

Impact of Training on Job Satisfaction among Managers

B.Mahadevappa

Associate Professor
Department of Studies in Commerce
University of Mysore, Manasagangotri, Mysore-570 006, Karnataka

Mathew George

Director, Department of Management Studies
Mar Athanasius College, Kothamangalam- 686 666, Kerala

Abstract

The aim of this paper is to study the impact of training on job satisfaction among managers. The study has covered a sample of four hundred and fifty-five managers from one hundred forty manufacturing and service organisations having well defined training programmes spread across India. Primary data were collected by administering research instrument on training inputs and job satisfaction. The main conclusion emerged from the study include acquisition of knowledge, changing of attitude and development of skills were the main objectives and expectations from the training programme. Actual benefits received from the training programmes correlated with the objectives and expectations from the training programme. The study found that, among the hygiene factors, security was the major source of dissatisfaction, followed by supervision, working condition, co-workers and pay and among the motivators, recognition and achievement were the major sources of satisfaction, followed by promotion. Job satisfaction level among managers was positively correlated with number of days of training programmes attended by them.

Key Words: *Training, job satisfaction, managers*

Introduction

Training is a process to enhance knowledge, develop attitudes and improve skills of individuals who are working for the organisation. What is imparted in the form of training percolates to actual behaviour and performance on the job. The need for trained managers became apparent with the emergence of the management movement prior to World War I. The works of Frederick W. Taylor (1911) and Henri Fayol (1949) identified management as a separate and distinct discipline that could be taught. Initially, it appeared that colleges and universities could do the teaching, but the Great Depression seriously depleted the supply of experienced managers as businesses cut back or failed. World War II worsened the situation by drawing managerial talent from business and industry into the armed forces and government agencies just when industrial production

processes, business problems, and managerial functions were becoming more complex. Since globalisation, business has become even bigger and more complex. Technological advances, product diversification, decentralised operations, government regulations, domestic and foreign competition for markets and rapid social change have resulted in a shortage of managerial talent. Organisations in manufacturing and service sectors have found it necessary to provide training to its supervisory and managerial personnel. This study is an attempt to understand the impact of training on job satisfaction among managers.

Literature Review

Several researchers have investigated the type and nature of training, contents, duration, methods and aids used in training, place of training etc and also impact of training on various organisational variables.

The difficulty of getting hold of the scope of training and the resources devoted to it was discovered by Tracey (1980). Lynton, et. al. (1978) argued that evaluation of training should be addressed starting with the training programme itself and followed by evaluating participant learning, the training objectives and the worthwhileness of the whole training effort. Virmani, et.al. (1985) conducted study in two phases. The first phase dealt with transfer of training in the training institution; and the second, related to transfer of learning to the job. The emphasis of the first phase was to evolve a model and framework for the evaluation of training and development activities. Their second phase focused on the impact of training in organisational and job performance improvement. Earlier research studies on job satisfaction attempted to determine the general properties of satisfied and dissatisfied workers such as Happock (1935), Roethlisberger, et. al. (1939), Roe (1956) etc. With the Hawthorne experiments, attention of researchers shifted from the physical and economic characteristics of work to the social and emotional aspects of work behaviour such as Herzberg, et. al. (1959).

Objectives of the Study

- Understand the objectives and expectations of managers from the training programme and actual benefits received from them.

- Enumerate the number of days of training attended by managers.
- Assess the determinants of job satisfaction among managers.
- Study the impact of training on job satisfaction among managers.

Hypotheses of the Study

- H₁ There is a positive relationship between objectives and expectations of managers from the training programme and actual benefits received from them.
- H₂ There is a significant difference in job satisfaction level between managers who have attended more number of days of training than others.

Methodology

Sample of Organisations

One hundred and forty organisations having well defined training schemes spread across India were covered using judgement sampling method. They were stratified by nature of organisations into manufacturing and service and by ownership into public and private sectors as given in Table 1.

Table 1: Sample of Organisations

Stratification	n	%	Stratification	n	%
Nature			Sector		
Manufacturing	102	73	Public	69	49
Service	38	27	Private	71	51
Total	140	100	Total	140	100

Sample of Managers

Six hundred managers were selected from one hundred and forty sampled organisations as subjects of this study using convenience sampling method. Out of these, four hundred and fifty-five responses were received representing a response rate of

seventy-six per cent. They were stratified by nature of organisations into manufacturing and service and by managerial position in to top, middle and junior management level, by gender and by age as given in Table 2.

Table 2: Sample of Managers

Stratification	n	%	Stratification	n	%
Nature			Gender		
Manufacturing	272	60	Male	398	87
Service	183	40	Female	57	13
Total	455	100	Total	455	100
Managerial Position			Age (Years)		
Top Management	86	19	21-30	73	16
Middle Management	234	51	31-40	134	29
Junior Management	135	30	41-50	163	36
			51-60	85	19
Total	455	100	Total	455	100

Research Instrument

Research instrument developed for the purpose of this study consisted of four sections. The first was related to organisational profile; the second on personal profile of individual manager; the third on training inputs received by the manager and the fourth on job satisfaction after attending the training programme. The job satisfaction scale developed by Dubey, B.L. & et.al. (1989) was used in this study. Job satisfaction was measured on a five

point scale ranging from '5' strongly agree to '1' strongly disagree. Reverse scores were used for statements 24 and 25.

For analysis, these twenty five statements given in Table 7 were classified into hygiene and motivators. Sixteen statements were distributed to five hygiene factors- pay (statements 12,14,20); supervision (4,7,8,10,13); co-worker (3,21); security (2,17) working condition (5,6,15,22); and nine statements were distributed to three motivation factors - achievement (16,19,24,25); promotion (1,18,23) and recognition (9,11).

Reliability Analysis

The internal consistency method was chosen to assess the reliability of the research instrument. It is estimated by using reliability coefficient such as Cronbach's alpha (Cronbach, 1951). Cronbach's alpha is computed for a scale based on a given set of items. A scale score for all measures is the mean of the item scores. It can also be calculated for any subset of the items. Therefore, it is possible to identify the subset (category) that has the highest reliability co-efficient. The scale constructed from that subset is likely to be the best with regard to internal

consistency. Using SPSS reliability programme (Hull and Nie, 1981), an internal consistency analysis was performed separately for the items of each category of job satisfaction instrument. Table 3 presents the reliability co-efficient associated with the eight categories of job satisfaction scale and also number of items measuring each category, its mean and standard deviation. Higher values of alpha indicate higher reliability. Reliability values are greater than 0.70 for all categories. It meets the reliability requirement of a minimum value of 0.7 recommended by Nunnally (1978).

Table 3: Results of Reliability Analysis

Factors of Job Satisfaction	N	Mean	S.D.	Alpha
A. Hygiene				
1.Security	2	4.11	0.68	0.77
2.Supervison	5	3.98	0.60	0.79
3.Working Condition	4	3.82	0.74	0.77
4.Co-worker	2	3.62	0.87	0.70
5.Pay	3	3.46	0.98	0.82
B. Motivators				
1.Recognition	2	4.15	0.71	0.71
2.Achievement	4	3.75	0.69	0.72
3.Promotion	3	3.61	0.87	0.74

Data Collection and Analysis

Primary data were collected from four hundred and fifty-five managers by administering the above research instrument. Descriptive statistics, t-test and correlation were used to analyse and interpret the data.

Findings

Objectives and Expectations from the Training Programme

Of the total sample, 71 per cent of the respondents claimed that the objective behind their attending the training programme was acquisition of knowledge, while 42 per cent claimed knowledge retention and 62 per cent for changing their attitudes as per

Table 4. 40 per cent to 57 per cent of the respondents claimed that the objectives behind their attending the training programme were for development of different skills ranging from supervisory skills to

problem solving skills. The evidences support to conclude that, major objectives and expectations from the training programme were acquisition of knowledge, development of skills and changing of attitudes.

Table 4: Objectives and Expectations from the Training Programme

Objectives and Expectations	Percentage of preference for each choice
1. Acquisition of knowledge	71
2. Knowledge retention	42
3. Changing attitudes	62
4. Development of skills (a) supervisory skills	40
(b) human relations skills	57
(c) leadership skills	57
(d) communication skills	53
(e) interpersonal skills	55
(f) decision making skills	51
(g) problem solving skills	51

Actual Benefits Received from the Training Programme

Training programme helped trainees to gain new knowledge and expose them to practical aspects of the job to solve problems they face in day to day situation. The next major benefit trainees gained was

change of their attitude that would help in their jobs. This is also a good indicator of utility of the training programme. Bringing positive mind set among the people towards their jobs and their organisation is the need of the hour in both manufacturing and service organisations.

Table 5: Benefits Gained from the Training Programme

Benefits	Percentage of preference
1. New knowledge and exposure to practical aspects that is pertinent to the job.	78
2. Specific approaches, skills and techniques that can be applied on the job.	66
3. Change of attitude that will be helpful in the job.	69

Testing of Hypothesis

H_0 : There is no positive relationship between objectives and expectations of managers from the training and actual benefits received from them.

H_1 : There is a positive relationship between objectives and expectations of managers from the training and actual benefits received from them.

Table 6: Results of Correlation Analysis

Independent Variable (Objectives and Expectations from the training programme)	Dependent Variable (Actual Benefits received from the training programme)	Value of 'r'	Level of Significance
1. Knowledge Acquisition	1. New Knowledge and exposure to practical aspects that are pertinent to the job.	.733	.0001
2. Changing Attitudes	2. Change of attitude that would be helpful in the job	.712	.0001
3. Development of Skills	3. Specific approaches, skills and techniques that can be applied on the job.	.658	.0001

Correlation is Significant at 0.01 level

The results of correlation given in Table 4 reject the null hypothesis and accept the research hypothesis as the *p*-value associated with the objectives and expectations from the training programme and actual benefits received from the training programme is <0.01. As objectives and expectations from the training programme before the training (independent-regressor) has resulted in increased actual benefits received from the training programme after the training (dependent-response), there exists significant correlation co-efficient with a positive sign between them. The positive relationship is brought about by the increased benefits received from the training programme.

Determinants of Job Satisfaction among Managers

A manager's satisfaction on the job is related to his total self and therefore, it cannot be explained on the basis of any single factor. Researchers have identified a number of factors of job satisfaction, each composed of a number of jobs aspects. Hoppock,

the earliest investigator in this field, in 1935 suggested that there are six major components of job satisfaction. These include: a) The way the individual reacts to unpleasant situations; b) The facility with which he adjusts himself to other persons; c) The relative status in the social and economic group with which he identified himself; d) The nature of work in relation to the abilities, interests and preparation of the worker; e) Security and g) Loyalty. After Hoppock (1935), a number of theoretical and empirical investigations have been reported in leading academic journals of the time. Out of these, the contributions of Herzberg and his colleagues were the most important.

Herzberg, & et. al. (1959) suggested that there are two factors, corresponding to satisfaction and dissatisfaction. They concluded that 'hygiene' and 'motivators' factors. Hygiene factors include pay, working condition, co-workers, supervision and security which affect mainly satisfaction. Motivators include promotion, recognition, and achievement which affect mainly satisfaction.

The analysis in this study is based on Herzberg's two factors theory. The twenty-five statements of the job satisfaction scale developed by Dubey, & et. al. (1989) was classified into hygiene and motivators. The percentage frequencies, average scores and ranks of the determinants of job satisfaction stratified into hygiene factors and motivators of four hundred

and fifty-five managers are presented in Table 7 and Table 8. The study found that among the hygiene factors, security was the major source of dissatisfaction, followed by supervision, working conditions, co-workers, and pay. Among the motivators, recognition and achievement were the major sources of satisfaction, followed by promotion.

Table 7: Percentage of Frequencies of Determinants of Job satisfaction among Managers

Determinants of Job Satisfaction	Percentage of Frequency					Cumulative Percentage of Frequencies of scores 5 and 4
	5	4	3	2	1	
I HYGIENE FACTORS						
1. Pay	16	44	16	18	6	60
1. Comparing the salary for similar jobs in other organisations, I feel my pay is better. [12]	18	38	16	20	8	56
2. As per work requirement my pay is fair. [14]	13	46	17	19	5	59
3. My pay is enough for providing necessary things in my life. [20]	18	47	15	15	5	65
2. Supervision	24	55	11	9	1	79
4. On the whole, I am satisfied with the general supervision in my department. [4]	22	46	17	12	2	68
5. My superior keeps me informed about all policies/happenings of the organisation. [7]	25	54	11	9	1	79
6. I feel that I have opportunity to present my problems to the management. [8]	24	59	10	6	1	83
7. My supervisor behaves properly with me. [10]	32	52	6	8	2	84
8. My supervisor takes into account my wishes as well as work done. [13]	19	59	13	8	1	78
3. Co-Worker	21	47	15	14	3	68
9. Favouritism does not have any role to play in this organisation. [3]	21	43	15	17	4	64
10. There is high team spirit in the work groups. [21]	21	50	16	11	2	71
4. Security	33	53	10	4	0	86
11. I have full confidence in the management of this organisation. [2]	29	54	13	4	0	83
12. I feel that my job is reasonably secure as long as I do good work. [17]	36	51	8	4	1	87

Table 7:Percentage of Frequencies of Determinants of Job satisfaction among Managers Contd....

Determinants of Job Satisfaction	Percentage of Frequency					Cumulative Percentage of Frequencies of scores 5 and 4
	5	4	3	2	1	
5. Working Condition	24	50	15	10	1	74
13. Working conditions in this organisation are satisfactory.[5]	25	62	6	6	1	77
14. I think this organisation treats its employees better than any other organisation.[6]	24	44	17	13	1	69
15. My organisation adopts best methods of work as early as possible.[15]	22	47	19	10	2	69
16. I am satisfied with welfare facilities provided by the organisation.[22]	22	46	19	10	3	69
II MOTIVATORS						
6. Achievement	26	44	15	12	4	70
17. My job has helped me to learn more skills.[16]	36	53	6	4	1	89
18. I usually feel fresh at the end of the day's work. [19]	18	50	15	14	3	68
19. I do not like this job, but circumstances for me. [24]	27	42	13	13	5	69
20. If I get similar job in some organisation, I would like to quit this job. [25]	22	30	25	16	7	52
7. Promotion	21	43	18	14	4	64
21. I have been getting promotion as per my qualification and experience. [1]	21	43	15	17	4	64
22. Promotions are made on merit in this organisation.[8]	18	41	20	15	6	49
23. On the whole, I feel I have good prospects or advancement in my job.[23]	22	46	19	10	3	68
8. Recognition	37	50	7	5	1	87
24. My present job is as per my ability, qualification and experience.[9]	32	52	6	8	1	84
25. I feel proud of working in this organisation.[11]	42	47	8	3	0	89

Table 8: Overall rankings of determinants of job satisfaction

Determinants of Job Satisfaction	Mean	S.D.	Coefficient of Variation(%)	Rank
Recognition	4.15	0.71	17.1	1
Security	4.11	0.68	16.5	2
Supervision	3.98	0.60	15.1	3
Working Condition	3.82	0.74	19.4	4
Achievement	3.75	0.69	18.4	5
Co-workers	3.62	0.87	24.0	6
Promotion	3.61	0.87	24.1	7
Pay	3.46	0.98	28.3	8

Impact of Training on Job Satisfaction among Managers

The individual scores obtained for the twenty-five items of job satisfaction scale were summed up. The minimum individual job satisfaction score was 25 and maximum was 125 for twenty-five statements on five point scale 1-5. Later managers were classified into three categories-managers with high job satisfaction

(above 75 score); managers with moderate job satisfaction (51-75 score) and managers with low job satisfaction (below 50 score). According to Table 9, 38 per cent of the managers were highly satisfied with their jobs compared to 62 per cent moderately satisfied.

Table 9: Managers with High and Moderate Job Satisfaction

Job Satisfaction Level	Number of Managers	Per cent
Highly Satisfied	170	38
Moderately Satisfied	285	62
Total	455	100

The study has compared the training input of 170 highly job satisfied managers with 285 moderately job satisfied managers by number of days of training attended by them. The average number of days of

training attended by a highly job –satisfied was 11.37 per year, while that of a moderately job satisfied managers was 5.04 per year with a overall average s of 7.41 as per Table 10.

Table 10: Average Number of Days of Training Programmes Attended by Managers

Type of Managers	Average number of days of training attended by manager per year
Highly Satisfied Managers	11.37
Moderately Satisfied Managers	5.04
Overall	7.41

Testing of hypothesis

H_0 : There is no significant difference in the job satisfaction level between managers who have attended more number of days of training programmes than others.

H_1 : There is a significant difference in the job satisfaction level between managers who have attended more number of days of training programmes than others.

Table 11: Result of t-Test

Managers	Mean	S.D	Mean Difference	S.D.	S.E.	t-Value	P-Value
High Job Satisfaction	11.37	0.84	6.33	0.97	0.07	28.4	0.0001
Moderate Job Satisfaction	5.07	0.91					

The result of t-Test rejects the null hypothesis and accepts the research hypothesis as the p-value associated with the difference in Job Satisfaction level between managers who have attended more number of man-days training programmes than others is less than one percent. The study found that managers who have attended more number of days of training have high job satisfaction level than the managers who have attended less number of days of training.

Conclusions

The main conclusion emerged from the study include acquisition of knowledge, changing of attitude and development of skills which were the main objectives and expectations from the training programme. Actual benefits received from the training

programmes were correlated with the objectives and expectations from the training programme. The study found that, among the hygiene factors, security was the major source of dissatisfaction, followed by supervision, working condition, co-workers and pay and among the motivators, recognition and achievement were the major sources of satisfaction, followed by promotion. Job satisfaction level among managers was positively correlated with number of days of training programmes attended by them.

Further studies shall focus on impact of in-house or out-house training programmes, on-the-job and off-the-job training programmes, pre-employment and post-employment training programmes on job satisfaction among managers.

References:

- Cronbach, L.J. (1951). Co-efficient alpha and the internal structure of tests, *Psychometrika*, 16, 267-334.
- Dubey, B.L., Uppal, K.K. & Verma, S.K. (1989). Job satisfaction scale.
- Fayol, Henri. (1949). *General and industrial management*. New York: Pitman Publishing Corporation.
- Herzberg, F., Mausner, B & Snyderman, B, (1972). The role of training in national manpower policy. *Training and Development Journal*, July, 32.
- Hoppock, R. (1935). *Job Satisfaction*. New York: Harper & Brothers.
- Hull, C.H. & Nie, N.H. (1981). *SPSS Update*. New York: Mc-Graw Hill Inc.
- Nunnally, J.C. (1978). *Psychometric theory*. New York: McGraw Hill Book Company.
- Lynton, P. Rolf & Pareek, Udai. (1978). *Training for development*, New Delhi: Vistaar Publications, A Division of SAGE Publications India Pvt. Ltd.
- Roe, A. (1956). *The psychology of occupations*. New York: Rand McNally.
- Roethlisberger, F.J. & Dickson, W.J. (1939), *Management and the worker*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Taylor, Frederick W. (1911). *Principles of scientific management*. New York: Harper & Row, Reprinted in 1947.
- Tracey, William R. (1980), *Managing training and development systems*. 1st Reprint (India). Bombay: Taraporevala Publishing Industries Private Limited.
- Virmani, B.R. & Seth, Premila. (1985), *Evaluating management training and development*. New Delhi: Vision Books.

About the Authors

B. Mahadevappa

He is working as Associate Professor of Commerce in the Department of Studies in Commerce, University of Mysore with a teaching experience of 18 years and administrative experience of 7 years as education officer at central government. He holds a Master's degree in commerce and Ph.D, followed by a post-doctoral experience of 3 years carrying out research on Total Quality Management in higher education. He has also carried out research projects pertaining to service quality in banks and market potential for low cost drugs. He has guided five students for Ph.D. degree and currently guiding an equal number of students. Dr. Mahadevappa is a prolific writer with more than 25 research publications in international and national journals and more than 20 papers in international and national conferences and seminars. He has successfully coordinated several faculty development programs and refresher courses and also has visited Thailand and Taiwan to present papers. His email contact is bmahadevappa@gmail.com.

Mathew George

Dr. Mathew George retired as the Director of Indian Institute of Workers Education, Ministry of Labor and Employment, Government of India in 2007 and presently serving as Director, Department of Management Studies, Mar Athanasius College, Kothamangalam, Kerala. He holds a bachelors degree in science followed by several post graduate degrees that include social work, sociology, business administration, psychology, law and adult education, also a Ph.D. He has worked as Workforce Development Advisor in London Borough of Wandsworth and also as founder Director of Shramik Vidyapeeth, University of Kerala. He has more than four decades of experience in industry, training, academics, research, and administration. He has also worked in industries in public sector undertaking.

