

1. To ascertain the extent to which selection procedure of employee for training affects organizational productivity;
2. To determine the extent of effect of training design on employee productivity;
3. To ascertain the extent to which training delivery style affects employee productivity;
4. To find out the relationship between employee perceptions of training and organizational productivity; and
5. To determine the extent to which employee training affects organizational performance.
1.4 Research Questions

The research questions were drawn in line with the objectives as follows:

1. To what extent does selection procedure of employee for training affect organizational productivity?
2. To what extent does training design affect organizational performance?
3. To what extent does training delivery style affect organizational performance?
4. What is the relationship between employee perception of training and organizational productivity?
5. To what extent does employee training affects organizational performance?

1.5 Hypotheses

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

H₀: 1 Selection procedure of employee for training does not have a high effect on organizational productivity.
H₀: 2 The extent to which training design affects organizational productivity is not significant.
H₀: 3 The extent to which training delivery style affects organizational productivity is not significant.
H₀: 4 There is no substantial relationship between employee perception of training and organizational productivity.
H₀: 5 The extent to which employee training affects organizational productivity is not significant.
1.6 **Significance of the Study**

The significance of this study cannot be over-emphasized and can be viewed from the following perspectives.

1. The study will help the top management in taking strategic decision that affect training and development for the overall growth of the industry;
2. Members of Staff of the two manufacturing industries to be used as case study will have adequate knowledge as to the importance of training and why it is necessary that they are trained from time to time;
3. The study will help the Human Resource Department in proper planning and execution of training and development programmes;
4. Future researchers will also find this work very useful as reference materials for further studies;
5. The study will be useful to the researcher as it will help her in actualizing her dream and lead her to the completion of M.Sc. program in Management.

1.7 **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, post-training performance evaluation of training on organizational performance.

The geographical scope of the work is Enugu State in the South-east of Nigeria. The only two soft drinks manufacturing companies located in Enugu State were chosen for the study. They are: Nigerian Bottling Company Plc and 7UP Bottling Company Plc.

The field work for this research was conducted between August and September, 2012.
1.8 Limitations of the Study

The following constraints were encountered in the course of this work.

1. **Lack of reliable data**: The Respondents’ unwillingness to give out available and reliable data was major constrain in the course of the study.

2. **Dearth of Research materials**: The researcher was constrained in the search of research materials. Most current books and journals on the related area are not free, and so the researchers was limited to those materials she could afford.

3. **Measure used to collect data**: Secondary data would have been more appropriate for the post-evaluation analysis, but because it was difficult to separate and link percentage (%) increase in turnover to employee training, primary data was used.

4. **Self-reported data**: Self reported data was a major limitation of the study, because it rarely can be independently verified. The researcher had to take what the respondents said at face value.

Nonetheless, with available data and judicious use of the limited resources, reasonable analysis was carried out to ensure that research findings add up to the body of knowledge.

1.9 Operational Definition of Terms

**Delivery style** - This is a set of a systematic processes designed to meet learning objectives related to trainees' current or future jobs (Simmering, M.J., www.referenceforbusiness.com).

**Training design** - This is the process of creating a blueprint for the development of instruction for a training for positive impact (O’Toole, S., eHow Contributor).
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CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

2.1 Overview of the Effect of Employee Training on Organizational Performance

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 and 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 and Erero, 2005). Training offers a way of “developing skills, enhancing productivity and quality of work, and building worker loyalty to the firm” (http://www.bls.gov/oco/ocos021.htm).

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 and 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, 2008:327). 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). The
essence of evaluation is to know the extent to which the training has positively affected the
employee’s productivity. Organization’s development follows the development of individual
who form the organization. It therefore follows that no organization becomes effective and
efficient until the employee has acquired and applied the required skills and knowledge.

2.2 Conceptual Framework

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
and Moore, 2007:252). 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 and 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 and Holden, 2001:324). 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).

These divergent views notwithstanding, all the scholars seem to point to one fact that the training aims at improving organizational performance.

### 2.2.1 Purpose of Training

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 and 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.
To manage an organization both large and small requires staffing them with competent employees. The formal educational system in Nigeria does not adequately teach specific job skills for a position in a particular organization and few employees have the requisite knowledge, abilities, skills and competencies needed to work. As a result, many employees require extensive training on the job to acquire the necessary knowledge, abilities, skills and competencies needed to make substantive contribution towards the organization’s growth.

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 and 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, About.com Guide).

2.2.2 Types of Training

The type of employee training which is best suited to a particular organization depends on a number of considerations. The skill gap to be filled, the job description, the employee present qualification and the challenges faced by the employee in performing his/her job. The approaches that can be used in implementing training fall broadly into two categories namely: on-the job and off-the job techniques, notwithstanding that some of the training techniques cut across (Kempton, 1995).

On-the-Job training

Adamu (2008) asserts that on-the-job training is designed to impart knowledge of job by working under an experienced worker. The trainer or the experienced worker teaches and advices the trainee on specific methods and techniques of doing the job. In some cases, the trainee is expected to learn by watching the master. The trainee is learning and at the same time working, although the trainee’s output will not be much. The procedure is usually unsystematic and most times, it is by trial and error. Baum and Devine (2007) opine that it is better for the organizations to give their employees on the job training because it is cost effective and time saving. Besides, it helps their employees learn in a practical way.

Off-the-Job training

Off-the job training is a process of acquiring skill and knowledge at a location different from the employee office. It includes group discussion, individual tutorials, lectures, reading, training courses and workshops (Kempton, 1995). It permits individuals to leave their primary place of work for a different location. Its advantage includes, the trainee’s ability to
concentrate, analyse past behaviours and reflect on what has been successful and what has not (Okanya, 2008). This kind of training offers an opportunity to impart knowledge and skills that can be learnt or practiced in a safe and conducive atmosphere.

Kempton (1995) opines that if training is conducted in an organized and systematic way it should be able to develop new attitudes and experiences that contribute to the success of the organization, improve employee morale which would translate to better performance and greater productivity and create a psychological climate which orients the activities of each employee towards achieving the goals of the organization.

2.3 The Concept of Psychological Contract

The concept of psychological contract helps us understand employment relationship between employer and employee, especially in respect to training. Psychological contract concept was developed by Denise Rousseau in contemporary research. However, its origin could be traced to as far back as 1960.

While there has not been one universally accepted definition of psychological contract, most authors tend to see it as an implicit understanding of mutual obligations between an employer and an employee. The most widely accepted definition of psychological contract is that of Rousseau in his book titled “Psychological Contracts in Organization”, as: “The psychological contract is individual beliefs, shaped by the organization, regarding terms of an exchange arrangement between the individual and their organization” (Rousseau, 1995:9). Rousseau’s earlier definition, refers psychological contract as an individual’s belief regarding the terms and conditions of a reciprocal exchange agreement between the focal person and another party (Rousseau, 1989). It is distinguishable from the formal written
contract of employment which specifies the formal duties, responsibilities and obligations of employer and employee in an employment relationship.

When used in terms of training, the psychological contract helps us understand that some employers invest in training as a sign of trust in their employees and also as a way of ‘buying’ their commitment and loyalty (Okanya, 2008). It also shows that they are valued by the organization. It has been argued that organizations that recognize the importance of psychological contracts and have invested in lifelong learning characterized by long term, high trust, HRD strategies embracing education, training and career development have had positive responses from employees even in conditions of adversity (Graeme et al. 1999).

2.4 Theoretical Framework of Employee Training

There are two main theoretical approaches towards employee training, namely, the human capital approach and the technology-based approach. According to Luo (2000), the human capital approach regards training as investment in human capital. Thus, training is provided only when the benefit from productivity gains is greater than the cost of training. On the other hand, the technology-based approach regards training as a skill formation process. According to this approach, the expanded training in the contemporary period is driven by the rapidly changing technologies and work reorganization. Thus, training is provided because it satisfies the functional needs of an organization and equally contributes to human capital accumulation or skill formation. These approaches however, to a large extent overlooked the content of employee training, which could be a resultant effect of training design and training delivery style.
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.

2.5 Theoretical Models Linking Training to Organizational Performance

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 and Buyens, 2010). Most organizations invest in training because they believe that higher performance will result (Alliger, et al. 1997:50; Kozlowski, et al. 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, Fombrun, 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 and Edwards, 2000).
A second ‘soft’ HRM theoretical model to show how Human Resource Management (HRM) policies can affect employees and organizational outcomes was developed by Guest. The central hypothesis of Guest’s model is that if an integrated set of HRM practices is applied with a view to achieving the established goals, employees’ performance will improve. It also assumes that this will translate to increase in organizational performance. The strength of Guest's model is that it is a useful analytical framework for studying the relationship between HRM policies and organizational performance. This is because it expresses pathways for more careful, clear and ease of empirical testing. Guest also saw the goals of linking employees with organizational performance as important to ensure the high quality of products and services. He thus opines that training policy play an important role in HRM and contributes to improved strategic integration, employee commitment, flexibility and quality. He further asserts that HRM outcomes can lead to high job performance, high problem solving activity, high cost effectiveness, and low turnover, reduced absences and fewer grievances.

Similarly, 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 and 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.

Thang, Quang and Buyens (2010) contend that similarities exist between the normative (hard and soft) models of HRM. According to these authors, training has been put on a set of HRM policies and it is considered as an important and vital policy for improving knowledge, skills, attitude and motivation of employees.

This review of theoretical models linking training to organizational performance suggests that it explicitly recognized that no organization can attain its goals or organizational strategy without employees that have the right knowledge, skills, abilities, behaviour, and attitudes. Thus, training plays an important role in improving the quality of employees directly and affecting organizational performance through HR outcomes (Thang, Quang and Buyens, 2010).

2.6 Successful Models of Training and Development

There are many models of training and development that have significantly impacted into organizational settings. Such models are Instructional Systems Design (ISD), Human Performance Technology (HPT), Performance-Based Instructional Design (PBID) and Total Quality Management (TQM). These models originated from research in the area of organizational development.

2.6.1 ADDIE Instructional Design Model

The ADDIE Instructional Design model is the generic process traditionally used by Instructional Designers and Training Developers. It is the basis of Instructional Systems Design (ISD) which is the practice of creating instructional experiences that make the
acquisition of knowledge and skill more efficient, effective and appealing (Mayer, 1992). ISD was developed and used by the military during the World War II as a training material. The process consists broadly of determining the current state and needs of the learner, defining the end goal of instruction, and creating some “intervention” to assist in the transition. Tests for assessing learner’s ability were used to screen candidates for the training programs. It was after the success of military training that psychologists began to view training as a system and thus developed various analysis, design and evaluation procedures to support their argument.

ADDIE is an acronym which stands for Analyze, Design, Development, Implementation and Evaluation. It was initially developed by Florida State University (Branson et al 1975). The ADDIE has five (5) Phases. They are Analyze, Design, Develop, Implement, and Evaluation.

Reiser and Dempsey (2012) list and explain the five phases as follows:

- **Analyze**: The first phase of content development begins with Analysis. Analysis refers to the gathering of information about one’s audience, the tasks to be completed, and the project’s overall goals. The instructional problem is clarified; goals and objectives are established. The learning environment and learner’s existing knowledge and skills are identified.

- **Design**: The design phase deals with learning objectives, assessment instruments, exercises, content, subject matter analysis, lesson planning and media selection. Information gathered from the Analysis phase in conjunction with the theories and models of instructional design is meant to explain how the learning will be acquired.
• **Development:** The third phase is the development phases. Here the creation of activities being implemented is handled. Storyboards are created, content is written and graphics are designed. The proposals in the design phases are assembled.

• **Implement:** At this stage, the procedure for training the facilitators and the learners is developed. The facilitators training should cover the course curriculum, learning outcomes and method of delivery. This stage allows the instructional designer to test all materials to identify if they are functional and appropriate for the intended audience.

• **Evaluation:** This phase ensures that the materials developed achieve the desired goals. This phase consists of two parts – formative and summative. Formative evaluation is inbuilt in each stage while summative is at end of the whole process and it provides opportunities for feedback from the users.

![ADDIE Model](http://www.instructionaldesigncentral.com/images/addie.gif)

**Figure 1: ADDIE Model**, Diagram by: Steven J. McGriff, Instructional Systems, College of Education, Penn State University


*Accessed 12 May 2012*
2.6.2 Human Performance Technology (HPT)

HPT is a systematic approach to improving individual and organizational performance (Pershing, 2006). Human performance technology emerged as a field designed to help practitioners to critically analyze, prescribe, influence business leaders and develop interventions that are best suited to the performance problem presented (Wikipedia). HPT allows a rigorous analysis of the requirements of organization and human performance as well as identify the causes of performance gaps. It also proffers wide range of interventions with the aim of improving performance.

HPT as a field of study is related to Process Improvement, Six Sigma, Learn Six Sigma, Organization Development, Motivation, Instructional Technology and Human Factors. It focuses on improving performance at the organization, process and individual performer levels.

HPT is based on the following assumptions:

1. A technology is a set of empirical and scientific principles and their application.
2. Human performance technology is the technology concerned with all variables which impact human performance.
3. All organizational processes and practices impact the production of valued results, whether positively or negatively. (Everything that an organization does affects what it accomplishes, whether or not the results are acknowledged or desirable).
4. The purpose of all organizations is the same.
2.6.3 Performance-Based Instructional Design (PBID)

PBID is designed to help learners perform more effectively in the workplace. PBID was designed by David J. Pucel, a professor from the University of Minnesota and a specialist in the development and evaluation of training and development.

PBID as a system has seven major components (Pucel, 1989). They are as follows:

1. Program description
2. Content analysis
3. Content selection
4. Content sequencing
5. Lesson structuring
6. Lesson delivery formatting

7. Evaluation and feedback procedures development

The output of the system is an integrated plan of the instruction, and each system component contributes to the output.

### 2.6.4 Total Quality Management (TQM)

Total Quality Management is a management style based on continuously improving the quality of products and processes. The philosophy of TQM is on the premise that the quality of products and processes is the responsibility of everyone who is involved with the creation or consumption of the products or services offered by an organization (Wikipedia).

The nine common TQM practices are: cross-functional product design, process management, supplier quality management, customer involvement, information and feedback, committed leadership, strategic planning, cross-functional training, and employee involvement. The processes of TQM as outlined above cannot be achieved without training (Cua, McKone, and Schroeder, 2001).

Among the entire model x-rayed above, ADDIE Model is the basis of this research project.

### 2.7 Learning Theories

Armstrong (1996) emphasizes that training should be developed and operated within an organization by appreciating learning theories and approaches if the training is to be well understood. The success of a training program depends more on the organization’s ability to identify training needs. Training experts believe that if trainees do not learn, it is probably because some important learning principle had been overlooked.
Sherman et al (1996) argues that the success or failure of a training program is frequently related to the recognition and application of basic psychological principles of learning. This assertion is not necessarily right. If the trainees do not learn anything, then of what benefit will they be for the organization. Laing (2009) argues that trainees could return empty, with nothing to contribute, even when the organization have done all that is necessary to ensure a successful training program. According to him, this could happen if a wrong candidate has been selected for the training program.

McGhee et al (1996) posit that learning is a term used to describe the process by which behavioral changes result from experience. They assert further that the fact that learning has occurred could only be inferred from a comparison of an individual’s behavior prior to the experiences of specific kinds of task. However, if there is no explicit behavioral change, it could then be argued that learning principles have not been followed.

Training therefore can be explained as a planned and systematic effort by management aimed at altering behaviour of employees, in a direction that will achieve organizational goals. A formal training program is an effort by the employer to provide opportunities for the employee to acquire job-related skills, attitudes and knowledge (McGhee et al 1996).

2.8 Identification of Training Needs in an Organisation

The popular saying that ‘a problem identified is half solved’ suggests the need to enumerate the different ways of identifying employee training needs in an organization. Nielson (2010) opines that an overall organizational training needs assessment is a thorough examination of what is currently being trained, what knowledge, skill and abilities should be added presently and in future. Depending on the matter, assessment methods could vary (Nielson, 2010).
Nielson (2010) further notes that training needs could be identified in the following ways:

1. A felt or perceived need: This is an overall desire for improvement in a certain subject area.
2. Comparative needs: These are needs that are identified by comparing the training audience to a set of criteria.
3. Response to a failure of some type. This could be as a result of the organisation’s inability to meet a set goal for a particular period.
4. Critical Incident needs: This need could occur because of a catastrophic failure such as a factory explosion.
5. The final needs: This is an anticipated need that will occur based on organizational changes, such as new products, new services etc.
6. If current training is not meeting its objective, there becomes a need to retrain.
7. When there is a gap in the job. This occurs when performance is below specification or standard.

### 2.8.1 Training Needs Assessment

Training needs assessment methods differ from one organization to another. Depending on the goals, the timeline for the intervention, staffing and budget, but the most common needs assessment tool is a survey (written or online) (Nielson, 2010). Job analysis is another method of identifying training needs and this has to do with the comparison of job being performed with job descriptions or manager’s description, or even expected output.

Other tools as enumerated by Nielson (2010) are:

- Competency identification; and
- Operational measurements.
2.8.2 Benefits of Training Needs Assessment

CommLab (2013) highlighted the following as the importance of training needs assessment to organizations:

1. It explores ways in which the competency, capability and potential of organization can be enriched;
2. It enables organizations obtain better outcomes with optimum utilization of resources;
3. It establishes relevance of training for employees as data obtained from the assessment reveals training requirements;
4. It aligns organizational goals with training;
5. It enlists standards that need to be followed for ideal competency levels;
6. It helps to work on areas in which employees need skills development; and
7. It identifies the list of skills or knowledge that employees need in order to achieve organizational goals.

2.9 Training Design and Organizational Performance

It is very necessary for the organization to design training in a very careful manner (Armstrong, 2000). The design of the training should be according to the needs of the employees (Khan, Khan and Khan, 2011). Those organizations which develop a good training design according to the need of the employees as well as the organization always get good results (Partlow, 1996). Effective training design considers learning concepts, legal issues, and different approaches to training (Mathis and Jackson, 2000:225). Training design plays a very crucial role in the employee as well as organizational performance. A bad training design is nothing but the loss of time and money (Tsaur and Lin, 2004).
Mathis and Jackson (2000) assert that there are three primary considerations when designing training. They are (1) determining learner’s readiness, (2) understanding different learning styles, and (3) designing training for transfer. For training to be successful and capable of influencing organizational performance, the trainees must have the basic skills necessary for learning, the motivation to learn and possess self-efficacy.

Since the objective of training is to assist learners acquire the behaviour necessary for effective work performance, it is therefore imperative that a clear understanding of the ways in which learning theories are applied when designing training programs are explained.

Flippo (1984) opines that the more highly motivated the trainee, the more quickly and thoroughly a new skill or knowledge is learned. People learn if they accept the need for training and commit to it. For instance, if their motivation is weak and they doubt their ability to learn; no matter how well their training is designed and implemented, its effectiveness will be limited. This is to say that training must be related to something which the trainee desires. The drive could be the need which the trainee feels that training will help him or her solve. For example, job promotion, recognition, and so on (Bryan, 1990). The second requirement is cue. Through training the learner recognizes relevant cues and associates them with desired responses. The third is response. Training should be immediately followed with positive reinforcement to enable the learner feel the response. If reinforcement is not timely, positive and consistent; then there is every tendency that it will not produce the desired result. Feedback is another important requirement. The information the learner receives indicating the quality of his response is the feedback. It should be made available as quickly as possible to ensure possible effective learning. Although, these learning principles are good, the author, nevertheless, failed to discuss its practicability, where the learner actively participates in using the skills and knowledge acquired and did not mention that the level of aptitude and
intelligence of individuals are different and that could affect the methods of training (Bryan, 1990).

2.10 Implication of Training Delivery Style on Employees Performance

Training delivery style is a very important part of training (Carlos, 1995). Employees are very conscious about the delivery style (Armstrong, 2000)). Thus, if someone is not delivering the training in an impressive style and not capturing the attention of the audience, it means the trainer is wasting the time (Mark and Andrew, 2000). Therefore, it becomes imperative for a trainer to engage its audience during the training session (Phillip and Eves, 2005). Delivery style means so much in the training because it is what goes into making the change expected in the trainee. The HR Department must ensure that no matter the type of method used, it must be able to catch the trainees’ interests.

Once training has been designed, then the actual delivery of training can begin. The general recommendation is that training be pilot-tested or conducted on a trial basis in order to ensure that the training meets the needs identified and that the design is appropriate (Mathis and Jackson, 2004).

2.10.1 Methods of Training

Training methods refer to the means by which learning contents are communicated to learners or trainee. The effectiveness of training depends on the methods and techniques used. However, choice of any method by an organization will depend on cost, time available, number of employees to be trained, the depth of knowledge required and the trainee’s background. (Adamu, 2008).
Ezigbo (2011) argues that the method to be adopted depends on whether the training is going to be applied in the employee’s current position, future or anticipated position. However, since training is our focus, the HR Department should consider the suitable and most rewarding methods.

a. **Apprenticeship**

Apprenticeship is a system of training of a new generation of practitioners of structured competency based on set of skills. Apprenticeships ranged from craft occupations or trades to those seeking a professional license to practice in a regulated profession. Apprenticeship training provides an individual with the knowledge and skill in doing a craft or a series of related job (Ezeigbo, 2011). Most of their training is done while working for an employer who helps the apprentices learn their trade or profession, in exchange for their continuing labour for an agreed period (say 4-6 years) after they have achieved measurable competencies. During the apprenticeship period, the employer pays them allowance for their upkeep. Sometimes, apprenticeship programme combines on-the-job training and formal or classroom instruction (Ezeigbo, 2011).

b. **Induction/Orientation**

This type of training is carried out for new entrants on the job to make them familiar with the total corporate requirements like norms, ethics, rules and regulations of the organization (Olaniyan and Ojo, 2008). This training is concerned with the introduction of new employees into new roles usually during their first day in office.

c. **Internship**

This is a system of on-the-job training, but usually for white-collar and professional careers. Internships for professional careers are similar to apprenticeships for trade and vocational jobs. The major difference is that internship is typically for college or university students. Sometimes, post-graduate adults go on internship.
Generally, the internship works as an exchange of services for experience between the student and his or her employer. Students exchange their cheap or free labour to gain experience in a particular field. Internship could also be used to determine if a person has interest in a particular career. An internship may be paid, unpaid or partially paid. Paid internships are common in professional fields. Non-governmental and non-profit organizations have unpaid internships.

d. **Coaching and Understudy**

According to Ezigbo (2011:419), "understudy is a type of training where an employee works as a subordinate partner with a boss so that eventually the subordinate will assume the full responsibilities and duties of the particular job". Merriam-Webster, a free online encyclopedia defines understudy as ‘the act of studying another actor’s part in order to substitute in case of an emergency’. Christy Lively posits that the incoming or current employee should work directly with a senior manager or supervisor he or she is to replace for weeks to ensure proper training with the intent that the new employee will become the new manager. She argues that for understudy to be effective, coaching and understudy training should be implemented as part of a manager’s day-to-day work far before retiring or leaving a company (www.ehow.com).

e. **Job Rotation**

This is a training technique that assigns trainees to various jobs and departments over a period of few years. Job rotation is an effective approach to management development in that individual is moved from a schedule of assignments designed to expose him or her to the entire operations of the organization (classsof1.com).
A well-structured job rotation program in an organization has huge potential of positive impact on job satisfaction, engagement of people as well as retention of people. Its benefits include leadership development, job enrichment, effective motivation to perform caused by newer challenges and career development (en.wikipedia.org).

f. **Informal Training**

Informal training occurs through interactions and feedback among employees. Much of what employees know about their jobs is learnt informally from asking questions and getting advice from other employees and their supervisors, rather than from formal training programs (Mathis and Jackson, 2004).

g. **E-Learning: On-line training**

E-learning is the use of the internet or an organizational intranet to conduct training on-line. As more and more employees use computers and have access to internet portals, their employers look for training opportunities on-line that will be beneficial to the employee. Computer-supported simulations within organizational training can replicate the psychological and behavioural requirements of a task, in addition to providing some amount of physical resemblance to the trainee’s work environment (Mathis and Jackson, 2004).

h. **Vestibule training**

This is a system of training whereby an employee is sent to a replica organization in another location outside his place of work. The training place looks exactly like the employee’s work environment. The difference between the training venue and employee’s workplace is that emphasis is on learning instead of production. The trainee is there only to acquire the desired knowledge or skill. Some banks in Nigeria have this kind of training facility. The essence is to ensure that the trainee learns the job skills without necessarily imbibing some bad customs and practices of the work environment. Another advantage of this method is that costly
mistakes are avoided and acquisition of knowledge is enhanced since the trainee practices with identical equipment and tools.

i. **Classroom instruction technique**

This method is usually designed for the purpose of passing on knowledge in an off-the-job location such as training centres, schools, professional institutions. The emphasis is on developing an understanding of general principles, background knowledge and general awareness of comparative ideas (Adamu, 2008). The techniques used in this method include case study, role-playing, in-basket and lectures. Workshops, seminars, conferences and symposiums also belong to this category of training. Sometimes, an examination is conducted at the end of the training and a certificate of participation issued.

2.11 **Difference between Training and Development**

Some authors use the terms “training” and “development” as synonyms. However, some view the two concepts as being different. Jones, George and Hill (2000) posit that training primarily focuses on teaching organizational members how to perform their current jobs and helping them acquire the knowledge and skills they need to be effective performers. Development on the other hand focuses on building the knowledge and skills of organizational members so that they will be prepared to take on new responsibilities and challenges (Ezigbo, 2011).

According to Crawford in Adamu (2008), training is the ways in which specific knowledge and skills necessary to perform specific jobs are taught and learnt, development entails an analogous process in which people acquire more general abilities and information, but in ways that cannot always be tied directly to a particular task they perform.
Training refers to the acquisition of skills, knowledge and information directly required for the performance of a specific role. It includes on-the-job training, workshops, seminars and conference. Development broadly refers to job enrichment that has an intrinsic mechanism to motivate an employee to accept and play challenging organizational tasks (Chukwunenye and Igbokwe, 2011). Development is not as specific as training; it is more general in application. It is used in relation to the process of helping managerial employee who perform non-routine jobs to improve their managerial, administrative and decision making abilities and competence (Adamu, 2008).

Training is any learning activity which is aimed at the acquisition of specific knowledge and skills for the purpose of an occupation or task. The focus of training is the job or task, while development is a learning activity which is directed towards future needs rather than present needs (Adamu, 2008).

Table 1: Comparison of principal characteristics of training and development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S/N</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Training</th>
<th>Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Primary target group</td>
<td>Rank and file</td>
<td>Managers and professional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Usual location</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Dispersed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Pay off</td>
<td>Right away or soon</td>
<td>Long term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Application</td>
<td>Current job</td>
<td>Future job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Specificity</td>
<td>Narrow</td>
<td>Broad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Objective</td>
<td>Improved performance</td>
<td>Improve potential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Linkage to performance</td>
<td>Immediate</td>
<td>Distance sometimes uncertain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Number of target employee</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>served at a time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Transferability</td>
<td>Narrow</td>
<td>Broad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Scope</td>
<td>Single level</td>
<td>Across levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Variations required</td>
<td>Comparatively uniform</td>
<td>Many special requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Duration</td>
<td>Short</td>
<td>Extended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Participant gain or reaction</td>
<td>Sense of competency</td>
<td>Meaningful overview, sense of satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Anticipated</td>
<td>Specific, definite and measure</td>
<td>General and uncertain and difficult to measure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.12 Human Resource Management (HRM) Process vis-à-vis Employee Training

Stoner, Freeman and Gilbert (2007), refer to HRM as the management function through which managers recruits, select, train, and develop organization members. The HRM process is an ongoing procedure that tries to keep the organization supplied with the right people in the right positions, when they are needed.

Stoner, Freeman and Gilbert (2007) go further to explain the seven basic activities of the HRM process.

1. Human resource planning: This activity has to do with ensuring that personnel needs are constantly and appropriately met. It is accomplished through analysis of (a) internal factors, such as current and expected skill needs, vacancies, departmental expansions and reductions and (b) factors in the environment which includes the labour market, the host community and operational equipment and materials.

2. Recruitment: This is concerned with developing a pool of job candidates in line with the human resource plan. Potential employees are usually located through newspaper, professional journals and internal advertisements, employment agencies and so on.

3. Selection: This activity involves the use of application forms, curriculum vitae, interviews, employment and skills tests to evaluate and screen job candidates for the HRM Manager who has the responsibility to finally select and hire a candidate.

4. Orientation: This stage of the HRM process ensures that the selected individual fit smoothly into the organization. New employees are introduced to their colleagues, acquainted with their responsibilities, and informed about the organization’s culture, policies and expectations regarding employee behaviour.

5. Training and development: Training and development aim at increasing employees’ abilities to contribute to organizational effectiveness.
6. Performance appraisal: The next stage becomes the comparison of individual’s job performance to standards or objectives developed for the individual’s position. Low performance may prompt corrective action, such as additional training, a demotion, or separation, while high performance may merit a reward, such as raise, bonus, or promotion. The individual’s immediate supervisor performs the appraisal but the HRM department is responsible for working with upper management to establish the policies that guide all performance appraisals.

7. Promotions, transfers, demotions, and separations: High performers may be promoted or transferred to help them develop their skills, while low performers may be demoted, transferred to less important positions, or even separated. Any of these options will, in turn, affect human resource planning.

Figure 3: Human Resource Management (HRM) Process
From the diagram, the HRM process is a continuous activity and it also shows clearly the stage at which training starts. This again underpins the importance of training on organizational performance.

2.13 Non-Systematic Approach of Training

Adamu (2008) argues that the traditional approach of training of staff in organizations is not a systematic one. Training follows a process and that process makes it systematic. But most of
the time, human resource departments in most organizations ignore the process and conduct training in an ad-hoc and haphazard ways without training need analysis. (Olaniyan and Ojo, 2008). The following approaches are non-systematic but are sometimes used by HR Department to identify who attend training Olaniyan and Ojo (2008):

(a) Administrative approach: This approach is based on establishment of budget and policies. Employees are sent on training based on the availability of funds.

(b) Welfare approach: This approach is based on extraneous considerations whereby some organizations send employees on training with a view to improving their financial well being or their skills to enable them secure employment elsewhere.

(c) Political approach: This approach makes use of political powers. In this case loyalist and favourites of Managers and the likes are more likely to be sent on trainings. The Managers and those in power use their positions to secure training opportunities for those who are loyal to them over and above their colleagues who in most cases merit the training programmes available.

(d) Organizational development approach: This approach uses departmental training needs as consideration for selection.

2.14 Systematic Training Process

A systematic approach of employee training stipulates that training of employees should be a deliberate corporate policy instrument designed with the central goal and objective to guide its programme choice and content packaged to evaluate or solve identified training needs or problems (Adamu, 2008).

Cole (1997) in Adamu (2008) emphasizes that systematic approach to training will generally follow sequence of activities starting with the establishment of a policy and planned resources to sustain it, followed by an assessment of training provided; and ending with some
form of evaluation and feedback. Mathis and Jackson (2004), while arguing in same line posit that using such a process reduces the likelihood that unplanned, uncoordinated, and haphazard training efforts will occur.

According to Mathis and Jackson (2004), the systematic training process is made up of four phases namely, assessment, design, delivery and evaluation.

1. **Training needs assessment**

   Training is designed to help the organization accomplish its objectives. Consequently, assessing organizational training needs represents the diagnostic phase of setting training objectives. The assessment phase considers employee and organizational performance issues to determine if training can help. When doing the training needs assessment, it is important to consider non-training factors such as compensations, organization structure, job design, and physical work settings. Mathis and Jackson (2004) further note that organizational analyses, job analyses and individual analyses could be used to identify training needs.

   After training needs have been identified using appropriate analyses, then training objectives and priorities must be established by identifying a skill gap or training need, which is the distance between where an organization is with its employee capabilities and where it needs to be. Training objectives and priorities are set to close the gap.

2. **Training Design**

   Once training objectives have been identified, the next stage is to develop the training design. Training must be designed to address the assessed needs. Effective training design considers learning concepts, legal issues, and different approaches to training.
3. **Training Delivery**

After the development of the training design, then begins the actual delivery of training. It is generally recommended that the training be pilot-tested or conducted on a trial basis in order to ensure that the training meets the needs identified.

4. **Evaluation of Training**

This stage compares the post-training results to the objectives expected by managers, trainers and trainees. Often times, training is conducted with little thought of measuring and evaluating it later to see how well it worked. Mathis and Jackson (2004) suggest that because training is both time-consuming and costly, it is imperative that there is evaluation after training.

![Systematic training process](image.png)

**Figure 4: Systematic training process**


### 2.15 Empirical Framework of Training on Organizational Performance

Studies have sought to isolate whether high skills are contributory factor behind successful and higher performing firms (Tamkin, 2005). These studies have identified a significant association between a highly skilled workforce and organizational performance, most commonly measured by the level of labour productivity. For example, Haskel and Hawkes (2003) have shown that the top performers in UK manufacturing are hired workers with, on
average, an extra qualification level compared to the lower performers. These studies also found that higher skill levels support innovation and more sophisticated production processes and were associated with the production of higher quality products (Penny, 2005).

Haskel, Hawkes and Pereira (2003) showed that more productive UK firms hired more skilled workers. Their finding showed that skills were positively related to total factor productivity (TFP) and the skill gap between the top- and bottom-performing firms explained some 8% of the productivity gap. Similarly, Lynch and Black (1995) found in the US, that an extra year of education raised productivity by between 4.9 and 8.5% in the manufacturing sector and between 5.9 and 12.7% in the services sector. Other research has suggested that a more highly skilled workforce can bring other benefits such as enhancing company survival. Reid (2000) opined that a more skilled UK workforce was related to a greater commercial orientation and strategic awareness and propensity to innovate and to retain competitive advantage.

An OECD study looked at innovation in UK SMEs and found that higher qualification levels of both managers and staff boosted innovation (Albaladejo and Romijn, 2001). Higher training expenditure per employee was also associated with higher technological complexity and originality. Perhaps, some of the most influential work in this area has focused on the investment in skills and training and the association between skills and productivity. A clear connection between higher skills and higher productivity has been identified particularly at the intermediate skills level. The studies found that the higher average levels of labour productivity in firms in continental Europe were closely related to the greater skills and knowledge of their workforces. Within manufacturing firms, lower skills levels in the UK were found to have a negative effect directly on labour productivity and on the types of
machinery chosen (Keep, Mayhew and Corney, 2002). There is evidence that skill levels are associated with innovation performance (Tamkin, 2005).

Several studies have highlighted the performance benefits associated with increasing training activity, the type of training provided and the depth. Dearden and Van Reenen (2000) analyzed the impact of training on performance for a variety of measures including value added output, profits and wages for a group of British industries between 1983 and 1996. They found connections between more training and higher labour productivity across a number of sectors.

In essence, manufacturing firms undertaking training were found to be more productive, to have higher capital intensity, to conduct more research and development and have a more highly qualified workforce (Penny, 2005). A study in France (d’Arcimoles, 1997) found that the more training given, the better the economic performance. Training was permanently and clearly associated with an increase in profitability and productivity. Raising the proportion of workers trained in an industry by 5% points (say, from the average of 10% to 15%) was associated with a 4% increase in value added per worker and a 1.6% increase in wages. They note that this level of increase has also been found by other researchers like Blundell et al. (1996) and Booth (1991). Collier et al. (2002) have found that increasing investment in training reduces the chance of firm closure. For small firms it was the training of craft and manual workers that made the difference, for larger firms it was training of professional, clerical and secretarial employees. Others have found evidence on benefits from training in terms of motivation and attitude; Booth and Zoega (2000) suggested that training fosters a common firm culture and helps attract good quality workers; Green and Felstead et al. (2000) found that training had a downward impact on employee turnover.
Effects of Employee Training on Employee Motivation vis-à-vis Organizational Performance

Stoner, Freeman and Gilbert (2007) affirm that “managers and management researchers have long believed that organizational goals are unattainable without the enduring commitment of members of the organization”. There will be no improvement on employees’ performance without employees being motivated to perform.

Several authors have given many definitions to motivation. However, a general understanding from the various definitions of Motivation is that motivation is what causes one to act (Stoner, Freeman and Gilbert, 2007, p.468). It is the process that guides and maintains goal-oriented behaviour. Motivation is a human psychological characteristic that contributes to a person’s degree of commitment. Eisenbower defined “Motivation as the art of getting people to do what you want them to do because they want to do it” (Brany Quote).

Training is an excellent source of motivation. When an organization sends an employee for training, obviously, that employee will be motivated to perform. Advance Team Concepts, a training firm based in the USA opine that trained employees have a greater capacity to be empowered and perform with excellence, which also motivates them since it builds their sense of ownership, confidence and willingness.

No matter the size of an organization, having a team of motivated, hard-working employee is crucial to business success. Similarly, when people lose their motivation, their productivity suffers. They become less productive, less creative, less of an asset to the organization (AllBusiness.com).
Training has always been seen as a positive impact in every organization. Employee training increases employee motivation to perform which in-turn increases organizational performance. Looking back to the original experiment by Elton Mayo in Chicago from 1927 - 1932, the mere fact that an organization has paid attention to people (employee) spurs them to better job performance. For instance, suppose a management trainee has been given specialized training in skills show that such employee is valued in the organization. The feeling that he/she is on track to the top will motivate him/her to work harder and better (www.accel-team.com).

From the argument thus far, training has an important role in motivating employee to increased performance. Besides, employees need to be constantly motivated to ensure that there is no shortfall in productivity.

2.17 Measuring the Impact of Training on Organizational Performance

Evaluating the impact of investments in people (such as training) helps to justify the costs incurred, validate the intervention as a business tool, and aid the design and selection of future investment methods (Page, Jagger, Tamkin and Henwood, 2006). Page et al (2006) further assert that in practical terms, isolating the impact on the bottom line is complex and therefore many organizations do not try to measure it very rigorously.

Evaluation is a systematic process of determining the significance or worth of subject, using criteria governed by a set of standards. It can assist an organization to ascertain the degree of achievement or value in regards to the aim and objectives of an undertaken project (ICAP, 2012). The primary aim of evaluation, apart from gaining insight into prior or existing
initiatives, is to enable reflection and assistance in the identification of future change (Sarah del Tufo, 2002).

2.17.1 Organizational Performance Measurement

Many measures of performance may be more relevant to some sectors than others. When measuring organizational performance, the choice of measures should be informed by the sector and business-specific context (Page et al., 2006). Measurement of organizational performance is not without its challenges. Measures based on accountancy are to some extent, open to manipulation and therefore may be difficult to compare over time, or between organizations. Many measures do not necessarily capture the quality of a product or service and where part-time work is frequent and to be comparable, measures need to take into account hours worked (Page et al., 2006).

Page and others developed a set of ‘core’ measures of organizational performance that have general application, to enable benchmarking and comparison across sectors. The ‘core’ set of measures include:

1. **Productivity:** Productivity could be measured using Net added value per hour worked or Net added value per worker. However, this measure will be affected by investments other than those in skills and training, for example in capital.

2. **Profitability:** Return on assets is a useful measure of profitability, and measures how well a company is using its assets to generate earnings. However, values can vary substantially between companies and between sectors and therefore for wider benchmarking purposes profit per employee may be more effective.

3. **Quality:** Manufacturing organizations could estimate quality using the Number of defects in a given number of products. More generally, customer satisfaction could be used.
Exactly how customer satisfaction is measured is likely to vary from organization to organization.

4. **Innovation:** Sales (\(N\)) from new or adapted products or services is a measure that could be used to benchmark innovation across sectors and which takes some account of the success of the innovation.

5. **Staff performance:** Employees’ performance is appraised against preset standards. A range of staff performance measures are detailed below.

### 2.17.2 Employee Performance Indicators

Tracking employee training and measuring training effectiveness is a key objective of any HR department. To ensure that there is adequate return on investment in training of new and current employees, the organization has to establish key performance indicators (KPI). KPI if created and tracked properly serve as a benchmark for measuring the progress of employees towards a set of broader based goals or objectives (Lilly, 2011). However, most organizations are faced with the challenges of developing a good KPI. Lilly (2011) suggests that quality key performance indicators for tracking employee training effectiveness should include:

(a) measurable and quantifiable indicators;

(b) competency based indicators;

(c) linked to proficiency indicators; and

(d) mapped to organizational and employee goals indicators.

Hakala (2008) explains that performance measurement uses the following indicators of performance.

1. **Quantity:** This indicator places emphasis on the number of units produced, processed or sold against the set standard i.e. the number of units to be produced, processed or sold.
2. **Quality:** The quality of work performed can be measured by several means. The percentage of work output that must be redone or is rejected is one such indicator. In a sales environment, the percentage of inquiries converted to sales is an indicator of salesmanship quality.

3. **Timeliness:** This indicator measures how fast work is performed or how fast services are provided. For example, in a service industry, the average customer’s downtime is a good indicator of timeliness, while in a manufacturing outfit, it might be the number of units produced per hour.

4. **Cost-Effectiveness:** The cost of work performed should be used as a measure of performance only if the employee has some degree of control over costs.

5. **Absenteism/Tardiness:** An employee is obviously not performing when he or she is not at work. Other employees’ performance may be adversely impacted by absences, too.

6. **Creativity:** It can be difficult to quantify creativity as a performance indicator, but in many white-collar jobs, it is vitally important. Supervisors and employees should keep track of creative work examples and attempt to quantify them.

7. **Adherence to Policy:** This may seem to be the opposite of creativity, but it is merely a boundary on creativity. Deviations from policy indicate an employee whose performance goals are not well aligned with those of the company.

8. **Gossip and Other Personal Habits:** This indicator may not seem performance-related to the employee, but some personal habits, like gossip, can detract from job performance and interfere with the performance of others. The specific behaviours should be defined, and goals should be set for reducing their frequency.

9. **Personal Appearance/Grooming:** Most people know how to dress for work, but in many organizations, there is at least one employee who needs to be told. Examples of inappropriate
appearance and grooming should be spelled out, their effects upon the employee’s performance and that of others explained, and corrective actions defined. Hakala (2008) goes further to state that performance indicators must be assessed by some means in order to measure performance itself. He enumerated the following as some of the ways in which performance is assessed from the above indicators.

**a. Manager Appraisal:** A manager appraises the employee’s performance and delivers the appraisal to the employee. Manager appraisal is by nature top-down and does not encourage the employee’s active participation. It is often met with resistance, because the employee has no investment in its development.

**b. Self-Appraisal:** The employee appraises his or her own performance, in many cases comparing the self-appraisal to management's review. Often, self-appraisals can highlight discrepancies between what the employee and management think are important performance factors and provide mutual feedback for meaningful adjustment of expectations.

**c. Peer Appraisal:** Employees in similar positions appraise an employee’s performance. This method is based on the assumption that co-workers are most familiar with an employee’s performance. Peer appraisal has long been used successfully in manufacturing environments, where objective criteria such as units produced prevail. Recently, peer appraisal has expanded to white-collar professions, where soft criteria such as “works well with others” can lead to ambiguous appraisals. Peer appraisals are often effective at focusing an employee’s attention on undesirable behaviors and motivating change.

**d. Team Appraisal:** This is similar to peer appraisal in that members of a team, who may hold different positions, are asked to appraise each other’s work and work styles. This approach assumes that the team’s objectives and each member’s expected contribution have been clearly defined.
e. **Assessment Center:** The employee is appraised by professional assessors who may evaluate simulated or actual work activities. Objectivity is one advantage of assessment centers, which produce reviews that are not clouded by personal relationships with employees.

f. **360-Degree or “Full-Circle” Appraisal:** The employee’s performance is appraised by everyone with whom he or she interacts with, including managers, peers, customers and members of other departments. This is the most comprehensive and expensive way to measure performance and it is generally reserved for key employees.

g. **MBO (Management by Objectives):** The employee’s achievement of objective goals set in concert with his or her manager is assessed. The MBO process begins with action statements such as, “reduce rejected parts to 5 percent.” Ongoing monitoring and review of objectives keeps the employee focused on achieving goals. At the annual review, progress toward objectives is assessed, and new goals are set.

There are as many indicators of performance as there are companies and jobs. The various assessment methods can be used in combinations. It is important to choose indicators that align with each company's goals and assessment methods that effectively appraise those indicators.

### 2.18 Productivity

A UNIDO study revealed that the productivity of Nigerian workers was only 10% of that in Botswana and 50% of that in Ghana and Kenya. According to Larossi, Mousley and Radwan (2009), the deterioration of the manufacturing sector in recent years can be attributed to a number of factors, including a poor investment climate and low capacity utilization which
indirectly relates to lack of adequate training policies for employees. No employee will give what he/she does not possess. This again emphasizes the importance of training.

Productivity is the measure of efficiency of production. It is calculated as the ratio of production output to input. Productivity measure is defined as the total output per one unit of total input. The measurement of productivity is geared towards finding out the effectiveness and efficiency of all resources employed in production. Resources include time, money, materials, people, knowledge, information, space and energy (Scott-Grant, 2012).

The overall aim of all motivational tools whether intrinsic or extrinsic is to increase employee’s productivity. Training is a motivational tool. The knowledge that the employee gets after the training process becomes a stimulus which drive him/her to improved performance.

BusinessDictionary.com defines productivity as a measure of the efficiency of a person, machine, factory or system in converting inputs into useful outputs. Productivity is computed by dividing average output per period by total costs incurred or resources consumed in that period.

2.18.1 Measures of Productivity and Profitability

Penny (2005:79) listed the following as some of the formulas for calculating productivity and profitability.

(a) **Gross value added / Total turnover (%)**: This is the value expressed as a percentage of total turnover. It is an indicator of wealth creation and productivity. *Calculated as*

\[
\frac{\text{Gross value added}}{\text{Total turnover}} \times 100\%
\]
Insurance contributions + employers pension contributions + pre-tax profit + depreciation) / Total turnover \times 100.

(b) **Total turnover per employee (N):** This is the ratio of turnover (sales) divided by the total number of Full Time Equivalent (FTE) employees and is an indication of employee productivity. It is calculated as total turnover / no. of FTE Employees.

(c) **Gross added value per employee (N):** This ratio represents the value added divided by the number of FTE employees and is an indication of employee productivity.

\[
\text{Calculated as (employee remuneration + directors and owners remuneration + employers National Insurance contributions + employers pension contributions + pre-tax profit + depreciation) / no. of FTE employees}
\]

To measure profitability the following are often used:

(a) **Tax profit/total turnover (not profit margin) %:** This is the profit before tax expressed as a percentage of turnover. It is an indicator of profitability and provides a useful measure for how well costs have been controlled. \( \text{Calculated as (pre tax profit/total turnover) \times 100} \).

(b) **Return on capital employed (ROCE) %:** This is the profit before tax expressed as a percentage of shareholders’ funds. It is an indicator of profitability regardless of financing method. \( \text{Calculated as (pre tax profit / (total assets-other liabilities-creditors)) \times 100} \)

(c) **Return on net assets (RONA) %:** This is the profit before tax expressed as a percentage of total assets. It is an indicator of operating efficiency. \( \text{Calculated as (pre tax profit / total assets) \times 100} \)

(d) **Pre-tax profit/ No. of FTE employees (N):** This is a pre-tax profit divided by the number of FTE employees. It is an indicator of employee profitability. \( \text{Calculated as pre tax profit/no. of employees} \)
(e) **Total turnover / no. of orders received (₦):** This ratio provides an indication of the average order value expressed as Naira (₦) per order. *Calculated as total turnover/no. of orders received*

For measurement of total and labour productivity the following formulas are used:

\[
\text{Productivity} = \frac{\text{Unit Produced}}{\text{Input Used}}
\]

\[
\text{Labour Productivity} = \frac{\text{Unit Produced}}{\text{Labour hours Used}}
\]

\[
\text{Productivity} = \frac{\text{Output}}{\text{Labour + Material + Energy + Capital + Miscellaneous}}
\]
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CHAPTER THREE
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Research Design
The research design encompasses the methods for the collection, measurement and analysis of data related to the research objectives. The research design chosen for this study is survey method. The survey research method was most appropriate because the researcher has no control of the variables as well as the outcome.

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

3.2.1 Primary Source
Primary data are firsthand or raw data, original records and materials created by participants or witnesses of the event(s) under study. In collecting primary data for the study, personal interview and questionnaire were used.

3.2.2 Secondary Source
Secondary data are information that has been gathered and often interpreted by other researchers and recorded in books, articles, and other publications. In collecting secondary data, existing but related records like newsletters, annual reports, books, publications etc were used.

3.3 Population of the Study
Eboh (2009) defines population as “all items in any field of enquiry or study”. In other words, population is any group the researcher has focused his attention to and has been chosen as the approved subject of study.
The population consists of:

(a) 394 senior and junior staff of Nigerian Bottling Company, Enugu Plant

(b) 300 senior and junior staff of 7UP Bottling Company, Enugu Plant

694 staff

Table 2: Population of the study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>Junior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigerian Bottling Company</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7UP Bottling Company</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>124</td>
<td>570</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Human Resource Departments of Nigerian Bottling Company and 7UP Bottling Company

The categorization of the population as senior and junior is based on the fact that they are classes of employees in the organizations under study.

### 3.4 Determination of Sample Size

Considering the fact that it would be cumbersome to study the entire population due to time, cost and accessibility, a subset of the population i.e. sample size was chosen so as to represent the whole population. Sample is viewed not as a whole in itself but as an approximation of the whole. In determining the sample size of this research, Taro Yamani’s Statistical Formula was applied.

\[
n = \frac{N}{1 + N(e)^2}
\]

Where

- \( n \) = sample size
- \( N \) = population of the study
- \( e \) = % level of significance or margin of tolerable error

The researcher chose 5% as level of significance or margin of tolerable error. The translation of the formula is as follows:
3.5 Sampling Method

For a high degree of accuracy and adequacy in presentation of the sample the stratified sampling method (proportional allocation) was adopted. The sample size representing the number of staff who received questionnaires was divided into stratum.

This is shown below using the following formula:

\[ nx = \frac{(n)(N)}{P} \]

Where \( nx \) is sample size in each level

\[ n = \text{total sample size for the study} \]

\[ N = \text{population size of staff in each stratum} \]

\[ P = \text{total population of the study} \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of institutions</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Total population</th>
<th>Sample size nx</th>
<th>Total sample size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>Junior</td>
<td></td>
<td>Senior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigerian Bottling Company</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7UP Bottling Company</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>694</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Human Resource Departments of Nigerian Bottling Company and 7UP Bottling Company
3.6 Validation of the Research Instrument

Uyimadu (2005) defines validity as the extent to which a measuring instrument on application performs the function for which it is designed. To ascertain the validity of the instrument, content validity was adopted. The instrument was validated by the researcher’s supervisor and two (2) senior lecturers of Department of Management, University of Nigeria Enugu Campus. They ensured that the instrument represents the entire range of possible items to be tested in the study. The questionnaire was modified in line with their recommendations.

3.7 Reliability of the Research Instrument

Reliability is the tendency toward consistency found in repeated measurements (Carmines and Zeller, 1979). The reliability of the instrument was ascertained using the internal consistency method. The questionnaire was given to a 10-man expert on the field for their grading based on 5-point Likert scale. The researcher used the Cronbach’s alpha correlation matrix to test the reliability of the instrument as ranked by the experts and it indicated an index of 0.81 as shown in Appendix C.

3.8 Data Analysis Techniques

Data generated from the questionnaire are presented in frequency distribution tables and analyzed by the use of simple percentage techniques using the following formula:

\[ \% = \frac{f \times 100}{n} \]

Where:

- \( f \) = frequency of response to each questions
- \( n \) = the number of respondents

The researcher graphically illustrated the data by the use of bar charts and pie charts for a clearer and reader friendly description.
In testing the hypotheses, hypotheses 1, 2, 3 and 5 were tested using One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test ($Z_c$) and for hypothesis 4 Pearson Product Moment Correlation ($r$) was adopted. Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) was used to perform these tests.

3.8.1 Decision Rule

If it is found that the calculated value is less ($<$) than the critical value, then we accept the null hypothesis $H_0$ and reject the alternate hypothesis $H_i$. But if the calculated value is greater ($>$) than the critical value, then we reject the null hypothesis $H_0$ and accept the alternate hypothesis $H_i$. 
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CHAPTER FOUR

PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA

4.1 Presentation of Data

This chapter deals with the presentation and analysis of the data obtained from the respondents in the selected manufacturing organizations in Enugu State. The study was conducted to evaluate the effect of employees training on organizational performance – a case study of Nigerian Bottling Company and 7UP Bottling Company both situated in Enugu State. A total of two hundred and fifty four (254) copies of questionnaires were distributed, out of which, two hundred and forty eight (248) were fully completed and returned while six (6) copies were not returned.

Table 4: Respondents’ Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Range</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid 18 - 25</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 - 35</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>42.3</td>
<td>42.3</td>
<td>57.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 - 45</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>92.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 - 55</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Fieldwork, 2012
Interpretation

The age distribution of respondents as presented in Table 4 and Figure 5 shows that 38 out of the 248 respondents are in the age bracket of 18-25, representing 15.3%; 105 representing 42.3% are in the age of 26-35, while 87 representing 35.1% are in the age range of 36-45 and 18 respondents representing only 7.3% of the respondents are aged between 46-55. This implies that 85% of the respondents are over 25 years of age.

Table 5: Sex Distribution of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>64.9</td>
<td>64.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Fieldwork, 2012

Figure 6: Sex Distribution of Respondents

Source: Fieldwork, 2012

Interpretation

The sex distribution of respondents as presented in Table 5 and Figure 6 shows that 161 respondents representing 64.9% of the respondents are males while 87 representing 35.1% are females. This implies that manufacturing companies employ more males than females.
This is understandable because it is a manufacturing outfit and males are more disposed to working in factories. This could have an adverse effect on the organization’s objective of employee training, because men are primarily responsible for the welfare of the family and they could lobby more to go for training to improve their financial conditions.

**Table 6: Respondents Educational Qualification**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid WASC/GCE</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OND</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>25.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HND/B.Sc</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>65.3</td>
<td>65.3</td>
<td>90.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBA/M.Sc</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>248</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Fieldwork, 2012*

**Figure 7: Respondents Educational Qualification**

*Source: Fieldwork, 2012*

**Interpretation**

Table 6 and Figure 7 shows that out of 248 respondents, 15(6%) have West African School Certificate/General Certificate of Education (WASC/GCE), 48(19.4%) have Ordinary National Diploma (OND), 162(65.3%) are graduates and 23(9.3%) have Masters Degree. This shows that 185(74.6%) of the total respondents graduated from university or polytechnic. The implication is that more than half of the employees will not pay serious
attention when sent on training since they have acquired basic education and their jobs are
more or less a routine one.

Table 7: Respondents’ Job Position

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid-Junior</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>56.5</td>
<td>56.5</td>
<td>56.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Fieldwork, 2012

Figure 8: Respondents’ Job Position

Source: Fieldwork 2012

Interpretation

Table 7 and Figure 8 shows that out of 248 respondents, 140(56.5%) are junior staff, while
108(43.5%) are senior staff. This shows that more of the manufacturing organization
employees fall within the junior staff rank.

Table 8: Respondents Duration of Employment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid-1 - 10 years</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 20 years</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - 30 years</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Fieldwork, 2012
Interpretation

Table 8 and Figure 9 shows that 100(40.0%) of the respondents are in the range of 1-10 years duration of employment. Similarly, 87(35.0%) have put in over 10 years of service to the organizations and 61(25.0%) of the respondents have put in over 20 years of service to the organizations. This implies that 60% of the employees continued working in the organizations after 10 years of service and rather than find job elsewhere having undergone training.

Research Question 1

To what extent does selection procedure of employee training affects organizational productivity?

In sourcing respondents’ opinion on the extent to which unsystematic approach of employee training affects organizational productivity, responses from the questionnaire on the following questions as presented in Tables 9 to 12 and Figures 10 to 13 were sought.
Questionnaire #1: Why do you go for training?

Table 9: Reasons for sending employee on training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To acquire more skills and improve employee performance</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>35.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To improve my financial wellbeing</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>61.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To enable me secure employment elsewhere</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>64.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Result of my loyalty to immediate boss</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>65.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To prepare for promotion within the organization</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>248</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Fieldwork*

![Figure 10: Reasons for sending employee on training](source)

*Source: Fieldwork, 2012*

**Interpretation**

Table 9 and Figure 10 show that 88(35.5%) of the respondents said that the reason for going on training is to acquire more skills and improve their performance; 65(26.2%) said it is to improve their financial wellbeing; 7(2.8%) said it is to enable them secure employment elsewhere; 3(1.2%) said, it is the reward of their loyalty to their boss, while 85(34.3%) 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. Nevertheless, there
could be other reasons for going on training, such as financial gains, preferential treatment and so on.

Questionnaire #2: Immediate supervisors and the HR Department have a strong influence on the selection of an employee for training

Table 10: Immediate supervisors and the HR influence on the selection of an employee for training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>34.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>78.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Fieldwork, 2012

Figure 11: Immediate supervisors and the HR influence on the selection of an employee for training

Source: Fieldwork, 2012

Interpretation

Table 10 and Figure 11 show that immediate supervisors and HR Department could influence the selection of an employee for training. 110(44%) of the respondents agreed to that assertion, while 54(22%) strongly agreed. Based on the result, 38(15%) were undecided and
46(19%) did not agree. What this implies is that employees will pay more attention in winning the hearts of their supervisors, by going on personal errands for them, while their job suffers. Besides, politics will be used to decide who goes for training.

Questionnaire #3: Discrimination in identifying and selecting employees for training has a negative effect on organizational performance

Table 11: Effect of discrimination in selecting employees for training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cum. Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>58.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Fieldwork, 2012

Figure 12: Effect of discrimination in selecting employees for training

Source: Fieldwork, 2012

Interpretation

Table 11 and Figure 12 show that 104(42%) of the respondents strongly agreed that discrimination in identifying and selecting employees for training has a negative effect on organizational performance. In the same vein, 94(38%) agreed that discrimination has a
negative effective on performance. While 30(12%) respondents were undecided, 16(6%) disagreed and only 4(2%) strongly disagreed.

Questionnaire #4: To what extent does unsystematic approach of employee training affect your organizational productivity?

Table 12: Extent to which unsystematic approach of employees training affect organizational productivity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cum. Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very low extent</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low extent</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High extent</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very high extent</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>248</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Fieldwork, 2012*

Figure 13: Extent to which unsystematic approach of employees training affect organizational productivity

*Source: Fieldwork, 2012*

**Interpretation**

Table 12 and Figure 13 show that 30(12%) of the respondents opined that unsystematic approach of employee training to a very high extent affects organizational productivity; while 110(44%) are of the view that unsystematic approach of employee training to a high extent
affects organizational productivity. 22(9%) were undecided and 49(20%) said it has a low effect on organizational productivity, while 37(15%) 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.

Research Question 2

To what extent does training design affect organizational productivity?

In sourcing respondents’ opinion on the extent to which training design affects organizational performance; responses from the questionnaire to the following questions as presented in Tables 13 to 16 and Figures 14 to 17 below were sought.

Questionnaire #5: Good training design ensures that identified employee skill gaps are properly captured.

Table 13: Good training design ensures that identified employee skill gaps are properly captured

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Fieldwork 2012
Figure 14: Good training design ensures that identified employee skill gaps are properly captured

Source: Fieldwork 2012

Interpretation

In Table 13 and Figure 14, 127(51%) of the total respondents agreed that training design ensures that identified employee skill gap is properly captured during the training design stage, while 44(18%) strongly agreed. However, a cumulative figure of 40 representing 16% of the respondents did not agree and 37(15%) were undecided. This implies that there is need to have a training design before the training proper.

Questionnaire #6: To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement:

Training design affects organizational performance

Table 14: Extent to which training design affects organizational performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very low extent</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low extent</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High extent</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very high extent</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Fieldwork 2012
Interpretation

From Table 14 and Figure 15 above, 24(10%) of the respondents are of the opinion that training design to a very low extent have effect on organizational performance. 34(14%) said it has a low effect on organizational performance, while 28(11%) were undecided. Contrary to that, 124(50%) of the respondents believe that training design to a high extent affect organizational performance and 38(15%) said training design to a very 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.
Questionnaire #7: Please rate the importance of training design on employee performance

Table 15: Importance of training design on employee performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cum. Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not important</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat important</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very important</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>248</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Fieldwork 2012

Figure 16: Importance of training design on employee performance

Source: Fieldwork 2012

**Interpretation**

Table 15 and Figure 16 show that training design is important as acclaimed by 114(46%) of the total respondents, in like manner, 48(19%) said it is very important to organizational performance. Only 64(26%) think that it is not necessary and 22(9%) are undecided.
Questionnaire #8: Bad training design results to waste of resources and does not improve organizational performance

**Table 16: Bad training design results to waste of resources on employee training**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>248</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Field 2012*

**Figure 17: Bad training design results to waste of resources on employee training**

*Source: Fieldwork 2012*

**Interpretation**

In Table 16 and Figure 17 above, 192 respondents representing 78% of the total respondents agreed to the fact that bad training design will result to waste of resources. 38(15%) strongly agreed to that notion while 18(7%) were neither here nor there. None of the respondents disagreed.
Research Question 3

To what extent does training delivery style affect organizational productivity?

In sourcing respondents’ opinion on the extent to which training delivery style affect organizational productivity, responses from the questionnaire to the following questions as presented in Tables 17 to 19 and Figures 18 to 20 below were sought.

Question #9: Training delivery style ensures that the objective of employee training is achieved

Table 17: Training delivery style ensures that the objective of employee training is achieved

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>248</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Field 2012*

Figure 18: Training delivery style ensures that the objective of employee training is achieved

*Source: Fieldwork 2012*
Interpretation

Table 17 and Figure 18 show that 128(52%) of the respondents are in the affirmation that training delivery style ensures that the objective of employee training is achieved. 84(34%) strongly agreed that training delivery style ensures that the objective of employee training is achieved. Only a cumulative number of 10(4%) disagreed and 26(10%) of the respondents were undecided.

Questionnaire #10: To what extent does training delivery style affect your performance?

Table 18: Extent to which training delivery style affects employee performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cum. Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very low extent</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low extent</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High extent</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>62.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very high extent</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Fieldwork, 2012

Figure 19: Extent to which training delivery style affects employee performance

Source: Fieldwork 2012
Interpretation

In Table 18 and Figure 19, 116(46.7%) of the respondents opined that training delivery style to a high extent affects employee performance, while 94(37.9%) said to a very high extent it affects organizational performance. 16(6.5%) out of the total respondents were undecided and 16(6.5%) said the extent to which it affects affect organizational performance is low, while 6(2.4%) said the effect is very negligible.

Questionnaire #11: To what extent does employee poor performance as a result of poor training delivery style affect organizational performance?

Table 19: Employee poor performance as a result of poor training delivery style affects organizational performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very low extent</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low extent</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High extent</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very high extent</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>248</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In Table 19 and Figure 20 above, 132 (53%) of the respondents stated that employees’ poor performance as a result of poor training delivery style to a high extent affect the overall organizational performance. In the same line, 42 (17%) opined that to a very high extent, employee poor performance affects organizational performance negatively. 22 which is 9% of the respondents said that the organizational performance to a very low extent will be affected, while 32 (13%) believe that it only has little or no effect on the overall performance of the organization. 20 (8%) were not sure of what to say.

**Research Question 4**

**What is the relationship between employee perception of training and organizational productivity?**

In sourcing respondents’ opinion on the relationship between employee perception of training and organizational performance, responses from the questionnaire to the following questions as presented in Tables 20 to 23 and Figures 21 to 24 below were sought.
Questionnaire #12: Employee perception of training is correlated to organizational performance

Table 20: Employee perception of training is correlated to organizational performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cum. Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>36.3</td>
<td>36.3</td>
<td>46.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>53.2</td>
<td>53.2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>248</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Fieldwork, 2012*

Figure 21: Employee perception of training is correlated to organizational performance

*Source: Fieldwork 2012*

**Interpretation**

Table 20 and Figure 21 show that 132(53.2%) of the respondents strongly agreed that there is a relationship between employee perception of training and organizational performance. Similarly, 90(36.3%) agreed that there is a relationship between employee perception of training and organizational performance. 14(5.6%) were undecided and only 12(4.8%) did not agree.
Questionnaire #13: How closely related is employee perception of training to organizational performance?

Table 21: Level of correlation between employee perception of training and organizational performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cum. Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all related</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat related</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closely related</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>62.1</td>
<td>62.1</td>
<td>73.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very closely related</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Fieldwork, 2012

Figure 22: Level of correlation between employee perception of training and organizational performance

Source: Fieldwork 2012

Interpretation

Table 21 and Figure 22 show that 66(26.6%) of the respondents opined that employee’s perception of training and organizational performance are very closely related. Similarly, 154(62.1%) of the respondents said that employee perception of training and organizational
performance are closely related. 20(8.1%) neither agreed nor disagreed. However, only 8(3.2%) said that they are not related.

Questionnaire #14: How has your post training performance affected the organizational performance?

Table 22: Post training performance and organizational performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cum. Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very negatively</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negatively</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positively</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very positively</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>248</td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Fieldwork, 2012*

Interpretation

In Table 22 and Figure 23, 64(26%) of the respondents stated that their post training performance was very positive. Similarly, 152(61%) said their post training performance was positive, while 32(13%) were undecided.
Questionnaire #15: Indicate the degree of post-training confidence you have in your ability to successfully perform your duties.

**Table 23: Degree of post-training performance confidence**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No confidence (0-30%)</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cum Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate confidence (40-80%)</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete confidence (90-100%)</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>248</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Fieldwork, 2012*

**Figure 24: Degree of post-training performance confidence**

*Source: Fieldwork 2012*

**Interpretation**

In Table 23 and Figure 24, 142(57%) said they had moderate confidence to perform their jobs after training. In the same vein, 106(43%) said they had complete confidence to perform their jobs as a result of training. Invariably, none of the respondent agreed to the fact that training did not impact on their level of confidence.
Research Question 5

To what extent does employee training affect organizational performance?

In sourcing respondents’ opinion on the extent to which employee training affect organizational performance, responses from the questionnaire to the following questions as presented in Tables 24 to 26 and Figures 25 to 27 below were sought.

Questionnaire #16: Employee training affects organizational performance

Table 24: Employee training affects organizational performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Fieldwork, 2012

Figure 25: Employee training affects organizational performance

Source: Fieldwork 2012
Interpretation

Table 24 and Figure 25 show that 138(56%) of the respondents strongly agreed that employee training affects organizational performance. 92(37%) agreed that employee training affects organizational performance, while 18(7%) were undecided.

Questionnaire #17: To what extent does employee training affect organizational performance?

Table 25: Extent of employee training effect on organizational performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very low extent</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low extent</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High extent</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very high extent</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>248</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Fieldwork, 2012*

**Figure 26: Extent of employee training effect on organizational performance**

*Source: Fieldwork 2012*
Interpretation

Table 25 and Figure 26 show that 92(37%) of the respondents said that employee training to a very high extent affect organizational performance. 130(53%) opined that employee training to a high extent affect organizational performance. 18(7%) were undecided, while, only 8(3%) opined that employee training to a low extent affect organizational performance.

Questionnaire #18: The more training employee attends the better his/her performance

Table 26: Relationship between employee training and employee performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cum. Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>36.3</td>
<td>36.3</td>
<td>50.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>49.2</td>
<td>49.2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>248</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Fieldwork, 2012*

Figure 27: Relationship between employee training and employee performance

*Source: Fieldwork 2012*

Interpretation

In Table 26 and Figure 27, 122(49.2%) of the respondents strongly agreed that the more training employee attends the better his/her performance. Thus, employee training improves
performance. 90(36.3%) agreed also that employee training increases performance. On the 
other hand, 22(8.9%) disagreed, while 6(2.4%) strongly disagreed. Only 8 respondents 
representing 3.2% of the total respondents were undecided.

4.2 Hypotheses Testing

In analyzing the five (5) hypotheses earlier stated in chapter one, One-Sample Kolmogorov-
Smirnov Test ($Z_c$) and Pearson Product Moment Correlation ($r$) were used to test the 
hypotheses. Hypothesis one, two, three and five were tested with One-Sample Kolmogorov-
Smirnov Test while hypothesis four was tested with Pearson Product Moment Correlation. 
Below are the analysis and the results of the hypotheses formulated to answer the research 
questions that guided the study.

Decision rule:

If $Z$ is less than -1.96 or greater than 1.96 reject the null hypothesis.

4.2.1 Hypothesis 1

$H_0$: Selection procedure of employee training does not have a high effect on 
organizational productivity.

$H_1$: Selection procedure of employee training has a high effect on organizational 
productivity.

To test the hypothesis, the response to question 1 in the questionnaire as found in Table 12 
and Figure 13 was used.

Test of Hypothesis for Research Question 1

Our goal is to determine the extent at which the unsystematic approach of employee training 
affects organizational productivity. The One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test was used as 
shown below.
### Descriptive Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very high extent</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>.323</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High extent</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>.498</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>.285</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low extent</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>.399</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very low extent</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>.357</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>VHE</th>
<th>HE</th>
<th>UD</th>
<th>LE</th>
<th>VLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normal Parameters (a, b)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>1.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>.323</td>
<td>.498</td>
<td>.285</td>
<td>.399</td>
<td>.357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most Extreme Differences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absolute</td>
<td>.525</td>
<td>.370</td>
<td>.534</td>
<td>.492</td>
<td>.513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>.358</td>
<td>.312</td>
<td>.378</td>
<td>.310</td>
<td>.338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>-.525-.370</td>
<td>-.534</td>
<td>-.492</td>
<td>-.513</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z</td>
<td>8.246</td>
<td>5.827</td>
<td>8.402</td>
<td>7.751</td>
<td>8.076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monte Carlo Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000(c)</td>
<td>.000(c)</td>
<td>.000(c)</td>
<td>.000(c)</td>
<td>.000(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% Confidence Interval</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Bound</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Bound</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>.012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Test distribution is Normal.
b Calculated from data.
c Based on 248 sampled tables with starting seed 2000000.

### Interpretation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>(Z_c)</th>
<th>(Z_t)</th>
<th>df</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very High Extent</td>
<td>8.246</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>8.246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Extent</td>
<td>5.827</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>5.827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>8.402</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>8.402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Extent</td>
<td>7.751</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>7.751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Extent</td>
<td>8.076</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>8.076</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Test Statistics \((Z_c < Z_t, \alpha = 0.05)\) was observed and based on the decision rule, unsystematic approach of employee training has a high effect on organizational productivity.

Therefore, we accept the null hypothesis and reject the alternate hypothesis.
4.2.2 Hypothesis 2

H₀: The extent to which training design affects organizational performance is high.

H₁: The extent to which training design affects organizational performance is low.

To test the hypothesis, the response to question 6 in the questionnaire as found in Table 14 and Figure 15 was used.

Test of Hypothesis for Research Question 2

Our goal is to determine the extent to which training design affects organizational performance. The One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test was used as shown below.

### Descriptive Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extent of Performance</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Extent</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9.50</td>
<td>5.339</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Extent</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11.50</td>
<td>6.494</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>19.00</td>
<td>10.824</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Extent</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>64.00</td>
<td>36.806</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very High Extent</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>22.50</td>
<td>12.845</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extent of Performance</th>
<th>VLE</th>
<th>LE</th>
<th>UD</th>
<th>HE</th>
<th>VHE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Normal Parameters(a,b)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>9.50</td>
<td>11.50</td>
<td>19.00</td>
<td>64.00</td>
<td>22.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most Extreme Differences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absolute</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td>.074</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td>.060</td>
<td>.066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td>.074</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td>.060</td>
<td>.066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>-.078</td>
<td>-.074</td>
<td>-.067</td>
<td>-.060</td>
<td>-.066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z</td>
<td>.332</td>
<td>.348</td>
<td>.410</td>
<td>.679</td>
<td>.437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.996</td>
<td>.746</td>
<td>.991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monte Carlo Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>1.000(c)</td>
<td>1.000(c)</td>
<td>.988(c)</td>
<td>.730(c)</td>
<td>.988(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% Confidence Interval</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Bound</td>
<td>.988</td>
<td>.988</td>
<td>.974</td>
<td>.675</td>
<td>.974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Bound</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.785</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a  Test distribution is Normal.

b  Calculated from data.

c  Based on 248 sampled tables with starting seed 2000000.
**Interpretation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>$Z_c$</th>
<th>$Z_t$</th>
<th>df</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Extent</td>
<td>0.332</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>-0.668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Extent</td>
<td>0.348</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>-0.652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>0.410</td>
<td>0.988</td>
<td>-0.578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Extent</td>
<td>0.679</td>
<td>0.730</td>
<td>-0.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very High Extent</td>
<td>0.437</td>
<td>0.988</td>
<td>-0.551</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the above, the Test Statistics, $(Z_c = 0.679 < Z_t = 0.730; \alpha = 0.05)$ 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 accept the null hypothesis and reject the alternate hypothesis.

**4.2.3 Hypothesis 3**

$H_0$: The extent to which training delivery style affects organizational performance is high.

$H_1$: The extent to which training delivery style affects organizational performance is low.

To test the hypothesis, the response to question 9 in the questionnaire as found in Table 17 and Figure 18 was used.

**Test of Hypothesis for Research Question 3**

Our goal is to determine the extent to which training delivery style affects organizational performance. The One-Sample Kolmogorov Smirnov Test was used as shown below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>.707</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>2.449</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UD</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>13.50</td>
<td>7.649</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>64.50</td>
<td>37.094</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>42.50</td>
<td>24.393</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>UD</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normal Parameters (a, b)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>13.50</td>
<td>64.50</td>
<td>42.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>.707</td>
<td>2.449</td>
<td>7.649</td>
<td>37.094</td>
<td>24.393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most Extreme Differences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absolute</td>
<td>.260</td>
<td>.105</td>
<td>.072</td>
<td>.060</td>
<td>.062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>.260</td>
<td>.105</td>
<td>.072</td>
<td>.060</td>
<td>.062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>-.260</td>
<td>-.105</td>
<td>-.072</td>
<td>-.060</td>
<td>-.062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z</td>
<td>.368</td>
<td>.297</td>
<td>.365</td>
<td>.681</td>
<td>.566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.999</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.999</td>
<td>.742</td>
<td>.906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monte Carlo Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig.</td>
<td>1.000(c)</td>
<td>1.000(c)</td>
<td>1.000(c)</td>
<td>.762(c)</td>
<td>.887(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% Confidence Interval</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Bound</td>
<td>.988</td>
<td>.988</td>
<td>.988</td>
<td>.709</td>
<td>.848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Bound</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.815</td>
<td>.926</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Test distribution is Normal.
b. Calculated from data.
c. Based on 248 sampled tables with starting seed 2000000.

#### Interpretation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>$Z_c$</th>
<th>$Z_t$</th>
<th>df</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0.368</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>-0.632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>0.297</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>-0.703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UD</td>
<td>0.365</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>-0.635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>0.681</td>
<td>0.762</td>
<td>-0.081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>0.566</td>
<td>0.887</td>
<td>-0.321</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Test Statistics, $(Z_c = 0.566 < Z_t = 0.887; \alpha = 0.05)$ was observed and based on the result, the extent to which training delivery style affects organizational performance is high. Therefore, we accept the null hypothesis and reject the alternate hypothesis.

#### 4.2.4 Hypothesis 4

$H_0$: There is a significant relationship between employee training and organizational performance.

$H_1$: There is no significant relationship between employee training and organizational performance.
To test the hypothesis, the response to question 12 in the questionnaire as found in Table 20 and Figure 21 was used.

**Test of Hypothesis for Research Question 4**

Our goal is to test the significance of the relationship between employee perception of training and organizational productivity. The Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient was used as shown below.

**Descriptive Statistics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>2.449</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>1.291</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UD</td>
<td>7.50</td>
<td>4.183</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>45.50</td>
<td>26.125</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>65.89</td>
<td>38.539</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Correlations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>UD</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.000(**)</td>
<td>1.000(**)</td>
<td>1.000(**)</td>
<td>1.000(**)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>1.000(**)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.000(**)</td>
<td>1.000(**)</td>
<td>1.000(**)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UD</td>
<td>1.000(**)</td>
<td>1.000(**)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.000(**)</td>
<td>1.000(**)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>1.000(**)</td>
<td>1.000(**)</td>
<td>1.000(**)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.948(**)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>1.000(**)</td>
<td>1.000(**)</td>
<td>1.000(**)</td>
<td>.948(**)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).**

**Interpretation**

From the above Pearson Correlation \( r = 0.948; \ alpha = 0.05 \) test, there is a positive relationship between employee perception of training and organizational performance. How the employee views the effect and goal of the training highly affects his/her take home from the training. Therefore the null hypothesis should be accepted and the alternate rejected.
4.2.5 Hypothesis 5

$H_0$: The effect of employee training on organizational performance is high.

$H_1$: The effect of employee training on organizational performance is low.

To test the hypothesis, the response to question 16 in the questionnaire as found in Table 24 and Figure 25 was used.

Test of Hypothesis for Research Question 5

Our goal is to determine the extent to which employee training affects organizational performance. The One-Sample Kolmogorov Smirnov Test was used as shown below.

**Descriptive Statistics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UD</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9.50</td>
<td>5.339</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>46.50</td>
<td>26.702</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>69.50</td>
<td>39.981</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>UD</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>9.50</td>
<td>46.50</td>
<td>69.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>5.339</td>
<td>26.702</td>
<td>39.981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absolute</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>.060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>.060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>-.078</td>
<td>-.061</td>
<td>-.060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z</td>
<td>.332</td>
<td>.589</td>
<td>.705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.879</td>
<td>.704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monte Carlo Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>1.000(c)</td>
<td>.851(c)</td>
<td>.665(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% Confidence Lower Bound</td>
<td>.988</td>
<td>.806</td>
<td>.607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% Confidence Upper Bound</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.895</td>
<td>.724</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Test distribution is Normal.
b Calculated from data.
c Based on 248 sampled tables with starting seed 957002199.
Interpretation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Zc</th>
<th>Zt</th>
<th>df</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UD</td>
<td>0.332</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>-0.678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>0.589</td>
<td>0.851</td>
<td>-0.262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>0.705</td>
<td>0.665</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the above, the Test Statistics, \((Zc = 0.705 > Zt = 0.665; \alpha = 0.05)\) shows that majority of the respondents strongly agree that employee training affects organizational performance. But bearing in mind from the preceding tests, employee training alone does not improve organizational performance. Other factors such as procedure, perception, training design and delivery style must be considered to improve organizational performance. On these grounds, it is safe to say that the effect of employee training alone on organizational performance is low. Therefore, we accept the alternate hypothesis and reject the null hypothesis.

4.3 Discussion of Findings

The discussion of findings revolved around the set objectives in chapter 1. The findings in this study were compared to empirical findings made in other related studies; and where there are illogicalities, efforts were made to reconcile them.

For ease of reference, the objectives are presented again below:

1. To ascertain the extent to which unsystematic approach of employee training affects organizational productivity;
2. To determine the extent of effect of training design on employee productivity;
3. To ascertain the extent to which training delivery style affects employee productivity;
4. To find out the relationship between employee perception of training and organizational productivity; and
5. To determine the extent to which employee training affects organizational performance.
Research Objective One

From the analysis of data collected from the respondents, it was observed as shown in Tables 4.7 to 4.9 and Figures 4.7 to 4.9 that the respondents’ opinion clearly indicated that the extent to which unsystematic approach of employee training affects organizational productivity was high ($Z_c < Z_t; \alpha = 0.05$). The respondents’ views to a large extent synchronized with the assertion by Olaniyan and Ojo (2008) that non-systematic approach of training like administrative approach, welfare approach, and political approach affects the overall performance of the organization because the purpose is incongruent with organizational policy and vision. This is also in line with the assertion by Adamu (2008) that systematic approach of employee training is a deliberate corporate policy instrument designed with the goal and objective to guide its programme choice and content packaged to evaluate or solve identified training needs or problems.

Research Objective Two

The respondents opined that to a high extent, training design affects employee productivity as shown in Tables 4.10 to 4.11 and Figure 4.10 to 4.11. The finding ($Z_c < Z_t; \alpha = 0.05$) is in line with the position of Partlow (1996) that Organizations that develop a training design according to the needs of the employees and that of the Organization always get good results.

Research Objective Three

The respondents’ standpoint is that training delivery style to a high extent affects employee productivity ($Z_c < Z_t; \alpha = 0.05$). This is shown in Tables 4.14, 4.15 and 4.16 and Figures 4.14, 4.15 and 4.16. The respondents’ view supports Mark and Andrew (2000) assertion that if training is not delivered in an impressive style and is not capturing the attention of the
audience; it means the trainer is wasting the time. Similarly, Phillip and Eves (2005) opined that delivery style means so much in training because it is what goes into making the change expected in the trainee.

Research Objective Four

The respondents are of the view that employee perceptions of training are very closely related to organizational performance ($r=0.948; \alpha = 0.05$). This is shown in Tables 4.17, 4.18, 4.19 and Figure 4.17, 4.18, 4.19. This position is in line with Bryan (1990) that people learn if they accept the need for training and commit to it. If their motivation is weak, no matter how well their training is designed and implemented, its effectiveness will be limited.

Research Objective Five

The respondents' standpoint is that employee training to a high extent affects organizational performance $Z_c > Z_t, \alpha = 0.05$, as shown in Table 4.22 and Figure 4.22. The respondents' view to a large extent synchronized with Smith (2010) assertion that training motivates employee and make them more productive.
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CHAPTER FIVE
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, RECOMMENDATION AND CONCLUSIONS

5.1 Summary of Findings

The major findings of the study include the following:

1. The extent to which selection procedure of employee training affected organizational productivity was high ($Z_c = 8.246 < Z_t = 0.000; \alpha = 0.05$)

2. The extent of effect of training design on employee productivity was high ($Z_c = 0.679 < Z_t = 0.730; \alpha = 0.05$)

3. The extent to which training delivery style affected employee productivity was high ($Z_c = 0.681 < Z_t = 0.762; \alpha = 0.05$).

4. There was a very strong positive relationship between employee perception of training and organizational performance ($r = 0.948; \alpha = 0.05$).

5. The extent to which employee training affected organizational performance was low ($Z_c = 0.705 > Z_t = 0.665; \alpha = 0.05$), however, when other variables like training design, delivery style, it effect becomes significant.

5.2 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. In addition, Nigerian Bottling Company and 7Up Bottling Company should have a mechanism for evaluating employee post training performance. Emphasis should be on skill gap and not on sentiment when selecting employees for training.
5.3 Recommendations

In the light of the findings and conclusion of the study the following recommendation are made, which if adopted would make the training function of the Human Resource department of Nigerian Bottling Company and 7UP Bottling Company more productive and efficient.

- Seminars and workshops should be organized for the Human Resource department on the importance of systematic approach of training and proper procedure to follow in identifying skill gaps in the various departments.

- Heads of Department should be sensitized on the importance of sending the right employee on training. They should not see training opportunities as pay back opportunities for their loyalists.

- Recommending employees for training based on favouritism 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.

The recommendations would impact positively on other organizations, especially those in the manufacturing sector.
5.4 Contribution to Knowledge

Employee training is the process of enhancing the skills, capabilities and knowledge of employees for doing a particular job. Training process moulds the thinking of employees and leads to quality performance of employees. It is continuous and never ending in nature. In the course of the research, the researcher developed an employee training model labeled “Employee Systematic Training Model”. The model is as shown with a brief explanation on its operationalization (see Figure 28 as reproduced hereunder).

The objective of the various training programme, whether on-the-job or off-the-job is to bring about a positive transformation process in the employees’ skills, knowledge of the job and improve his/her performance which in turn will improve organizational performance. As an on-going concern, the evaluation of employee post-training performance would be required for possible training.

![Figure 28: Employee Systematic Training Model](image)

*Developed by the Researcher*

From Figure 28 it is shown that training is one of the core functions of the Human Resource Department of any organization. The HR Department therefore carries out continuous
assessment for the purpose of identifying skill gaps that could be filled by training. After such skill gaps (employee skill gaps) have been identified, the employee is sent on training. Naturally, it is expected that the employee should come back with some performance changes. The employee performance is thus evaluated. The evaluation will enable the HR department know if the employee improved positively as a result of the training or not. Evaluation will also enable the HR department identify other skill deficiencies with the overall aim of improving organizational performance.
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APPENDICES

Appendix A: Questionnaire

Section A
BASIC DEMOGRAPHIC DATA (PLEASE TICK WHERE APPROPRIATE)

1. How old are you? (Years)
   a) 18 – 25 ( )
   b) 26 – 35 ( )
   c) 36 – 45 ( )
   d) 46 – 55 ( )
   e) 56 – 59 ( )

2. Gender:
   a) Male ( )
   b) Female ( )

3. Educational Background:
   a) WASC/GCE ( )
   b) OND ( )
   c) HND/B.Sc ( )
   d) MBA/M.Sc ( )
   e) Others, please specify _____________________

4. What is your position in the company?
   a) Junior ( )
   b) Senior ( )

5. How long have you been working with the company?
   a) 1 – 10 years ( )
   b) 11 – 20 years ( )
   c) 21 – 30 years ( )
   d) 31 – 40 years ( )

Section B
Please read the questions carefully and tick (√) where appropriate

Research Question 1
To what extent does selection procedure of employee training affect organizational productivity?

1. Why do you go for training?

2. Immediate supervisors and the HR Department have a strong influence on the selection of an employee for training.
   a. Strongly disagree √ b. Disagree √ c. Undecided √ d. Agree √
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To what extent does training design affect organizational productivity?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Good training design ensures that identified employee skill gaps are properly captured.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Undecided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Strongly agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement: Training design affects organizational performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Very low extent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Low extent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Undecided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. High extent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Very high extent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Please rate the importance of training design on employee performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Not important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Somewhat important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Undecided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Very important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Bad training design results to waste of resources and does not improve organizational performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Undecided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Strongly agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To what extent does training delivery style affect organizational productivity?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Please rate to what extent you agree or disagree with this statement: Training delivery style ensures that the objective of employee training is achieved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Undecided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Strongly agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10. To what extent does training delivery style affect your performance?
   a. Very low extent [ ]  
   b. Low extent [ ]  
   c. Undecided [ ]  
   d. High extent [ ]  
   e. Very high extent [ ]

11. To what extent does employee poor performance as a result of poor training delivery style affect organizational performance?
   a. Very low extent [ ]  
   b. Low extent [ ]  
   c. Undecided [ ]  
   d. High extent [ ]  
   e. Very high extent [ ]

**Research Question 4**
What is the extent of relationship between employee perception of training and organizational productivity?

12. Employee perception of training is correlated to organizational performance.
   a. Strongly disagree [ ]  
   b. Disagree [ ]  
   c. Undecided [ ]  
   d. Agree [ ]  
   e. Strongly agree [ ]

13. How closely related is employee perception of training to organizational performance?
   a. Not at all related [ ]  
   b. Somewhat related [ ]  
   c. Closely related [ ]  
   d. Very closely related [ ]  
   e. Strongly agree [ ]

14. How has your post training performance affected the organizational performance?
   a. Very negatively [ ]  
   b. Negatively [ ]  
   c. Undecided [ ]  
   d. Positively [ ]  
   e. Very positively [ ]

15. Indicate the degree of post-training confidence you have in your ability to successfully perform your duties.
   [ ] 0 – 30% No confidence
   [ ] 40 – 80% Moderate confidence
   [ ] 90 – 100% Complete confidence

**Research Question 5**
To what extent does employee training affect organizational performance?

16. Employee training affects organizational performance
   a. Strongly disagree [ ]  
   b. Disagree [ ]  
   c. Undecided [ ]  
   d. Agree [ ]  
   e. Strongly agree [ ]
17. To what extent does employee training affect organizational performance?
   a. Very low extent  
   b. Low extent  
   c. Undecided  
   d. High extent  
   e. Very high extent  

18. Do you agree or disagree with the following statement:
   The more training employee attends the better his/her performance.
   a. Strongly disagree  
   b. Disagree  
   c. Undecided  
   d. Agree  
   e. Strongly agree  
APPENDIX B: INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

1. Has your company been involved in training and development for employees?
   ........................................................................................................................................
   ........................................................................................................................................

2. What are the reasons for sending an employee on training?
   ........................................................................................................................................
   ........................................................................................................................................

3. How does your organization identify skill gaps of employees?
   ........................................................................................................................................
   ........................................................................................................................................
   ........................................................................................................................................
   ........................................................................................................................................

4. What are the benefits of employees training to both the employee and the employer?
   ........................................................................................................................................
   ........................................................................................................................................
   ........................................................................................................................................
   ........................................................................................................................................
   ........................................................................................................................................
   ........................................................................................................................................
   ........................................................................................................................................

5. Is there significant relationship between employee training and organizational performance?
   ........................................................................................................................................
   ........................................................................................................................................

6. In what ways has employees training affected your organization’s performance?
   ........................................................................................................................................
   ........................................................................................................................................

7. What methods of training does your organizational use most and why?
   ........................................................................................................................................
   ........................................................................................................................................
8. How does training design affect employee performance?

9. Do you have records on past training with dates on each worker?

10. Please provide data on employees sponsored in the past 10 years in terms of:
   a) Number sponsored each year in the past 10 years
   b) Type of sponsorship offered
   c) Studies completed.
APPENDIX C: CALCULATION OF THE RELIABILITY OF THE RESEARCH INSTRUMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
<th>0.811018449</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Split-Half (odd-even) Correlation</td>
<td>0.781164724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spearman-Brown Prophecy</td>
<td>0.877139226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean for Test</td>
<td>48.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation for Test</td>
<td>11.9084004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KR21</td>
<td>1.57137237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KR20</td>
<td>1.59486934</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reliability Calculator created by Del Siegle

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Subjects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|       | Q 1 | Q 2 | Q 3 | Q 4 | Q5  | Q6  | Q7  | Q8  | Q9  | Q10 | Q11 | Q12 | Q13 | Q14 | Q15 | Q16 | Q17 | Q18 | Q19 | Q20 |
|-------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| Subject1 | 2   | 2   | 2   | 3   | 4   | 5   | 2   | 1   | 2   | 4   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 3   | 4   | 5   | 5   | 5   | 5   | 4   |
| Subject2 | 1   | 1   | 2   | 4   | 5   | 5   | 1   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 1   | 2   | 2   | 5   | 5   | 4   | 4   | 3   | 3   |
| Subject3 | 1   | 2   | 2   | 5   | 5   | 4   | 1   | 2   | 2   | 1   | 1   | 2   | 2   | 5   | 5   | 4   | 1   | 2   | 1   | 2   |
| Subject4 | 3   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 1   | 3   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 3   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 1   | 3   | 2   | 1   | 3   | 1   |
| Subject5 | 5   | 5   | 5   | 4   | 4   | 3   | 3   | 2   | 3   | 4   | 5   | 5   | 5   | 4   | 3   | 2   | 3   | 1   | 2   | 1   |
| Subject6 | 1   | 1   | 1   | 5   | 1   | 1   | 1   | 1   | 1   | 1   | 1   | 1   | 1   | 1   | 1   | 5   | 1   | 1   | 2   | 2   | 1   |
| Subject7 | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 1   | 2   | 3   | 1   |     |     |
| Subject8 | 2   | 1   | 2   | 2   | 4   | 1   | 3   | 2   | 1   | 2   | 1   | 2   | 2   | 4   | 1   | 3   | 1   | 3   | 2   | 1   |
| Subject9 | 5   | 5   | 1   | 1   | 2   | 1   | 2   | 5   | 4   | 5   | 5   | 1   | 1   | 1   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 1   |
| Subject10| 4   | 3   | 3   | 3   | 1   | 2   | 1   | 1   | 3   | 4   | 4   | 3   | 3   | 3   | 1   | 2   | 1   | 1   | 2   | 2   |