



Investigating the Factors Affecting Training Decision among Employees in Hospitality Industry (w.r.t Select Categorized Hotels in and Around Faridabad)

Vijit Chaturvedi

Lingaya's University, Faridabad, India

(Received: 18/01/2016; Accepted: 26/04/2016)

Abstract

It is an evident fact that in the contemporary competitive business environment the significance for survival and sustenance is indispensable. The medium for growth for every organization today is its work force and investing in workforce of utmost importance to transform them into talented, competitive and loyal. With the underlying role of training and its importance in service industry, the present paper aims at analyzing different factors that affect the training decision of employees in hotel industry. The objective of the paper was also to understand whether demographic factors have any role in rating/deciding the importance attached to different dimensions affecting training decision. On the basis of analysis, it was observed that few dimensions like leadership quality, outcome based training, brand building of organization, training content, improvement in efficiency or quality of work were considered to be primarily important by managers while taking training decisions. The importance attached to different demographic factors did not seem to be different with respect to age, gender, income and qualification of managers. Thus, after analysis and interpretation, it was found that training is one of the most vital ways of invigorating new skills, building competency and propelling growth for any organization.

Keywords: Training Decision, Service Industry, Investment in Training.

JEL Classification: M12

Paper Classification: Research Paper

Introduction

It is evident that hospitality industry is amongst the fastest growing industries which demands skilled workforce. However, it is marred by two major challenges, i.e., firstly, staff turnover that affects business and the brand experience and secondly, career growth path for employees is not well defined.

It has been interpreted by several studies that various competencies are required by employees working in hotel industry. Ineson & Kempa (1996) identified 4 important skills right to improve like oral and written communication, supervising skills and ability to provide customer

satisfaction and service. Various other researchers have focused on role of varied other skills like ethics, leadership and problem solving as important skills to improve operational excellence (Tas & Baum 1990; Kay & Russette 2000 and Christou & Sigala, (2001). Also, role of various other areas like safety against various hazardous factors, managing situations that can be threat to employees and organization are also found significant in competencies and skill set.

However, one important skill, strategic management skill, was found missing in many researches. Different authors have focused on importance of various skills, for e.g., Kay & Russette (2000) found leadership and communication skills to be more important than administrative and conceptual skills. According to Tas, LaBrecque & Clayton (1996), there are five main competencies in hotel property management. These competencies are Interpersonal, Leadership, Conceptual-creative, Administrative and Technical. Thus, it can be understood that imparting training and promoting development is one of the most significant function for an effective organization building and for new staff to get prepared for taking higher roles.

Review of Literature

According to Ryan (2008), creating stability and direction in imparting training is important as without this the employee is unable to help the client in the desired way, thus making him unhappy and forcing a customer to switch loyalties and opt for another hotel. According to various studies there is a direct and strong impact of training in maintaining employee retention, loyalty and morale. It helps in improving the learning which, in turn, helps in building knowledge resulting in effective customer handling. According to Daniels (2008), irrespective of the economic losses; an organization should never cut down their training costs as reduction of training budgets gives a negative message to employees and training boosts their morale and commitment. Staff turnover may be endemic in hospitality industry as majority of the employees leave when they have been initially incorporated in the industry. This is also called "Induction Crisis". This can be because of poor induction, training, care, relationship building or any other reason but leads to huge loss. People who aim to build their career, in this industry need to be trained and prepared adequately.

It is important to develop trust amongst people that will help in reducing turnover intentions by providing continuous training, fair and formal appraisal and ample career advancement opportunities. These practices will lead to high level of trust building within the organization. Agrusa & Lema (2007) when investigating the issue of employee retention found that in hospitality industry retention and feedback of employees who are in direct interaction with customers is important as customers form impression about the business and services based on their interaction with these employees. It is also important to train a good employee since poor presentation, customer handling, service will also lead to huge loss and negative image building. According to Colonel & Goong (2007) costs can be very higher when employees leave in a short time span since getting return from investment due to improperly planned training, incentive, and compensation leading to poor cultural and motivational fit. According to Hemdi & Nasurdi (2006) investment in training and resulting development and fair appraisals create a positive emotional state of employees. The authors also suggested that there should be closer association between supervisors and employees as they are complementary in developing sense of shared vision and thus help in the growth of business. According to Armstrong (1997), "Training is systematic development of the knowledge, skills and attitudes required by an individual to perform adequately a given task or job. In order for any organization to have a successful training procedure, it should motivate employees to improve their skills, and keep rewarding it." Additionally, Flippo(1971) emphasized on role of training as an act of increasing knowledge and

skills of an employee for doing a particular job. Thus, training plays a significant role in improving the KSA and thus ensuring effective performance in every task. It also helps in incubating changes and updating the required skills and helping successful candidates in effective performance delivery. The major motive of training is to ensure availability of skilled and willing workforce and fulfilling organizational, individual and functional outcomes. Iqbal (2011) determined relationship between characteristics and formative evaluation of training based on Kirkpatrick model and found that all the characteristics of training had a significant positive relationship with reaction and learning. Gandolfi(2009) studied the role of training during downsizing. In order to remove and minimize challenges and to strengthen after downsizing the role of training people on various policies, programmes, and strategies on downsizing is important. According to study conducted by Pollitt (2009) on importance of training for AXA Sun Life, he found that training plays a vital role for this industry where tight regulations are present. The team dealing with customers should be highly trained and have the potential to deal with customers and advise them the right products at right time with reference to pension and investment plans. Narayan & Johnson(2007) focused on role of certain demographic variables on employees' performance and found that effective training helps employees to adapt themselves to the organization environment quite easily. It is quite obvious in today's times that diverse workforce and different skill sets are available, thus training employees on various skill sets will help in effective adaptation and achieving organizational objectives.

Research Gaps

Although, several studies have brought out the relevance of training in developing effective organizations, especially service industry like hotel industry, there are certain issues that still remain to be researched like the role of demographic variables as age, income level, gender, qualifications on selection of training dimensions. Also not many studies have tried to establish interrelationship between various training dimensions and training selection decisions. Also how the selection of training is linked with organizational objectives and strategic outcomes in a quantitative manner also needs to be understood. The majority of studies have focused on a single aspect of understanding outcomes and impact towards one direction whereas understanding the impact of training climate, content, type of groups, leadership quality, outcome with respect to work autonomy are not addressed very specifically.

It is evident that all the previous studies have focused on imperative role of training on effective outcome and employees commitment and morale but how the initial stage of selection of required dimension affects complete outcome needs to be addressed more specifically.

Contribution of Study

The present study is based on the research gaps identified and realizing the indispensable role of training in effectual outcome focuses on role of different demographic variables on selection of training decisions. It also focuses on assessing the most important variables in affecting training decision of managers right from understanding need of training to career development, resulting work quality and autonomy, role of top management and its outcome on organizational effectiveness. Thus, based on the study outcomes, requisite inputs in designing training calendar, conducting training need analysis, relating it with both inter personal, work related, organizational and individual outcome will be possible. It will make the training outcome more related, strategic and assessable and individual centric, thus making commitment and performance both effectual.

Need of Study

Based on the above review, it is quite evident that training imparts a vital function in driving business result, strengthening internal environment, work culture, driving innovation and thus shaping future sustainability of organizations. Thus, it is important to assess and understand which are the important factors employees consider while making their training decisions and whether with respect to their demographic factors, it makes any difference in choosing such dimensions.

The study will help in identifying the preferred factors that employees look for while deciding on training decision. It will help in designing effectual training plan and schedule based on needs and focusing on outcome thus benefitting both employees and organization.

Research Objectives

1. To identify the factors affecting training decision among employees working at managerial level in categorized hotels in and around Faridabad.
2. To identify differences in satisfaction level with training being imparted against different demographic variables.

Research Methodology

Type of study

This study is descriptive in nature.

Sampling and sample size

In order to analyze employees' perspective on factors that they feel important while choosing training, a structured questionnaire was designed in order to collect primary data from a primary sample of 186 employees working at managerial level. The sample was chosen on random basis from 12 different categorized hotels in and around Faridabad Region, India. Random sampling was chosen to collect responses. Out of 300 questionnaire, 186 were usable. The primary data was collected through structured questionnaire consisting of 14 different attributes on the basis of literature review and earlier studies that affected training decision of employees.

The sample was chosen through random sampling. The questionnaire consisted of 2 different sub-sections. The first part dealt with determining the importance attached to different dimensions of training decision in selecting a training program. The second sub-section dealt with identifying the difference in satisfaction levels of managers with respect to different aspects of demographic profile like gender, annual income, qualification and job experience. The responses were measured on a 5 point Likert scale that ranged from 1 to 5 were 1 referred to "not at all important" and 5 reflects "highly important".

Method of Data Collection

The data was collected using both primary and secondary methods.

Primary. The primary data was collected through structured questionnaire.

Secondary. The secondary data was collected through books, journals and internet.

Statistical tools used

KMO and Bartlett test of sphericity, Levene's test of equality of variance, descriptive statistics, and factor analysis

Variables

Variables were selected on a 14 attribute dimension including whether the training is need based, type of trainer or resource person, training delivery, training content, type of training group, outcome/application of training take-away, support of top management, career advancement, operation excellence and quality improvement through training, strengthening brand of organization, achieving organizational objectives , type of training climate, autonomy to implement learned concepts from training, soft skill development and development of leadership quality through training.

Factor analysis was used to determine the appropriate factors for measuring importance and satisfaction from different chosen dimensions. KMO and Bartlett test of sphericity was also used to check appropriateness of factor analysis.

The responses obtained from first sub-section were analyzed with the help of Factor Analysis and Principal Component Analysis. Variables that had factor loading more than 0.5 were grouped under one factor and factors that had Eigen values greater than one were considered and rest of them were not included in analysis. Further, in order to validate the response and draw inferences, mean, standard deviation and variance were used to see to what level the response differed and also to identify the most preferred dimension.

The second question was analyzed with the help of Independent sample t-test and Levene's test to check equality of variance with the help of SPSS 16.0

Research Findings and Analysis

Checking appropriateness of factor analysis– With the purpose to determine the appropriateness of factor analysis for set of variables, Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin and Bartlett tests of sphericity were used. The results are shown in Table 1.

KMO measures the magnitude of observed correlation coefficients to the magnitude of partial correlation coefficients. Value of more than 0.5 is desirable. Bartlett's Test measures correlation of variables. Generally a probability of less than 0.05 is acceptable.

Hypothesis 1

H₀₁: There is no significant correlation between variables affecting selection of training decision.

The first objective of the study was to determine the relationship between the variables thus as per first hypothesis in order to determine if there is any significant relationship between the variables the following tests were applied.

Table 1: KMO and Bartlett's Test

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy	.764
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity Approx. Chi-Square	1834.965
Df	182
Sig.	.000

As can be seen from Table -1, the KMO value is greater than 0.5 and the significance level is also less than 0.05. Therefore, KMO is significant at level of 1% level of significance. Thus, null hypothesis is accepted that there is no significant correlation between variables.

Further factor analysis was used to reduce the different factors considered to affect training decision of managers. The output of Factor Analysis from Table 2 shows the Rotated Component Matrix. All the extracted components that had Eigen values greater than 1 were considered to function as factors.

Table 2: Total Variance Explained- Initial Eigenvalues Extracted Sum of Squared Loading

Component	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative Variance	Total	% of Variance
1	1.751	12.509	12.509	1.751	12.509
2	1.618	11.555	24.064	1.618	11.555
3	1.386	9.901	33.965	1.386	9.901
4	1.263	9.019	42.984	1.263	9.019
5	1.194	8.528	51.512	1.194	8.528
6	1.061	7.577	59.088	1.061	7.577
7	1.016	7.256	66.344	1.016	7.256
8	.924	6.598	72.942		
9	.848	6.057	78.999		
10	.750	5.354	84.353		
11	.604	4.315	88.667		
12	.581	4.150	92.818		
13	.513	3.666	96.484		
14	.492	3.516	100.000		

Table 3 shows Eigenvalues of factors extracted, cumulative percentage of variance and rotated component matrix. It can be seen that seven factors whose Eigen value was greater than 1 were extracted. From Table 3 it can also be seen that seven factors together represent 66.344 % of variance (information contained in original 14 variables) with a loss of around 44% of information.

Table 3: Rotated sum of Squared Loading

Component	Total	%of Variance	Cumulative variance
1	1.475	10.532	10.532
2	1.383	.877	20.409
3	1.351	9.652	30.062
4	1.291	9.225	39.286
5	1.278	9.131	48.417
6	1.261	9.006	57.423
7	1.249	8.921	66.344

Table 4: Rotated Component Matrix

	Components						
Need based training	.540	.332	.105	.143	.204	.053	.301
Role of trainer/resource person	.323	.590	.298	.168	.120	.154	.207
Training delivery	.214	.451	.258	.182	.122	.046	.181
Content of training	.105	.453	.325	.024	.237	.122	.201
Type of training group	.221	.232	.540	.030	.030	.132	.302
Outcome /application of training	.453	.102	.168	.122	.145	.262	.320
Support of top management	.232	.221	.444	.149	.182	.207	.231
Career development	.332	.168	.221	.201	.225	.132	.578
Improvement in efficiency/quality of work	.221	.332	.108	.529	.178	.302	.122
Brand building/achieving organization objectives	.254	.208	.168	.574	.105	.085	.113
Leadership quality	.265	.301	.024	.320	.579	.259	.116
Training climate	.132	.227	.019	.402	.224	.467	.172
Work autonomy	.214	.168	.182	.324	.359	.120	.098
Soft skill development	.105	.321	.122	.231	.357	.122	.065

The other important task is to determine what these seven factors represent. This can be analyzed by looking at the Rotated Component Matrix.

It is clear from Rotated Component Matrix (Table 4) that in Factor 1, the factor loading of “need based training”, and “outcome or applications of training” have higher loading as .540 and .453 respectively. This factor can be interpreted as **‘Application Based Outcome of Training’**.

From Factor 2 it is clear that “type of trainer or resource person”, “training delivery” and “training content” have higher factor loadings i.e. .590, .451, .453. This factor can be interpreted as **‘Training Design’**. Similarly, for factor 3, “type of training group” and “support of top management” have higher factor loading at .540, .444 respectively. This factor can be interpreted as **“Organization Training Culture”**.

Again in factor 4, “brand building”, “achievement of organization objectives”, and “improvement in efficiency/quality” have higher factor loading .574, .529 respectively. This factor can be termed as **‘Organization Competitive Advantage’**.

Similarly for factor 5, “leadership qualities”, “soft skill development” and “work autonomy” have higher factor loading i.e., .579, .357, .359 respectively. This factor is termed as **‘Leadership Development’**.

For factor 6 the only factor that had higher factor loading was **“Training Climate”** which was .467.

Similarly, in Factor 7, “Career advancement opportunities” had higher factor loading .578. This factor can be termed as **“Opportunity for Career Advancement”**.

Thus after factor analysis fourteen variables are grouped under 7 factors namely -

- Factor -1 **Application Based Outcome of Training**
- Factor-2 **Training Design**
- Factor-3 **Organization Training Culture**
- Factor-4 **Organization Competitive Advantage**

Factor -5 **Leadership Development**

Factor-6 **Training Climate**

Factor-7 **Opportunity for Career Advancement**

Further, the other objective of study was to determine the importance attached to different dimensions of training decision by managers. This was assessed by the scores of mean based on the importance attached to different dimension as felt by the respondents in context to various dimensions.

Table 5 depicts different mean scores based on different dimensions which reflect the importance attached to factors affecting training decision of managers.

Table 5: Statistical analysis for question 1 based on response of managers on the basis of Mean and standard deviation

S.No.	Statement	Mean	Standard Deviation	Dispersion
1	How important do you consider that training should be need based for effective outcome	4.160	.9036	.817
2	How important do you consider role of trainer/resource person in training decision	3.564	1.034	.312
3	How important do you consider type of training delivery as important component for taking training decision	2.56	1.032	.537
4	How important do you consider content of training in taking training decision	3.68	1.1145	.465
5	How important do you consider type of training group in training decision	2.78	.914	.451
6	How important do you consider outcome /application of training in training decision	3.113	.868	.552
7	How important do you consider support of top management in deciding training	3.123	.326	.413
8	How important do you consider career development as an important component while deciding on training	4.270	.459	.234
9	How important do you consider improvement in efficiency/ quality of work while making training decision	4.386	.8147	.201
10	How important do you consider brand building/achieving organization objectives while making training decision	3.867	.9326	.470
11	How important do you consider leadership quality development as a necessary factor while making training decision	4.374	.9652	.214
12	How important do you consider training climate as a factor affecting training decision	3.15	1.02	.323
13	How important do you consider work autonomy for implementing change (take away from training) as important variable affecting training decision	2.311	.994	.548
14	How important do you consider soft skill development as a necessary component to decide training	2.45	.453	.2654

It is clear from Table 5 that amongst the different variables managers perceived "Improvement in Efficiency and Quality of Work" as most important factor while making training decision. "Leadership quality development" is the second most important factor as this decides the overall personality and outcome in terms of delivery. "Career Development" as third important factor followed by "Need Based Training" and "Brand Building or Achieving Organization Objective" to be amongst important factors affecting training decision. It was observed that work autonomy, soft skill development and training delivery were amongst least important variables based on mean scores.

The only factor that shows minimum dispersion since most respondents agreed was "Improvement in Efficiency/ Quality of Work".

The second major objective of the study was to determine if demographic factors like gender, income, qualification of managers affect rating of different parameters affecting training decision.

Out of the total 186 respondents, 61 (32.79%) were females and 125 (67.20%) males. In terms of monthly income 76 (40.86%) of trainees fall under category where annual income was between Rs.40,000-50,000, 68 (36.55%) trainees fall under category Rs.60,000-Rs.70,000 and 42 (22.58%) of trainees had earning in the range of Rs.80,000-Rs.1,00,000 per annum. In order to determine difference in rating among different dimensions with respect to selected demographic factors the following hypothesis were formulated -

Hypothesis 2

H₀₂ There is no difference in terms of gender in rating for a particular parameter.

In order to check the above hypothesis, t-test for testing equality of variance was used (at 5% significance level) From Table 6 it can be seen that the p value (equal variance not assumed, sig,2-tailed) significance value of all the parameters is greater than 0.05 (5% significance level). In such a situation where p-value is greater than significance level, it is concluded that the null hypothesis is accepted. Thus it can be said that there is no difference in terms of gender in rating for a particular parameter.

Table 6: Levene's Test for equality of variance between gender difference and overall importance attached in rating parameter

Factor	Variance	F	Sig.	T	Df	Sig (2-tailed)
Need based training	Equal variance assumed	.121	.765	.189	185	.752
	Equal variance not assumed			.192	182.721	.749
Role of trainer/resource person	Equal variance assumed	2.653	.274	.080	182	.958
	Equal variance not assumed			.077	183.241	.956
Training delivery	Equal variance assumed	.267	.748	.658	182	.654
	Equal variance not assumed			.654	184.712	.651
	Equal variance assumed	2.31	.685	.769	182	.453

(Continued)

Content of training	Equal variance not assumed			.772	183.734	.457
	Equal variance assumed	.826	.412	-.241	182	.567
Consider type of training group	Equal variance not assumed			-.233	137.324	.874
	Equal variance assumed	2.43	.532	-.243	183	.768
Outcome /application of training	Equal variance not assumed			-2.56	182.563	.760.
	Equal variance assumed	.465	.478	-.670	184	.654
Support of top management	Equal variance not assumed			-.654	135.512	.651
	Equal variance assumed	.099	.879	1.132	184	.675
Career development	Equal variance not assumed			1.123	184.213	.678
	Equal variance assumed	.012	.978	-.976	184	.445
Improvement in efficiency/ quality of work	Equal variance not assumed			-.972	183.823	.441
	Equal variance assumed	.756	.390	.567	182	.967
Brand building/achieving organization objectives	Equal variance not assumed			.569	139.125	.961
	Equal variance assumed	.178	.678	.225	184	.879
Leadership quality	Equal variance not assumed			.228	182.223	.874
	Equal variance assumed	.215	.528	.217	182	.716
Training climate	Equal variance not assumed			218	182.826	.710
	Equal variance assumed	.220	.427	.189	183	.648
Work autonomy	Equal variance not assumed			202	182.723	.684
	Equal variance assumed	.178	.367	.318	183	.658
Soft skill development	Equal variance not assumed			.314	182.456	.651

It shows that irrespective of gender, the sensitivity of managers while selecting training is same and both of them take such decisions quite judiciously which indicates seriousness towards career and professional life.

The next hypothesis was framed to check if there is difference in rating of different parameters in terms of annual income of managers that affect their rating for overall importance for different parameters.

Hypothesis 3

H₀₃- There is no difference in rating of respondent with respect to income group.

From the Table 7, it is clear that for certain parameters the p-value was less than 0.05 which indicates that with respect to a few parameters like need based training, training delivery, leadership quality, brand building, training content were the parameters where the respondents with different income categories differed in opinion. It is important because of the fact that based on the income factor, an employee looks for further career advancement thus investing and upgrading skills and competencies. Acquisition of skills and knowledge help in developing leadership qualities and thus through these competencies, organizational workforce develops as competent talent pool and thus strengthening the talented employees.

Table 7: Levene's Test for equality of variance between income and difference in rating of overall importance attached for different parameter

Factor	Variance	F	Sig.	t	Df	Sig(2-tailed)
Need based training	Equal variance assumed	4.277	.005	-2.874	149	.040
	Equal variance not assumed			-2.190	182.721	.062
Role of trainer/resource person	Equal variance assumed	.265	.651	-.870	185	.958
	Equal variance not assumed			-.877	183.241	.956
Training delivery	Equal variance assumed	.001	.985	-1.879	185	.044
	Equal variance not assumed			-1.675	182.712	.038
Content of training	Equal variance assumed	.015	.734	-2.023	185	.043
	Equal variance not assumed			-2.012	183.734	.473
Type of training group	Equal variance assumed	.724	.332	-.341	182	.667
	Equal variance not assumed			-.334	184.311	.664
Outcome /application of training	Equal variance assumed	4.43	.632	-.443	185	.845
	Equal variance not assumed			-3.56	184.533	.760
Support of top management	Equal variance assumed	.535	.451	-.570	185	.754
	Equal variance not assumed			-.554	183.522	.751
Career development	Equal variance assumed	.198	.659	-3.552	184	.575
	Equal variance not assumed			-3.521	182.113	.569
Improvement in efficiency/quality of work	Equal variance assumed	2.543	.154	-1.154	183	.545
	Equal variance not assumed			-1.143	182.413	.536
Brand building/achieving organization objectives	Equal variance assumed	.198	.659	-3.553	184	.001
	Equal variance not assumed			-3.550	182.225	.001
Leadership quality	Equal variance assumed	.001	.978	-2.034	185	.038
	Equal variance not assumed			-2.230	182.213	.027
Training climate	Equal variance assumed	1.182	.228	.376	185	.745
	Equal variance not assumed			.365	182.526	.739
Work Autonomy	Equal variance assumed	.197	.558	-2.452	185	.002
	Equal variance not assumed			-2.136	182.214	.658
Soft skill development	Equal variance assumed	.178	.367	.224	185	.556
	Equal variance not assumed			.215	183.236	.551

The last hypothesis is aimed at identifying the difference in rating of individuals with respect to academic backgrounds.

Hypothesis 4

H_{04} -There is no difference in rating with respect to qualification of managers

From Table 8, it is clear that parameters like leadership quality, achieving organization objectives, content of training type of training and need based training have significant differences based on qualification of managers. This is because of the fact that different managers at different level of their career decide about acquiring different skills depending on personal and professional factors. Thus null hypothesis H_{03} is rejected and it is found that there is a significant difference in rating with respect to qualification of managers.

Table 8: Levene's test for equality of Variance between different qualification and importance attached to different parameters in rating

Factor	Variance	F	Sig.	t	Df	Sig(2-tailed)
Need based training	Equal variance assumed	.080	.779	-2.654	185	.011
	Equal variance not assumed			-2.644	182.721	.016
Role of trainer/resource person	Equal variance assumed	.038	.845	-.836	185	.958
	Equal variance not assumed			-.830	182.241	.952
Training delivery	Equal variance assumed	.046	.982	-1.779	185	.765
	Equal variance not assumed			-1.774	182.512	.756
Content of training	Equal variance assumed	.280	.559	-2.767	185	.009
	Equal variance not assumed			-2.760	182.234	.017
Type of training group	Equal variance assumed	.524	.232	-.241	185	.567
	Equal variance not assumed			-.234	182.312	.564
Outcome /application of training	Equal variance assumed	4.58	.732	-.543	185	.745
	Equal variance not assumed			-3.56	182.511	.740
Support of top management	Equal variance assumed	.435	.351	-.460	185	.654
	Equal variance not assumed			-.464	1482.122	.651
Career development	Equal variance assumed	.158	.559	-2.552	185	.675
	Equal variance not assumed			-2.521	182.123	.669
Improvement in efficiency / quality of work	Equal variance assumed	1.543	.184	-2.154	185	.624
	Equal variance not assumed			-2.143	182.213	.616
Brand building/achieving organization objectives	Equal variance assumed	.102	.759	-2.553	185	.043
	Equal variance not assumed			-2.550	182.523	.041
Leadership quality	Equal variance assumed	.006	.678	-2.014	185	.038
	Equal variance not assumed			-2.016	182.014	.035
Training climate	Equal variance assumed	1.243	.318	.424	185	.641
	Equal variance not assumed			.421	184.123	.633
Work autonomy	Equal variance assumed	.238	.467	.324	185	.646
	Equal variance not assumed					
Soft skill Development	Equal variance assumed					
	Equal variance not assumed			.315	184.134	.6391

Findings of study

Thus based on the set objectives and hypotheses, the following observations were made-

a) Based on the first objective, it was found that trainees perceived few factors like efficiency and quality of work as most important factor while making training decision. Leadership quality development is the second important factor as it decides the overall personality and outcome in terms of delivery. Career Development is the third important factor followed by Need Based Training and brand building or achieving organization objective to be amongst important factors affecting training decision. This indicates that outcome based training or result centric outcomes are treated equally important both by trainees and management. This, in a way also reflects commitment, loyalty towards organization and job since investment in self helps both for organization and self-growth. High importance towards brand building, quality of work reflects a competitive spirit and contemporary work culture which keeps organization sustainable.

It was also observed that work autonomy, soft skill development, training delivery were amongst the least important factors based on mean scores.

b) With respect to gender and difference in importance attached to different dimensions, the results showed equity in career aspirations with respect to gender.

c) With respect to income level it was found that except with few factors like training content, brand building, leadership qualities, the importance attached to different dimensions did not show much difference. This establishes that "learning" is important to all employees irrespective of income levels. This is a positive sign for organizations, in service industry, as training and competency building is a must to remain competitive.

d) It was also found that the importance attached to different dimensions in training decision is not affected by the qualification of the managers and every manager is keen to develop the skills of the employees. Though a little difference was observed, in few dimensions like leadership quality, training content etc., it may be due to difference in job profile, present skill level and stage/level of career.

Implications of study

Thus, from the above study, it is clear that investment in human capital is amongst the most important factor for any organization for retaining its competitive advantage. With ever changing business environment popularized as VUCA world (Volatile, Uncertain, Competitive, and Ambiguous) retaining customer loyalty and brand building is of utmost importance. Thus, investing in human resources and preparing the future talented, competitive and loyal workforce is an important tool in the hands of an organization for remaining competitive. It is important for an organization to identify the gaps in skills, competencies and performances and thus train the workforce accordingly. This will help in bridging the skill gap, motivating the workforce, preparing talent pipeline and strengthening the talent reservoir of the organization.

Thus, regular and frequent need based training programs, assessing the application in real situations, measuring the change after training and keeping the process ongoing is must for remaining dynamic. Therefore, when the training is aligned with needs, outcomes and direct application, it will be highly effective.

Discussion

Based on the outcomes of the study, it was seen that the results are supported by many previous studies with reference to role of demographic factors on affecting training.

Ridoutt (2001) found significant relationship between training outcome and demographic variables, Tharenou (1995) also in his study, concluded that participation in training was affected by demographic factors such as gender, age and use of career strategies as compared to other predictors of organization performance. Another study conducted by Birdi (2005), also opined that lack of managerial support and sufficient creativity leads to poor training outcome.

Similarly, Haslinda & Mahyuddin (2009), found that the main factors like lack of support from top management and peers, employees' individual attitudes, job related factors and also the deficiencies in training practices are the main factors which affect training effectiveness.

Rama & Vaishnavi (2012) also identified that training directly helps in improvising performance of employees and it is important for organizations to focus on its training content, climate, and other variables like trainer, work autonomy, career planning, etc., to maximize outcome.

Limitations of study

The study was focused on employees working at managerial level only and did not include employees at supervisory, front desk or at back end operations. The sample size was limited to 186. Further research can be conducted on a large sample size. The present study was limited to hotels in and around Faridabad. A more genuine and reliable outcome can be assessed if similar research is conducted on a larger scale.

Scope for Future Research

Based on above study, future research can be conducted on impact of training dimensions, like psychographic, socio-graphic and demographic, on organizational outcome. Also research can be conducted on relating selection dimensions with career advancement and performance outcomes of employees. Also, depending on the sector and region, employees' and organizational perspective related studies can be conducted to make training as a core element in organization success.

Conclusion

Today's business dynamics demand planned investment in multi-tasking and multi-skilling ability from its workforce. Despite of the nature of industry, sustaining market share and remaining competitive is a huge challenge. The only tool which can ensure sustained development of growth through people (organization being people driven) is adequate and appropriate training. Today when we talk of HR as a means of innovation and creativity building, it is these practices that can deliver superior performances and provide a platform for harnessing individual creativity. Thus, developing a culture of investment in people through training is a tool for strengthening open culture, enable and empower employees to harness their potential.

It is important to utilize training and development as a function of innovation setting an agenda for innovation, communicating this vision to people (employees), creating an innovation strategy and building organization capability for the same. With this as vision and strategy, training will serve as a function of innovation leading to radical cost savings and business sustainability.

References

- Agrusa, S., & Lema, L. (2007). Alternative selection under risk conditions in human resource training and development through the application of the estimated monetary value and decision tree analysis. *Journal of Management and Economics*, 60(4), 68-75.
- Armstrong. (1997). *Handbook of human resource management practice*. New Delhi: Kogan Page.
- Aswathappa, K. (2000). *Human resource and personnel management*. New Delhi: Tata Mcgraw-Hill.
- Birdi, A. (2005). An analysis of training budgets and training needs assessments in mid-sized hotels in the United States. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*, 21(2), 86-97.
- Brecque, T. R., & Clayton (1996). Property management competences for management trainees. *Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly*, 37(4), 90-96.
- Cascio, S. (1997). The early employment influences of sales representatives on the development of organizational commitment. *Journal of Employee Relations*, 29(1), 5-15.
- Christou, S., & Sigala, N. (2001). Professional development in hospitality and tourism education: a strategy for the 21st century. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 5(1), 328-330.
- Coonel, O., & Kung, S. (2007). The role of national culture in enhancing training effectiveness: a framework. *Advances in Human Performance and Cognitive Engineering Research*, 4, 183-213.
- Daniels, D. (2000). Training in the U.S. lodging industry: perception and reality. *Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly*, 35(3), 16-21.
- Flippo, E. (1971). *Principles of Personnel Management*. New Delhi: Tata MC Graw –Hill.
- Gandolfi, F. (2009). The psychology of service and sales in the dining room. *Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly*, 19(1), 72-75.
- Haslinda, A., & Mayuddin, S. (2009). Human resource management, job satisfaction, morale, optimism, and turnover. *International Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Administration*, 8(2), 73-88.
- Hemdi, R., & Nasurdi, M. (2006). Customer satisfaction with training programs. *Journal of European Industrial Training* 25(6), 321-331.
- Ineson, R., & Kempa, P. (1996). Reflections on the Nature of Skills in the Experience Economy: Challenging Traditional Skills Models in Hospitality. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, 13(2), 124-135.
- Iqbal, M. J. (2011). An Empirical Analysis of the Relationship between Characteristics and Formative Evaluation of Training. *The International Journal of Business Research*, 4(1), 273-286.
- Kay, S., & Russette, R. (2000). Hospitality management competencies. *Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly*, 41(1), 52-63.
- Narayan, A., & Johnson, S. (2007). Relationships between prior experience of training, gender, goal orientation and training attitudes. *The International Journal Training and Development*, 11(3), 167-80.
- Pollitt, D. (2009). Training team shines at AXA sun life. *Journal of Human Resource Management International Digest*, 17(5), 23-24.
- Rama, S., & Vaishnavi, R. (2012). An analysis of training budgets and training needs assessments in mid-sized hotels in the United States. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*, 21(2), 86-97.
- Ridoutt, R. (2001). Exploring methods to evaluate the return on investment from training. *American Business Review*, 19(1), 6-12.
- Ryan, S. (2008). The impact of cross-training on team effectiveness. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87, 3-13.

Tas, S., & Baum, L. (1990). Competencies for hotel management: Industry expectations of education. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 2(4), 13-16.

Tharenou, T. (1995). Training effectiveness: Accounting for individual characteristics and the work environment. *Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly*, 36(6), 36-42.

Author's Profile

Vijit Chaturvedi, Ph.D., M.Phil. is Head & Associate Professor, School of Management Sciences, Lingaya's University, Faridabad, India with a total work experience 14 years. Her research area includes Leadership behavior, competency modeling, talent management, emotional intelligence. She has authored a Book on Talent management.

