

Efficacy of Employee's Training Programme at Reaction level: An Empirical Evidence from “State Bank of Hyderabad” in India

Dr. Sudhir Chandra Das*, Miss Harshit Topno**

The present study focuses on different factors that affect the effectiveness of training programme at reaction level based on Kirkpatrick Model with regard to various demographic variables in 'State Bank of Hyderabad' in India. It first analyzes the differences in perception of employees regarding different factors of training effectiveness in relation to various demographic variables by using independent sample t-test, one way ANOVA & chi-square. Next, it identifies the significant pairs by using post-hoc test. Analysis shows that demographic variables i.e. age, education and experience have greater impact on the effectiveness of training and development programme. In most of the factors, the average perception score of the respondents in relation to age, education and experience is found to be significantly different. The study may helpful for HR professionals to construct & develop more factors for right evaluation of training programme.

Keywords: Training, Employees, Programme, Effectiveness, Efficacy, Demographic, Education, Experience, Perception, Clerical Staffs, and Kirkpatrick.

Introduction

The economic scenario in India has undergone tremendous changes over the last few years. Liberalization and globalization have caused lots of changes in different organization. One of the important elements of this dynamic environment is our human resources who can play an important role in constantly adopting new developments and making change work. Any organization without its human resources is incomplete and impossible. The human resources become even more important in the service industry whose value is delivered through information, personal interaction or group work. Bankers are increasingly aware of the importance of technology for their operations and survivals. Banks are adopting and adapting to technological tools to further their businesses. The new technologies (core banking, mobile banking, ATM etc) are transforming the skill structure in banking. It has been observed that human resources are a very vital area and particularly their training is an aspect which organization has to attend for future success. The efficiency and effectiveness of an organization depends on the capability and talent of its personnel. Capability of a person depends on his ability to work and the types of training he/she receives. An organization is responsible to a great extent, for providing training and development.

Training is the act of increasing the skills of an employee for doing a particular job (Flippo 1984, p. 192). It enhances efficiency and develops a systematic way of performing duties and assigned tasks. Moreover, it bridges the gap between job requirement and employees present specification (Saharan

2011, p. 118). Every organization uses training to help its employees, develops skills and abilities to perform their job in a better and efficient manner. Training also helps the organization to cope up with the continuously changing environment and keep itself abreast with the needs of the industry (Iyer et al. 2009, p. 35). According to Dessler (2005) training refers to the methods used to give new or present employees the skills they need to perform their jobs.

Only providing training is not enough. There is also a need to evaluate the effectiveness of these training interventions in order to rationalize them. Evaluation of training and development is the most essential aspect of training programme. Generally, all good training programme starts with identification of training and development need and ends with evaluation of training (Gopal 2009, p. 142). Training evaluation ensures that whether candidates are able to implement their learning in their respective work place or to the regular routines (Nagar 2009, p. 86). Evaluation of training and development involves assessing whether it is achieving its objectives, it is effective or not. Training effectiveness refers to the benefits that the company and the trainees receive from training. Benefits for trainees may include learning new skills or behaviour. Benefits for the company may include increased sales and more satisfied customers. However, it is very difficult to measure the effectiveness of training and development because of its abstract nature and long term impact on the trainees and the organization (Prasad 2005, p. 394). There are different models to evaluate training, still training evaluation is the weakest and most under developed aspect of training and development. There are several reasons for underdeveloped

*Associate Professor, (HRM, Insurance & Research Methods), Faculty of Commerce, Banaras Hindu University, Varanasi, UP, India.

**Senior Research Fellow and Doctoral Scholar, Faculty of Commerce, Banaras Hindu University, Varanasi, UP, India.

evaluation. They are; evaluation means different things to different people, it is perceived to be difficult, tedious and time consuming task, which trainers do not like to pursue, trainers feel threatened by the prospect of an objective evaluation of training and its outcome (Sims 1993, p. 35). It causes expenses that can be ill afforded in a constrained financial area and it takes time to practice (Iyer et al. 2009, p. 35). Besides these, one of the main reasons is that all models are descriptive and subjective in nature, its indicators for evaluating training and development is not clearly given and explained.

Review of literature

Lewis & Thornil (1994) has examined the relationship between training evaluation, organizational objectives and organizational culture. Scholars have advocated that the absence of or ineffective practice of training evaluation within so many organizations is directly related to the nature of their organizational cultures. Hashim (2001) has made an intensive study that training evaluation is an elusive concept, especially when it comes to practice. The practice of evaluation in training has received a lot of criticism. This criticism is largely explained by the unsystematic, informal and adhoc evaluation that has been conducted by training institution. Gopal (2008) examines the evaluation of effectiveness of executive training programmes in Electronic of India Ltd. Scholar carried out evaluation of training in two ways. (1). Individual programmes wise evaluation and (2). Overall evaluation of all programmes. The study reveals that evaluation of training is the most essential one in the training function. All good training programmes starts with identification of training needs and ends with the evaluation of training. The evaluation of training provides useful feedback to the training professional and management as to help in making appropriate and effective one for the next better programme. Iyer, Pardiwalla & Bathia (2009) briefly explore the various methods of training evaluation to understand the need for training evaluation with emphasis on the Kirkpatrick's model. Scholars concluded that although there are different methods to evaluate training, still training evaluation is the weakest and most under developed aspect of training. Although evaluation is still a grey area, every organization has to move to evaluate return on investment and behaviour to evaluate its training programme in order to justify the investment made in training as well as to improve the training process. Nagar (2009) has made an attempt to study the effectiveness of training programmes being conducted by the commercial banks in public as well as in the private sector based on the responses of their clerical level staff. The results of the study reveal that training programme of the respondent organizations are generally effective with respect to course duration, library facilities, trainer, teaching and computer aided programme and infrastructure facilities. Ramachandran (2010) has made an analytical study on effectiveness of training programme of different cadre of employees working in a public sector organization. The result reveals that employees differed in effectiveness of training programme on the basis of

demographic characters. It is also inferred that experience and education of the employees of the organization is predominating and determining factor in training programme. Saharan (2011) highlighted that most organization are taking feedback from employees for training effectiveness to maximize its benefits. The study expounds the perspective of employees having different qualification and experiences towards objectives behind imparting training in organizations.

The above discussed literature focused on the need of evaluation and its practical implication. There are various models for evaluation, among them Kirkpatrick model is widely used model. According to a survey by the American Society for Training and Development (ASTD), the Kirkpatrick four level evaluation approaches is still the most commonly used evaluation framework among Benchmarking Forum Companies (Bassi & Cheney 1997, p. 60). This model has been introduced in 1959 by Donald Kirkpatrick. Kirkpatrick divided the evaluation model into four levels: reaction, learning, behaviour and result. Reaction would evaluate how participants feel about the programme they attended. The learning would evaluate the extent to which the trainees learned the information and skills, the behaviour would evaluate the extent to which their job behaviour had changed as a result of attending the training. The results would evaluate the extent to which the results have been affected by the training programme. Programme evaluation involves two general approaches – Formative evaluation also known as internal and summative evaluation also known as external evaluation. Likewise, reaction evaluation is a type of formative evaluation when the results are used for program modification and the redesign of contents, course material and presentations (Antheil & Casper 1986, p. 56; Robinson & Robinson 1989). Reaction can also be summative in nature. In such cases, the goal of reaction evaluation is to determine the value, effectiveness or efficiency of a training programme (Smith & Brandenburg 1991, p. 36) and to make decisions concerning programme continuation, termination, expansion, modification or adoption (Worthen & Sanders 1987).

Objective of the Study

To evaluate the perception of employees' regarding different factors of training effectiveness in relation to different demographic variables.

Hypothesis for the Study

There is no significant difference in the perception of employees regarding different factors of training effectiveness in relation to different demographic variables.

Design/ Methodology/ Approach

The present study is descriptive in nature based on primary data. The survey has been carried out in Staff College of State bank of Hyderabad, the largest associate bank of State Bank of India. State Bank of Hyderabad, originally a bank started by

the Nizam of Hyderabad, was constituted as the Hyderabad State Bank on 8 August, 1941 during the reign of the last Nizam, Mir Osman Ali Khan. In 1956, the bank was taken over by Reserve Bank of India (RBI) as its subsidiary and its name was changed from Hyderabad State Bank to State Bank of Hyderabad. After India's Independence this and other banks of the princely states were renamed after the Subsidiary Banks Act was passed in 1959 and turning them into subsidiaries of SBI, the bank became the 1st subsidiary of the State Bank of India and one of the Scheduled banks in India. The bank's Head office is situated at Gunfoundary, Hyderabad. The bank has performed well in the past decades. The bank has won several awards for its best banking practices. Bank was adjudged as 2nd best amongst public sector banks in India for 2 consecutive years 2006 and 2007 by Business India and KPMG combine. Bank was adjudged as 1st in customer satisfaction in saving bank a/c against 23 mid-sized banks in India (6 private banks, 2 foreign banks & 15 public sector banks) by Gallup Inc and Indian Banking Association (IBA) in their 2008 national survey of banks. Bank also won the award of India's Most Efficient Big Bank by Business Today Group in 2010. It got Best Bank Award for SME finance in 2011. Dunn and Bradstreet ranked SBH as number one in assets management. The judgment sampling has been used with a sample size of 105 clerical staffs who underwent training programme. The study has been conducted through well structured questionnaire. Kirkpatrick's model of evaluation at reaction level has taken as base for preparing the questionnaire. As the effectiveness of training programme depends on various factors, different parameters such as (i) Needs & Objectives, (ii) Study Material, (iii) Duration, (iv) Infrastructure, (v) Trainer, (vi) Organization and (vii) Usefulness are identified and adopted for evaluation of training programme.

Cronbach's Alpha test has been used for testing the reliability of the questionnaire. Next, it identifies the differences in perception of employees regarding different factors of training effectiveness in relation to various demographic variables by using Independent Sample t-test, One Way ANOVA and Chi-Square Test. Next, it identifies the significant pairs by using Post-Hoc Test. Finally, the paper suggests in conclusive remark the impact of demographic variables on effectiveness of training program.

Analysis & Discussion

- A. **Reliability Analysis:** Cronbach's Alpha test has been used for testing the reliability of the questionnaire as per the scale given by Freitas & Rodrigues, 2005 and it is .799 of 22 items, which shows useful of the scale.
- B. **Table No. 1** shows the distribution of respondents on the basis of age, gender, education, marital status and experience in SBH.

Age wise classification shows that 57.1% respondents are in the age group of 21 – 30 years, 21.0% respondents are in the age group of 31 – 40 years and 21.9% respondents are in the age group of > 40 years. Education qualification wise distribution shows that 7.6% respondents holds intermediate qualification, 51.4% respondents hold graduation, 10.5% and 30.5% respondents hold post graduation and professional/technical degree respectively. Table shows that 69.5% respondents were having experience of up to 5 years in SBH, 13.3% respondents were having experience of 6 -15 years and 17.1% respondents were having experience of >15 years in SBH. Table shows that out of the total respondents, 74.3% were male and 25.7% were female. Table also shows that 53.3% were married and 46.7% were unmarried.

Table No 1: General Profile of the Respondents

Variable	Group	No.	%	Variable	Group	No.	%
<u>Age</u>				<u>Education:</u>			
21 – 30	1	60	57.1	Inter	1	8	7.6
31 – 40	2	22	21.0	UG	2	54	51.4
>40	3	23	21.9	PG	3	11	10.5
				Prof./Tech.	4	32	30.5
Total		105	100.0	Total		105	100.0
<u>Experience in SBH</u>				<u>Marital Status</u>			
≤5	1	73	69.5	Married	1	56	53.3
6 – 15	2	14	13.3	Unmarried	2	49	46.7
>15	3	18	17.1				
Total		105	100.0	Total		105	100.0
<u>Gender:</u>							
Male	1	78	74.3				
Female	2	27	25.7				
Total		105	100.0				

C. Testing of Hypotheses:

Table No. 2: Distribution of clerical staffs' perception regarding Needs & Objectives factor of training effectiveness with various demographic variables.

S. No.	Factors	Label	Demographic Variable	Test Used	Value of F, t & d. f	P-value	Sig./Non-Sig.	Significant t Pairs
1.	Needs & objectives	1. Awareness of programme objectives	Age	ANOVA	1.71	P>0.05	NS	1vs3,1vs4
			Edu.	ANOVA	3.10	P<0.05	S	
			Exp.	ANOVA	3.06	P>0.05	NS	
			Gender	t-test (df)	0.87(103)	P>0.05	NS	
			Mar. Sta.	t-test (df)	0.40(103)	P>0.05	NS	
		2. Objectives matched with valuable needs	Age	ANOVA	0.28	P>0.05	NS	-
			Edu.	ANOVA	2.31	P>0.05	NS	
			Exp	ANOVA	0.02	P>0.05	NS	
			Gender	t-test (df)	0.045(103)	P>0.05	NS	
			Mar. Sta.	t-test (df)	0.273(103)	P>0.05	NS	
		3. Needs satisfaction	Age	ANOVA	1.68	P>0.05	NS	2vs3,3vs4
			Edu.	ANOVA	3.88	P<0.05	S	
			Exp.	ANOVA	1.05	P>0.05	NS	
			Gender	t-test(df)	0.87(103)	P>0.05	NS	
			Mar. Sta.	t-test(df)	1.40(103)	P>0.05	NS	

VHS-Very Highly Significant

HS-Highly Significant

S-Significant

NS-Not Significant

Discussion: Under 'Needs and Objectives' factor employees are asked question about their awareness of programme objectives, whether programme objectives matched with their valuable needs or not and to what extent their needs were satisfied. In case of awareness of programme objectives, the average perception score of respondents is found to be significantly different among various educational groups. In case of need satisfaction the average perception score of respondents is found to be significantly different among various educational groups. Further post-hoc test show the significant pair in the last column. In case of awareness of

programme objective, significant difference has been found between respondents having qualification of intermediate and PG, Intermediate and Professional/Technical. In case of needs satisfaction, significant difference has been found between respondents having qualification of UG & PG, PG & Professional/Technical. In all other cases, there is no significant difference.

Thus on the basis objective the H_0 in case of Needs & Objectives with educational group is rejected. In all other cases H_0 are accepted.

Table No. 3: Distribution of clerical staffs' perception regarding Study Material factor of training effectiveness with various demographic variables.

S. No.	Factors	Label	Demographic Vari.	Test Used	Value of F, t & df	P value	Sig./Non-Sig.	Significant t Pairs
2.	Study material	1. More background material in advance	Age	ANOVA	3.93	P<0.05	S	1vs2
			Edu.	ANOVA	0.20	P>0.05	NS	
			Exp.	ANOVA	1.41	P>0.05	NS	
			Gender	t-test(df)	1.83(103)	P>0.05	NS	
			Mar. Sta.	t-test(df)	1.56(103)	P>0.05	NS	
		2. Satisfaction of reading material	Age	ANOVA	0.46	P>0.05	NS	-
			Edu.	ANOVA	0.25	P>0.05	NS	
			Exp.	ANOVA	0.05	P>0.05	NS	
			Gender	t-test (df)	2.2.(103)	P<0.05	S	
			Mar. Sta.	t-test(df)	0.59(103)	P>0.05	NS	

		3. Training material quantity	Age	ANOVA	0.10	P>0.05	NS	-
			Edu.	ANOVA	1.33	P>0.05	NS	
			Exp.	ANOVA	1.06	P>0.05	NS	
			Gender	t-test(df)	0.28(103)	P>0.05	NS	
			Mar. Sta.	t-test(df)	0.71(103)	P>0.05	NS	
		4. Levels of inputs	Age	ANOVA	1.55	P>0.05	NS	-
			Edu.	ANOVA	1.46	P>0.05	NS	
			Exp.	ANOVA	2.61	P>0.05	NS	
			Gender	t-test(df)	1.30(103)	P>0.05	NS	
			Mar. Sta.	t-test(df)	1.59(103)	P>0.05	NS	
		5. coverage of various topics	Age	ANOVA	0.67	P>0.05	NS	-
			Edu.	ANOVA	0.85	P>0.05	NS	
			Exp.	ANOVA	0.01	P>0.05	NS	
			Gender	t-test(df)	2.28(103)	P<0.05	S	
			Mar. Sta.	t-test(df)	0.48(103)	P>0.05	NS	
		6. Training material quality	Age	ANOVA	0.82	P>0.05	NS	-
			Edu.	ANOVA	0.16	P>0.05	NS	
			Exp.	ANOVA	0.30	P>0.05	NS	
			Gender	t-test(df)	2.30(103)	P<0.05	S	
			Mar. Sta.	t-test(df)	0.88(103)	P>0.05	NS	

VHS-Very Highly significant

HS-Highly Significant

S-Significant

NS-Not significant

Discussion: It is one of the important factors of training effectiveness. While designing training programme, trainer or policy maker should be very careful about the contents, quality and quantity of study material. It should be according to needs of the target employees and must be easy enough to understand. Under this factor, 6 questions (variables) have

been asked to employees. Out of the 6 questions, the average perception score of respondents is found to be significantly different in 3 questions (variables) between gender groups.

Thus on the basis of objective the H_0 in case of study material with gender group is rejected. In all other cases H_0 are accepted.

Table No. 4: Distribution of clerical staffs' perception regarding Duration factor of training effectiveness with various demographic variables.

S. No.	Factors	Label	Demographic Vari.	Test Used	Value of F, t & df	P-value	Sig./Non-Sig.	Significant Pairs
3.	Duration	1. Duration of programme	Age	ANOVA	3.51	P<0.05	S	1vs2
			Edu.	ANOVA	2.21	P>0.05	NS	
			Exp.	ANOVA	5.01	P<0.01	HS	1vs3
			Gender	t-test (df)	1.19(103)	P>0.05	NS	
			Mar.Sta.*	t-test(df)	2.46(103)			
		2. Future duration of programme	Age	ANOVA	3.56	P<0.05	S	1vs3
			Edu.	ANOVA	1.07	P>0.05	NS	
			Exp.	ANOVA	4.40	P<0.05	S	
			Gender	t-test(df)	0.90(103)	P>0.05	NS	
			Mar.Sta.	t-test(df)	2.74(103)	P>0.05	NS	
		3. Schedule of 4. training programme	Age	χ^2 (df)	5.26(6)	P>0.05	NS	-
			Edu.	χ^2 (df)	7.45(9)	P>0.05	NS	
			Exp.	χ^2 (df)	5.39 (3)	P>0.05	NS	
			Gender	χ^2 (df)	8.22 (6)	P>0.05	NS	
			Mar.Sta.	χ^2 (df)	2.82(3)	P>0.05	NS	

VHS-Very highly significant

HS-Highly Significant

S-Significant

NS-Not Significant

* Marital Status

Discussion – Duration also plays a very important role in the effectiveness of training programme. If duration of any particular programme will be more, it will create tiredness among participants and their interest will go down. If duration will be too less, trainer will not be able to cover all the topics and it will create problem for participants to understand the subject matter. So, appropriate duration must be required for an effective training programme. Under this factor, 3 questions (variables) have been asked to participants. Among them, the

average perception score of participants is found to be significantly different in 2 questions (variables) among experience group. Further post-hoc test show the significant pairs in the last column. Significant difference has been found between the respondents having experience of up to 5 years & >15 years.

Thus on the basis of objective Ho is rejected in case of duration with experience group. In rest of the cases Ho are accepted.

Table No. 5: Distribution of clerical staffs' perception regarding Trainer factor of training effectiveness with various demographic variables.

S. No.	Factors	Label	Demographic Vari.	Test Used	Value of F, t & df	P value	Sig./Non-Sig.	Significant Pairs
4.	Trainer	1. Communication of trainer	Age Edu. Exp. Gender Mar. Sta.	ANOVA ANOVA ANOVA t-test (df) t-test (df)	2.34 0.40 4.34 1.44(103) 2.84(103)	P>0.05 P>0.05 P<0.05 P>0.05 P<0.05	NS NS S NS HS	1vs3
			VHS-Very highly significant	HS-Highly Significant	S-Significant	NS-Not significant		

Discussion-Trainer is a person who educates employees of companies on specific topics. Trainer is the key to success of every training programme. The effective transfer of training depends a lot on the trainer because it is the trainer who can remove the mental block of trainee, motivate the trainee to learn, delete the negative perception of the trainee regarding the training. In case of trainer, the average perception score of

employees is found to be significantly different among experience group. Further post – hoc test show the significant pairs in the last column. Significant difference has been found between the respondents having experience of up to 5 years & > 15 years. Thus, Ho in case of trainer with experience group is rejected. In rest of the cases Ho are accepted.

Table No. 6: Distribution of clerical staffs' perception regarding Infrastructure factor of training effectiveness with various demographic variables.

S. No.	Factors	Label	Demographic Vari.	Test Used	Value of F, t & df	P value	Sig./Non-Sig.	Significant Pairs
5.	Infrastructure	1. Training facilities	Age Edu. Exp. Gender Mar. Sta.	ANOVA ANOVA ANOVA t-test (df) t-test (df)	1.41 0.20 1.45 1.97(103) 2.39(103)	P>0.05 P>0.05 P>0.05 P>0.05 P<0.05	NS NS NS NS S	
		2. Environment of workspace	Age Edu. Exp. Gender Mar. Sta.	ANOVA ANOVA ANOVA t-test (df) t-test (df)	9.09 1.87 19.61 1.89(103) 4.21(103)	P<0.001 P>0.05 P<0.001 P>0.05 P<0.001	VHS NS VHS NS VHS	1vs3 1vs3,2vs3
		3. Hostel infrastructure	Age Edu. Exp. Gender Mar. Sta.	ANOVA ANOVA ANOVA t-test (df) t-test (df)	4.07 5.05 7.78 2.17(103) 2.46(103)	P<0.01 P<0.01 P<0.01 P<0.05 P<0.05	HS HS HS S S	1vs3 1vs4,2vs4 1vs3
			VHS-Very highly significant	HS-Highly Significant	S-Significant	NS-Not significant		

Discussion: Here infrastructure refers to physical infrastructure facilities provided to employees like hostel, classroom arrangement and various facilities like library, catering etc. Three questions (variables) have been asked to employees and the average perception score of participants is found to be significantly different in two questions (variables)

among age group. Further post – hoc test show the significant pairs in the last column. Significant difference has been found between the respondents who are in the age group of 21 – 30 years & > 40 years.

Thus, H_0 in case of infrastructure with age group is rejected. In rest of the cases H_0 are accepted.

Table No. 7: Distribution of clerical staffs' perception regarding Organization factor of training effectiveness with various demographic variables.

S. No.	Factors	Label	Demographic Vari.	Test Used	Value of F, t & df	P value	Sig./Non -Sig.	Significant Pairs
6.	Organisation	1. Programme organization	Age	ANOVA	1.66	P>0.05	NS	1 vs.3
			Edu.	ANOVA	1.67	P>0.05	NS	
			Exp.	ANOVA	4.58	P<0.05	S	
			Gender	t-test (df)	2.82(103)	P<0.01	HS	
			Mar. Sta.	t-test (df)	1.14(103)	P>0.05	NS	
		2. Methodology used	Age	ANOVA	0.20	P>0.05	NS	-
			Edu.	ANOVA	0.38	P>0.05	NS	
			Exp.	ANOVA	0.29	P>0.05	NS	
			Gender	t-test(df)	1.20(103)	P>0.05	NS	
			Mar. Sta.	t-test(df)	0.81(103)	P>0.05	NS	
		3. Trainee involvement & participation	Age	ANOVA	3.67	P<0.05	S	1 vs.3,2vs.3
			Edu.	ANOVA	2.48	P>0.05	NS	
			Exp.	ANOVA	2.10	P>0.05	NS	
			Gender	t-test (df)	0.92(103)	P>0.05	NS	
			Mar. Sta.	t-test (df)	1.85(103)	P>0.05	NS	

VHS-Very highly significant

HS-Highly Significant

S-Significant

NS-Not significant

Organization – The effectiveness of training programme also depends on its organization. Whether methods used for training, time span between each session, active participation of trainee in class teaching etc. are appropriate or not.

Regarding this factor the average perception score of employees, in most of the cases is found to be insignificant.

So H_0 in case of Organization with all demographic variables are accepted.

Table No. 8: Distribution of clerical staffs' perception regarding Usefulness factor of training effectiveness with various demographic variables.

S. No.	Factors	Label	Demographic Vari.	Test Used	Value of F, t & df	P value	Sig./Non -Sig.	Significant Pairs
7.	Usefulness	1. Relevance and usefulness of programme in work situation	Age	ANOVA	1.13	P>0.05	NS	-
			Edu.	ANOVA	0.93	P>0.05	NS	
			Exp.	ANOVA	0.02	P>0.05	NS	
			Gender	t-test(df)	1.24(103)	P>0.05	NS	
			Mar. Sta.	t-test(df)	0.61(103)	P>0.05	NS	

		2. Relevance and usefulness of programme in personal growth & development	Age	ANOVA	0.74	P>0.05	NS	-
			Edu.	ANOVA	0.46	P>0.05	NS	
			Exp.	ANOVA	1.15	P>0.05	NS	
			Gender	t-test(df)	0.75(103)	P>0.05	NS	
			Mar. Sta.	t-test(df)	1.07(103)	P>0.05	NS	
		3. Levels of gain	Age	ANOVA	0.01	P>0.05	NS	-
			Edu.	ANOVA	0.49	P>0.05	NS	
			Exp.	ANOVA	0.29	P>0.05	NS	
			Gender	t-test (df)	0.36(103)	P>0.05	NS	
			Mar. Sta.	t-test(df)	0.27(103)	P>0.05	NS	
VHS-Very highly significant			HS-Highly Significant		S-Significant		NS-Non significant	

Discussion : Under this factor employees are asked questions about the usefulness of programme in their personal growth and development as well as in present work situation. After analysis, it is found that the average perception score of employees in all cases is found to be insignificant.

So, Ho in case of Usefulness with all the demographic variables are accepted.

Findings & Conclusions:

From the above analysis, it is found that clerical staffs are satisfied with almost all the factors of training effectiveness except Duration of the training program. The clerical staffs having experience of up to 5 years are in the opinion that duration of training programme was not sufficient. Most of them are in view of conducting training programme annually. The respondents having experience of 6-15 years and >15 are almost satisfied with duration of training programme. Most of the clerical staffs who have qualified intermediate are with the opinion that programme objectives were according to their valuable needs followed by UG, Professional, and PG qualified respondents. Clerical staffs who have qualified intermediate are also with the view that their training needs were more satisfied followed by UG, PG and Professional qualified respondents. Regarding study material female clerical respondents are highly satisfied. They are satisfied with quality of training and reading material provided during the training. Most of them are with the view that during training, most of the topics had been covered. With trainer, the respondents having experience of up to 5 years are more satisfied than the respondents having experience of 6 – 15 years & > 15 years. In case of infrastructure the respondents who are in the age group of 21 – 30 years are highly satisfied than the respondents who are in the age group of 31 – 40 years and > 40 years.

Every year State Bank of Hyderabad conducts training programme to skill and re-skill of its employees. For this State Bank of Hyderabad has its own training and development policy. After studying, it is found that training and policy of the bank has covered all the three aspects of training i.e. training needs assessment, training design & its implementation and evaluation of training. Every year the

training plan is re-assessed at all levels to align it with the emerging requirements. The training programmes at the Staff College and learning centres are carefully and conscientiously structured, to bring about measurable changes in knowledge, skills, attitude and social behaviour of the personnel to improve customer satisfaction and business development. Training and development policy of State Bank of Hyderabad is good enough because analysis shows that training and development programmes are according to the needs of the employees and almost all employees are satisfied with their training and development practices. Analysis also shows that demographic variables i.e. age, education and experience have greater impact on the effectiveness of training and development programme and the perception of employees regarding different factors of training effectiveness is found to be significantly different in relation to these variables.

References:

- Anthul, J. H. & Casper, I. G. (1986). Comprehensive Evaluation Model: A tool for the evaluation of non-traditional education programmes. *Innovative Higher Education*, 11(1), 55-64.
- Bernardin, H. J. (2007). *Human Resource Management: An Experimental Approach*. New Delhi: Tata McGraw-Hill.
- Bassi, L. J. & Cheney, S. (1997). Benchmarking the Best, *Training and Development*, 5(11), 60-64.
- Dessler, G. (2005), *Human Resource Management*, New Delhi: Dorling Kindersley (India) Pvt. Ltd.
- Flippo, E. B. (1984). *Personnel Management*. New Delhi: Tata McGraw-Hill.
- Freitas, A. L. P., Rodrigues, S, G. (2005). *A avaliacao da confiabilidade de questionario: uma analise utilizando o coeficiente alfa de cronbach*. In: symposia de engenharia de producao, 12, 2005, bauru. Proceedings Bauru: UNESP
- Gopal, (2008). Effectiveness of Executive Training Programmes. *The Indian Journal of Commerce*, 61(3), 143-150.

- Hashim, J. (2001). Training Evaluation: Client's Roles. *Journal of European Industrial Training*, 25(7), 374–397.
- Iyer, R., Pardiwalla, P. & Bathia, J. (2009). Training Evaluation Practices in Indian Organizations. *HRD News Letter*, 25(8), 35–37.
- Kirkpatrick, L. D. & Kirkpatrick, D. J. (2006). *Evaluating Training Programmes*, San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.
- Lewis, P. & Thornhill, A. (1994). The Evaluation of Training: An Organizational Culture Approach. *Journal of European Industrial Training*, 18(8), 25–32.
- Nagar, V. (2009). Measuring Training Effectiveness. *The Indian Journal of Commerce*, 62(4), 86–90.
- Naquin, S. S. & Holtan, F. E. (2003). *Approaches to Training and Development*, New York: Basic Books.
- Noe, R. A. (2008). *Employees Training and Development*. Irwin: McGraw-Hill.
- Patnayak, B. (1998). *Human Resource Training*, New Delhi: Wheeler.
- Prasad, L. M. (2005). *Human Resource Management*, New Delhi: Sultan Chand & Sons.
- Ramachandaran, R. (2010). Effectiveness of training programmes of NLC—An Analysis. *Kegees Journal of Social Science*, 2(1), 119–129.
- Robinson, D. G. & Robinson, T. C. (1989). *Training for impact: How to link training to business needs and measure the result*, San-Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Saharan, T. (2011). Objective for Training: What Employees Perceive in Service Industry. *Kegees Journal of Social Science*, 3(1), 118–127.
- Sahu, R. K. (2006). *Training for Development: all you need to know*, New Delhi: Excel Books.
- Sim, R. (1993). *Evaluating Public Sector Training Programs*. *Public Personnel Management*, 22(8), 35–37.
- Smith, M. E. & Brandenburg, D. C. (1991). Summative Evaluation. *Performance Improvement Quarterly*, 4(2), 35–58.
- Tripathi, P. C. (2006). *Human Resource Development*, New Delhi: Sultan Chand & Sons.
- Worthen, B. R. & Sanders, J. R. (1987). *Educational Evaluation. Alternative Approaches and Practical Guidelines*, New York: Longman.