



**INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF RESEARCH IN COMMERCE AND MANAGEMENT**

## CONTENTS

Sr. No.	Article/Paper	Page No.
1.	<b>ASSESSMENT OF CUSTOMER HANDLING COMPETENCIES OF NIGERIAN EMPLOYEES</b> <i>AKINYELE, S. T.</i>	1
2.	<b>JOB SATISFACTION IN MANAGEMENT FACULTIES OF A METROPOLITAN AND PROXIMATE AREA: A STUDY OF PRIVATE COLLEGES</b> <i>S.M. SHARIQ ABBAS, VANDANA PREMI, ANANT JYOTI</i>	13
3.	<b>TRAINING CONSTRAINTS &amp; OBSTACLES: A STUDY OF INDIAN AUTOMOBILE INDUSTRIES</b> <i>B.K.PUNIA, TEENA SAHARAN</i>	29
4.	<b>WOMEN EMPOWERMENT THOROUGH SELF HELP GROUPS - A CASE STUDY OF NIZAMABAD DISTRICT OF ANDHRA PRADESH</b> <i>A. KOTISHWAR, PROF. MOHD. AKBAR ALLI KHAN</i>	48
5.	<b>INDIAN BANKS IN THE ERA OF GLOBAL FINANCIAL CRISIS - EMERGING CHALLENGES AND OPPORTUNITIES</b> <i>R.K. UPPAL</i>	72
6.	<b>LEVERAGING THE COMPETITIVENESS OF ERITREAN AGRICULTURE: A CASE STUDY</b> <i>RAVINDER RANA</i>	89
7.	<b>LEVERAGE CAPITAL STRUCTURE AND DIVIDEND POLICY PRACTICES IN INDIAN CORPORATE –A CASE STUDY</b> <i>DR. SUNIL KUMAR, PROF. R.K SHARMA, PROF. S CHATURVEDI</i>	105
8.	<b>AN EXPLORATION INTO WORKING AND PERFORMANCE OF CONSUMER DISPUTES REDRESSAL AGENCIES IN INDIA</b> <i>SAMBHAV GARG</i>	116

## TRAINING CONSTRAINTS & OBSTACLES: A STUDY OF INDIAN AUTOMOBILE INDUSTRIES

**Prof. B.K.Punia**

Haryana School of Business  
Guru Jambheshwar University  
Hisar

**Teena Saharan**

**Research Scholar**

Haryana School of Business  
Guru Jambheshwar University  
Hisar

### ABSTRACT

*Continuous investment in job-related training for employees is essential for ensuring the long-term economic growth of organizations in today's global economy. However, each of the employees who want or need the training can't access it. The purpose of this paper is to present finding on employees' perspective regarding training hurdles that impeditment the employees in gaining the benefits of training and the constraints that are minimizing the benefits of training in automobile industries. Data were collected through structured questionnaires, unstructured checklists and review of documents from the websites. Despite a well designed training program, the findings established that much importance was assigned to skill development in comparison to personal development and major constraints included inadequate and poor allocation of training funds, unfriendly training environment, unsuitable training venue and uncertain standards for trainees' up-gradation in the automobile industry. Furthermore the results show that training and development is not motivating the employees in order to determine the benefits it could bring to the industry. From these findings it is recommended that current training program needs to be re-analyzed and improved in order to promote efficacy as well as profitable implementation of training plans.*

**KEY WORDS:** Benefits, Budget, Constraints, Designing, Motivation, Perspective.

### 1. INTRODUCTION

Organizations spend significant amounts of money on training of employees. Training is conducted in organizations normally for two objectives. The first objective is to ensure that

employees perform their current jobs effectively and efficiently. The second objective is to prepare employees to be able to carry on future projects and responsibilities. Often organizations assure to an immensely popular but rarely admitted erroneous belief for training, that training is not as natural as any other activity performed by the organization and its workforce for their survival and growth. They tend to look at the training and development department as a bunch of supercilious & arrogant idealists, far removed from the grime and rut of their daily operational survival. But after going through all these efforts mostly the attempt is just a failure and only due to some constraints, some limitations in pre-training preparation and post- training evaluation.

According to Mathis and Jackson (1998) training can be defined as a learning process in which people acquire knowledge (K), skills(S), attitudes (A), and experience (E) that they need in order to execute their jobs well for the accomplishment of organizational and personal goals. Training is a systematic designing of methods and types so as to facilitate an individual or group to learn predetermined knowledge and processes against predetermined objectives and apply it to a required standard. The extent to which organizations support employee's training and development indeed alter, and that variability leads towards the interest of organizations for providing training to their employees. Based upon the findings of the study, the researcher analyzed that big companies are not satisfied with their own HR in Training services. Some constraints of organizers, trainers, and trainees are limiting the effect of training regardless of how much the company values it. If policies and practices are to be developed to improve the efficacy, effectiveness and access, then it is necessary to understand the barriers and the employees who are experiencing them.

As per the findings of Cross (1981) mainly three types of barriers have been identified: Situational, Institutional, and Dispositional. Situational Barriers arise from one's situation like being too busy at work, financial constraints, family responsibilities, and health problems etc. Institutional Barriers contains discouraged participation, non-established practices and procedures, high tuition fees, inconvenient time and venue etc. Dispositional barriers include attitude and opinion towards learning as well as perception of learner.

As per the study of P. Mohnen, F.C. Palm, S. Schim van der Loeff and A. Tiwari (2008) Major constraints of training includes:

- Financial Constraints
- Costs too high
- Economic Uncertainty
- Shortage of Personnel
- Shortage of Knowledge
- Organizational Rigidities
- Market Uncertainty
- Regulations etc.

## 2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Training is an activity that changes employee's behavior. To increase the productivity and modify the behavior is often said to be the most important reason for training. But it is only one

of the benefits. Jackson and Schuler (2000) referred training as the act of improving competencies needed today or in the upcoming time while development refers to improving competencies over the long term. Training is required not only to increase productivity but also to motivate and inspire workers by letting them to distinguish the importance of their jobs and giving them all the information they need to perform those jobs (Anonymous, 1998).

Rosner (1999) found that training can be a great investment and training can be a waste of money after interviewing Brandt Sakakeeny, training industry analyst for Solomon Smith Barney. Training is certainly a waste of money when the desired behavior does not occur. Gupta (1999) acknowledges that not all performance problems can be addressed by training. In many cases, non-training interventions are necessary. The answer to the problem is to identify the problems that can attribute to training deficiencies and, once that is accomplished, to insure that the right training is implemented. Bartram and Gibson (2000), in their Training Needs Analysis Toolkit agree that without the right training, employees can be organization's biggest liability but if trained effectively, they can become the biggest asset. Rosner (1999) adds another ingredient for success – support after training. He states, "The most effective programs train workers in new behaviors and then train managers to support employees as they apply learning daily. Support and endorsement from management can greatly enhance training results.

As per the study of National Development and Reform Commission (NDRC), automobile sector in India is employing around 10 million employees and its employment is growing continuously. With this rapid expansion and coming up of major players in this sector, the focus is more on the skilled and trained employees. The companies are looking for skilled, knowledgeable and hard working people who can deliver their best to the organization. Lots of companies are opening training institutes to train interested people in this sector, like Toyota had opened Toyota Technical Training Institute (TTTI) near Bangalore.

Matthews (2004) argues that training is concerned with and related to providing opportunity to the individual to learn what they need in order to do their job more effectively. As per the study of Singh and Vinnicombe (2003) training is considered to be a process of enhancing an employee's capacity to handle greater responsibilities successfully.

### **3. OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY**

The review of literature provides the deep insight of the work done by the experts and researcher on various aspects of Training and Development. The maximum researchers have done their work on Training Need Identification and Training Assessment. Only a few studies have been taken up to know the constraints management is facing in maximizing the benefits of training in automobile industries. So the study is related to answer the questions regarding the constraints that may adversely affect training efficacy, and suggestions to overcome these limitations. After reviewing the above mentioned studies, the following objectives are taken for the present study. The objectives are as follows:

1. To study the employee perspective related to constraints of training program that may adversely affect the training efficacy.
2. To study the effect of demographic profiles- Personal as well as Professional on above mentioned employee perspective.

#### 4. SAMPLE & PROCEDURE

This study's participants were from automobile industries. All the automobile industries spend a considerable amount in term of time and money for the training of employees due to cut throat competition in this industry. Survey recipients were identified by the researcher and by human resource department. The sample size was taken as 200. A total of 38 refused to participate and another 14 questionnaires were discarded because the employees failed to complete them properly. The effective sample size was thus 148. The valid response rate was 74% (or 148 completed surveys). Most of the final samples were below 30 years of age (48%), 79% were male, 65% were technically or professionally qualified, 64% were married, 64% were from operative level, 36% were having experience below 5 years, 74% were on the same position from less than 5 years, and 70% were in the same organization from less than 5 years. In the present study, responses from respondents were collected, coded and tabulated in SPSS 13.0. For analyzing the data both simple and advanced statistical tools have been used. Advanced tools like Factor Analysis, multiple variance analysis, K Independent samples tests were used. The confidence level was taken as 95% (or 5% level of significance).

#### 5. DATA ANALYSIS

Data analysis was done through factor analysis because the researcher had 16 variables in the questionnaire for the research. Further analysis was done through Non-parametric K-Independent Sample Test to determine whether the factors were influenced by various demographic profiles of employees. Significance value less than 0.05 indicated the existence of some relationship between the independent (demographic variable) and dependent variables (factors). In depth analysis was done through Post hoc Analysis by Multiple Comparisons using LSD Method.

**Factor Analysis of Variables:** The KMO value found (0.833) is indicative of a data set considered to be highly desirable for factor analysis. The result of Bartlett's sphericity test (Approx. Chi-square 3885.888, df 120, p 0.000) implies that the data are approximately multivariate normal and acceptable for factor analysis. In factor analysis, a rotation procedure is commonly applied which maximizes the correlations of item on a factor. Principal Component analysis was used for extracting factors and five factors were retained depending on Eigen values and variance explained. The solution of factor analysis gave five factors, which explained 76.522% of the total variance. The results were obtained through orthogonal rotations with Varimax method and all the factor loadings greater than 0.40 were retained.

**Naming of Factors:** 5.1 Table 1 clearly depicts that Factor 1 is linear combination of variable number 7, 5, 2, 14, 13, 11 and 1 ( $\alpha=0.900$ ). Factor 2 is linear combination of variable number 16, 4, 6, and 8 ( $\alpha=0.701$ ). Factor 3 is linear combination of variable number 15 and 10 ( $\alpha=0.645$ ). Factor 4 is the linear combination of variable number 12 and 9 ( $\alpha=0.579$ ). The fifth factor contains only one variable i.e. 3 so cronbach alpha value couldn't be calculated. All the factors have been given appropriate names according to the variables that have been loaded on each factor.

**F1: Stumbling Blocks of Training:** The rotated matrix has revealed that respondents have perceived this factor to be the most important factor containing major constraints that should get

proper consideration from management. This factor contributes the highest explained variance of 29.962 %. Seven out of sixteen training types load on significantly to this factor. Researcher has named this factor as Stumbling Blocks of Training as it includes unclear training objectives, disinterest shown by management, unfriendly presentation methods, duplication of program, high work pressure, high training cost and no linkage between training and further promotions.

**F2: Improper Designing of Training:** It has been revealed to be the second most important factor with explained variance of 16.026 %. This is the second major factor loading four types of training constraints that management should remove to increase the effectiveness of training. Unsuitable venue, lack of information for participation, incompetent trainer and inadequacy of physical facilities for training were the variables loaded on this factor.

**F3: Ill-assorted Facilitation:** This is the next important factor, which accounts for 12.716% of the variance. Two types of constraints were loaded on to this factor. Unsuitable training timing and date and larger trainee's group size were two constraints loaded on this factor.

**F4: Dispiritedness:** This is the second last factor and two variables loaded on this factor account for 10.472% of the variance. Longer duration of training program and lack of competitive spirit of trainees were two variables of this factor.

**F5: Budget Shortage:** This is the last factor and only one variable is loaded on it and i.e. budget shortage as the constraint for effective training and accounts 7.345% of variance.

## PERSONAL PROFILE

**5.2 Table 2 (Non Parametric - K independent samples test between Factors vs. Age)** depicts that represents that factor 2, 4, and 5 has no influence of age i.e. people from all age group perceived these factors as same. But Factor 1 and 3 have sig. value less than .05 so people from all age groups don't perceive these factors as same. Respondents differed significantly on the basis of Stumbling Blocks of Training and Ill-assorted Facilitation. In depth analysis is done through post hoc test.

**5.3 Table 3 (Post hoc analysis: Multiple Comparisons using LSD Method between-Independent Variable: Age/ Dépendent Variable: Stumbling Blocks of Training, Ill-assorted facilitation)** revealed that respondents of age up to 30 years differ significantly from other category people for the factor stumbling blocks of training. Positive mean difference marked that these people (age up to 30 years) are more concerned regarding stumbling blocks of training factor than other category people. This category indicated that objectives of training should be clear, management should be interested, friendly presentation methods of training should be used, duplication should be aborted, high work pressure of employees and high training cost should be lowered, proper linkage should be maintained between training and further promotions to maximize the effects of training. For the factor Ill- assorted Facilitation of training employees above 45 years age group have different perspective than other two age groups. As this factor includes variables Unsuitable training timing and date and larger trainee's group size, so management should arrange training on appropriate time and date and trainee's group size should be small so that proper interaction could be maintained.

**5.4 Table 4 (Non Parametric - K independent samples test between Factors vs. Gender)** represents that all factors have significance value more than .05 means both genders perceived all the factors to be same.

**5.5 Table 5 (Non Parametric - K independent samples test between Factors vs. Qualification)** represents that factor 4 has no influence of qualification i.e. all employees perceived these factors as same. But Factor 1, 2, 3, and 5 have sig. value less than .05 so employees of both qualification groups don't perceive these factors as same. Respondents differed significantly on the basis of Stumbling Blocks of Training, Improper Designing of Training, Ill-assorted Facilitation and Budget Shortage. In depth analysis is done through Descriptive compare mean.

**5.6 Table 6 (Descriptive Mean - Independent Variable: Qualification/ Dependent variable: Stumbling Blocks of Training, Improper Designing of Training, Ill-assorted facilitation and Budget Shortage)** represents the mean score of Stumbling Blocks of Training and Ill-assorted Facilitation of training for general qualification group was -.589 and -.260 respectively and for tech./professional qualified group is .338 and .149 respectively. The positive mean denoted that G2 are more concerned for stumbling blocks of training factor and Ill-assorted facilitation of training than other category people. This category indicated that objectives of training should be clear, management should be interested, friendly presentation methods of training should be used, duplication should be aborted, high work pressure of employees and high training cost should be lowered, proper linkage should be maintained between training and further promotions and training time and date should be appropriate and trainee's group size should be small to maximize the effects of training.

The mean score of Improper Designing of training and Budget Shortage for training for G1 was .154 and .111 respectively and for G2 it was -.088 and -.064 respectively. The positive mean denoted that G1 are more concerned for Improper designing of training and budget shortage than G2. This group had emphasized that management should remove training constraints like budget shortage, unsuitable venue, and lack of information for participation, incompetent trainer and inadequacy of physical facilities for training to increase the effectiveness of training.

**5.7 Table 7 (Non Parametric - K independent samples test between Factors vs. Marital Status)** analyzed that factor 2, 3, 4, and 5 have no influence of marital status i.e. people whether married and unmarried perceived these factors as same. But Factor 1 has value less than .05 so people from both marital statuses don't perceive this factor as same. Respondents differ significantly on the basis of Stumbling Blocks of Training. In depth analysis is done through Descriptive compare mean.

**5.8 Table 8 (Descriptive Mean - Independent Variable: Marital Status/ Dependent variable: Stumbling Blocks of Training)** the mean score of stumbling blocks of training for married employees was -.115 and for unmarried employees it was .228. The positive value of unmarried employees emphasized that objectives of training should be clear, management should be interested, friendly presentation methods of training should be used, duplication should be aborted, high work pressure of employees should be lowered, and proper linkage should be maintained between training and further promotions to increase the satisfaction of employees for training.

## PROFESSIONAL PROFILE

**5.9 Table 9 (Non Parametric - K independent samples test between Factors vs. Cadre)** represented that factor 1, 3, and 5 have no influence of cadre i.e. employees of all positions perceived these factors as same. But Factor 2 and 4 have sig. value less than .05 so people from all hierarchies don't perceive these factors as same. Respondents differed significantly on the basis of improper designing of training and dispiritedness .In depth analysis is done through post hoc test.

**5.10 Table 10 (Post hoc Analysis: Multiple Comparisons using LSD Method between-Independent Variable: Cadre/ Dépendent Variable: Improper Designing of Training and Dispiritedness)** revealed that respondents of middle level differ significantly from other cadre employees for the factor Improper Designing of training. These gave more emphasis to the removal of constraints like unsuitable venue, lack of information for participation, incompetent trainer and inadequacy of physical facilities for training.

The mean difference for dispiritedness differs significantly for top level employees. They perceived that by removing the constraint like longer duration of training program and lack of competitive spirit of trainees, management could maximize the effectiveness of training.

**5.11 Table 11 (Non Parametric - K independent samples test between Factors vs. Total Experience)** depicted that factor 2, 3, 4, and 5 have no influence of experience i.e. employees with all experiences perceived these factors as same. But Factor 1 has sig. value less than .05 so people from all experience groups don't perceive this factor as same. Respondents differed significantly on the basis of stumbling blocks of training. In depth analysis is done through post hoc test.

**5.12 Table 12 (Post hoc Analysis: Multiple Comparisons using LSD Method between-Independent Variable: Total Experience/ Dépendent Variable: Stumbling Blocks of Training)** revealed that respondents having experience below 5 years differ significantly from other category people for the factor Stumbling Blocks of Training. Positive mean difference marked that these employees (below 5 years of experience) emphasized that objectives of training should be clear, management should be interested, friendly presentation methods of training should be used, duplication should be aborted, high work pressure of employees should be lowered, and proper linkage should be maintained between training and further promotions to increase the efficiency and motivation of employees.

**5.13 Table 13 (Non Parametric - K independent samples test between Factors vs. Experience on present Position)** represented that factor 2, 3, and 4 have no influence of various experiences on present position i.e. employees with all experiences on present position perceived these factors as same. But Factor 1 and 5 have sig. value less than .05 so people from all experience groups don't perceive these factors as same. Respondents differed significantly on the basis of stumbling blocks of training and Budget Shortage. In depth analysis is done through post hoc test.

**5.14 Table 14 (Post hoc Analysis: Multiple Comparisons using LSD Method between-Independent Variable: Experience on present position/ Dépendent Variable: Stumbling Blocks of Training, Budget Shortage)** revealed that respondents having experience below 5



years on present position differ significantly from other category people for the factor Stumbling Blocks of Training. Positive mean difference marked that these employees (below 5 years of experience on present position) emphasized that objectives of training should be clear, management should be interested, friendly presentation methods of training should be used, duplication should be aborted, high work pressure of employees should be lowered, and proper linkage should be maintained between training and further promotions to increase the satisfaction of employees for training.

The positive mean difference of employees having experience between 5-10 years on present position explains that this group differs significantly from other categories for the factor budget shortage. These employees (Employees with 5-10 years of experience on present position) pressurized that organizations must concentrate on the budget of training. It is too low to deliver a perfect training.

**5.15 Table 15 (Non Parametric - K independent samples test between Factors vs. Experience in Present Organization)** analyzed that factor 2, 3, and 5 have no influence of various experiences in present organization i.e. employees with all experiences in present organization perceived these factors as same. But Factor 1 and 5 have sig. value less than .05 so people from all experience groups in present organization don't perceive these factors as same. Respondents differed significantly on the basis of stumbling blocks of training and dispiritedness. In depth analysis is done through post hoc test.

**5.16 Table 16 (Post hoc Analysis: Multiple Comparisons using LSD Method between-Independent Variable: Experience in present organization/ Dépendent Variable: Stumbling Blocks of Training and Dispiritedness)** revealed that respondents having experience below 5 years differ in present organization significantly from other category people for the factor Stumbling Blocks of Training. Positive mean difference marked that these employees (below 5 years of experience in present organization) emphasized that objectives of training should be clear, management should be interested, friendly presentation methods of training should be used, duplication should be aborted, high work pressure of employees should be lowered, and proper linkage should be maintained between training and further promotions to increase the satisfaction of employees for training.

The positive mean difference of employees having experience between 10-15 years in present organization explains that this group differs significantly from other categories for the factor dispiritedness. These employees (Employees with 10-15 years of experience in present organization) perceived that by removing the constraint like longer duration of training program and lack of competitive spirit of trainees, management could maximize the effectiveness of training.

## 6. CONCLUSION

In this paper we have analyzed the various training hurdles, their nature and the degree of effectiveness. The major constraints were reported related to ambiguous criteria of sponsoring employees for training and ineffective & inferior presentation methods adopted by the trainer. Other reported constraints were disinterest of management and trainees, training were considered problematic due to increase in responsibilities and work load of employees. These problems affected the vast majority of staff regardless of their position or age. The younger employees

voted that objectives of training should be clear, management should be interested in conducting training, friendly presentation methods of training should be used, duplication should be aborted, high work pressure of employees and high training cost should be lowered, proper linkage should be maintained between training and further promotions to maximize the effects of training. Improper designing of training was reportedly the biggest constraints from view point of top level employees. They perceived that inadequate training objectives & training facilities, repetition of training, and unsuitable time and venue were the major hurdles in training effectiveness. Dispiritedness was the major concern for the upper age group employees. They felt that management was not encouraging and motivating employees regarding training objectives and importance. Maximum staff spoke of a 'Cinderella effect', whereby they perceived that training budgets were allocated and so were often forgotten. They also believed that their managers knew too little about their area of work to make informed decisions about their training needs.

## 7. SUGGESTIONS

The results of this study hopefully will help researchers, businesses and managers/trainers to better understand the perspective of employees that what are the major areas of training that need more concentration to get the best out of the program. To enhance effective improvement of the training programs, it's important to:

- Developing a more effective and uniform TNA exercise that aims to improve the level of efficiency of training function and ultimately develop clarity in scope and objectives of training.
- Encouraging the employees for participation in training.
- Prioritizing the issues of increasing employee capacity, by allocating adequate training style and budget.
- Implementing training functions transparently, openly and involvement of every individual in determining the needs of training.
- Deciding the training timing and venue according to the suitability of trainees.
- Proper emphasis and concentration on quality of trainer and presentation methods.

## 8. BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Becker, B., & Gerhart, B. (1996), "*The impact of human resource management on organizational performance: Progress and prospects*", *Academy of Management Journal*, 39:4, 779-801.
- Blanchard, P. N., & Thacker, T. W. (1998), "*Effective training: systems, strategies, and practice*", Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, Prentice Hall, p. 11.
- Chance, C. (1998) ' "To train or not to train?" *Networking Magazine*, 7.
- Cross K.P. (1981), "*Adults as Learners*", San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Cross, R. L. & Funk, F. L. (1997), "*Leveraging intellect in a small business: Designing an infrastructure to support today's knowledge worker*", *Journal of Small Business Strategy*, 8:1.
- Gupta, C.B. (2007), "*Human Resources Management*", Sultan Chand & Sons, New Delhi pp. 9 -18.

- Jackson, S.E. and Schuler, R.S. (2000), “*Managing Human Resources: A Partnership Perspective*”, South Western College Publishing, USA.
- Kazanas, H.C. & Rothwell, J. (1990), “*Planned OJT is productive OJT*”, Training and Development Journal, 44:10, 58.
- Lee, C. (1991), “*Who gets trained in what?*” Training, 28:10, 47-59.
- Mathis, R.L. and Jackson, J.H. (1998), “*Personnel/Human Resources Management*”, Web Publishing Co., New York, USA.
- Matthews, J. J., Megginson, D. and Surtees M. (2004), “*Human Resource Development*”, 3rd Edition; Kogan Page Publishers, New York - USA, 309p.
- Noe, R. A. (1998), “*Employee training and development*”, Boston: Irwin/McGraw-Hill.
- Noe, R. A. (1999), “*Employee training & development*”, Irwin McGraw-Hill.
- Singh, V. and Vinnicombe, S. (2003), “*Women-only Management Training: an Essential Part of Women’s Leadership Development*”, Journal of Change Management, 3 (4), 294-306.
- Pine, J. & Tingley, J.C. (1993), “*ROI of soft skills training*”, Training, February.
- P. Mohnen, F.C. Palm, S. Schim van der Loeff and A. Tiwari (2008), “*Financial Constraints and Other Obstacles: Are they a Threat to Innovation Activity?*” United Nations University - Maastricht Economic and social Research and training centre on Innovation and Technology, Keizer Karelplein 19, 6211 TC Maastricht, The Netherlands.

## 9. ANNEXURE

Table 1: Factor Analysis of variables

F. No.	Name of Dimension	Variable	Factor Loading	Cronbach Alpha
F1	Stumbling Blocks of Training	7. Ineffective and unfriendly training presentation methods.	.882	.900
		5. Disinterest shown by the responsible person	.796	
		2. Lack of objective clarity for imparting training	.784	
		14. Duplication of training programs.	.771	
		13. High work pressure in the present positions.	.741	
		11. No linkage between training and further promotions.	.733	
		1. High training cost with limited returns on investment	.489	
F2	Improper Designing of Training	16. Unsuitable training venue.	.782	.701
		4. Lack of information on possible participation in training	.754	
		6. Standard of trainers is/are not up to mark	.678	
		8. Inadequacy of physical facilities (temp, light, noise etc.)	.580	
F3	Ill-assorted Facilitation	15. Unsuitable training date and timings.	.783	.645
		10. Large group size of trainees in the programs.	.692	
F4	Dispiritedness	12. Lack of competitive spirit in the trainees.	.836	.579
		9. Longer duration of training programs.	.603	
F5	Budget Shortage	3. Budget shortage for training function.	.907	

**Table 2:** K Independent Sample between Dependent variable: Factors of Training constraints vs. Independent Variable: Age

F.No.	Factor	Chi-Square	df	Asymp. Sig.
F1	<b>Stumbling Blocks of Training</b>	29.062	2	<b>.000</b>
F2	Improper Designing of Training	1.144	2	.564
F3	<b>Ill-assorted Facilitation</b>	6.061	2	<b>.048</b>
F4	Dispiritedness	4.424	2	.110
F5	Budget Shortage	2.744	2	.254

**Table 3:** Multiple Comparisons using LSD Method between- Independent Variable: Age vs. Dependent Variable: Stumbling Blocks of Training, Ill-assorted Facilitation.

Dependent Variable	(I) Age	(J) Age	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound
<b>Stumbling Blocks of Training</b>	Upto 30yrs	31-45 yrs.	<b>.27462973(*)</b>	.10652560	.010	.0651918	.4840677
		Above 45yrs	<b>.86138779(*)</b>	.13723987	.000	.5915631	1.1312125
	31-45 yrs.	Upto 30yrs	<b>-.27462973(*)</b>	.10652560	.010	-.4840677	-.0651918
		Above 45yrs	<b>.58675806(*)</b>	.14197718	.000	.3076194	.8658967
	Above 45yrs	Upto 30yrs	<b>-.86138779(*)</b>	.13723987	.000	-1.1312125	-.5915631
		31-45 yrs.	<b>-.58675806(*)</b>	.14197718	.000	-.8658967	-.3076194
<b>Ill-assorted Facilitation</b>	Upto 30yrs	31-45 yrs.	.02238151	.11087453	.840	-.1956068	.2403698
		Above 45yrs	<b>-.33474103(*)</b>	.14284272	.020	-.6155814	-.0539006
	31-45 yrs.	Upto 30yrs	-.02238151	.11087453	.840	-.2403698	.1956068
		Above 45yrs	<b>-.35712254(*)</b>	.14777344	.016	-.6476571	-.0665880
	Above 45yrs	Upto 30yrs	<b>.33474103(*)</b>	.14284272	.020	.0539006	.6155814

		31-45 yrs.	<b>.35712254(*)</b>	.14777344	.016	.0665880	.6476571
--	--	------------	---------------------	-----------	------	----------	----------

\* The mean difference is significant at the .05 level.

**Table 4:** K Independent Sample between Dependent variable: Factors of Training constraints vs. Independent Variable: Gender

F.No.	Factor	Chi-Square	df	Asymp. Sig.
F1	Stumbling Blocks of Training	.612	1	.434
F2	Improper Designing of Training	.473	1	.492
F3	Ill-assorted Facilitation	1.509	1	.219
F4	Dispiritedness	.632	1	.427
F5	Budget Shortage	2.597	1	.107

**Table 5:** K Independent Sample between Dependent variable: Factors of Training constraints vs. Independent Variable: Qualification

F.No.	Factor	Chi-Square	df	Asymp. Sig.
F1	<b>Stumbling Blocks of Training</b>	82.600	1	<b>.000</b>
F2	<b>Improper Designing of Training</b>	11.570	1	<b>.001</b>
F3	<b>Ill-assorted Facilitation</b>	14.220	1	<b>.000</b>
F4	Dispiritedness	.835	1	.361
F5	<b>Budget Shortage</b>	5.169	1	<b>.023</b>

**Table 6:** Descriptive Mean of Stumbling Blocks of Training, Improper Designing of Training, Ill-assorted Facilitation, and Budget Shortage.

	Qualification	Stumbling Blocks of Training	Improper Designing of Training	Ill-assorted Facilitation	Budget Shortage
G1	General	-.5898581	<b>.1541293</b>	-.2600218	<b>.1118963</b>
G2	Tech./ Professional	<b>.3387538</b>	-.0885160	<b>.1493298</b>	-.0642617

**Table 7:** K Independent Sample between Dependent variable: Factors of Training constraints vs. Independent Variable: Marital status

F.No.	Factor	Chi-Square	df	Asymp. Sig.
F1	<b>Stumbling Blocks of Training</b>	7.992	1	<b>.005</b>
F2	Improper Designing of Training	.282	1	.595
F3	Ill-assorted Facilitation	.567	1	.452
F4	Dispiritedness	.038	1	.844
F5	Budget Shortage	.922	1	.337

**Table 8:** Descriptive Mean of Stumbling Blocks of Training.

Qualification	Stumbling Blocks of Training
Married	-.1158984
Unmarried	.2282846

**Table 9:** K Independent Sample between Dependent variable: Factors of Training constraints vs. Independent Variable: Cadre

F.No.	Factor	Chi-Square	df	Asymp. Sig.
F1	Stumbling Blocks of Training	3.068	2	.216
F2	<b>Improper Designing of Training</b>	8.485	2	<b>.014</b>
F3	Ill-assorted Facilitation	1.335	2	.513
F4	<b>Dispiritedness</b>	7.644	2	<b>.022</b>
F5	Budget Shortage	.640	2	.726

**Table 10:** Multiple Comparisons using LSD Method between- Independent Variable: Cadre vs. Dependent Variable: Improper Designing of Training and Dispiritedness.

Dependent Variable	(I) cadre	(J) cadre	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval

						Lower Bound	Upper Bound
<b>Improper Designing of Training</b>	top	middle	-.31889086	.19203052	.098	-.6964384	.0586567
		operative	.02571761	.17895380	.886	-.3261201	.3775553
	middle	top	<b>.31889086</b>	.19203052	.098	-.0586567	.6964384
		operative	<b>.34460847(*)</b>	.11326466	.003	.1219210	.5672960
	operative	top	-.02571761	.17895380	.886	-.3775553	.3261201
		middle	<b>-.34460847(*)</b>	.11326466	.003	-.5672960	-.1219210
<b>Dispiritedness</b>	top	middle	<b>.17224895</b>	.19242490	.371	-.2060740	.5505719
		operative	<b>.40608961(*)</b>	.17932132	.024	.0535293	.7586499
	middle	top	-.17224895	.19242490	.371	-.5505719	.2060740
		operative	<b>.23384066(*)</b>	.11349727	.040	.0106958	.4569855
	operative	top	<b>-.40608961(*)</b>	.17932132	.024	-.7586499	-.0535293
		middle	<b>-.23384066(*)</b>	.11349727	.040	-.4569855	-.0106958

\* The mean difference is significant at the .05 level.

**Table 11:** K Independent Sample between Dependent variable: Factors of Training constraints vs. Independent Variable: Total Experience

F.No.	Factor	Chi-Square	df	Asymp. Sig.
F1	<b>Stumbling Blocks of Training</b>	35.543	3	<b>.000</b>
F2	Improper Designing of Training	.463	3	.927
F3	Ill-assorted Facilitation	2.869	3	.412
F4	Dispiritedness	6.169	3	.104
F5	Budget Shortage	4.021	3	.259

**Table 12:** Multiple Comparisons using LSD Method between- Independent Variable: Total Experience vs. Dependent Variable: Stumbling Blocks of Training.

Dependent Variable	(I) Total	(J) Total	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound



<b>Stumbling Blocks of Training</b>	Below 5 yrs.	5-10	<b>.14624573</b>	.12545961	.244	-.1004200	.3929115
		10-15	<b>.69051042(*)</b>	.15438060	.000	.3869832	.9940376
		above 15 yrs.	<b>.74019523(*)</b>	.12261780	.000	.4991168	.9812737
	5-10	below 5 yrs.	-.14624573	.12545961	.244	-.3929115	.1004200
		10-15	.54426468(*)	.16683197	.001	.2162569	.8722725
		above 15 yrs.	.59394950(*)	.13796616	.000	.3226947	.8652043
	10-15	below 5 yrs.	-.69051042(*)	.15438060	.000	-.9940376	-.3869832
		5-10	-.54426468(*)	.16683197	.001	-.8722725	-.2162569
		above 15 yrs.	.04968482	.16470555	.763	-.2741423	.3735119
	Above 15 yrs.	below 5 yrs.	-.74019523(*)	.12261780	.000	-.9812737	-.4991168
		5-10	-.59394950(*)	.13796616	.000	-.8652043	-.3226947
		10-15	-.04968482	.16470555	.763	-.3735119	.2741423

\* The mean difference is significant at the .05 level.

**Table 13:** K Independent Sample between Dependent variable: Factors of Training constraints vs. Independent Variable: Experience on Present Position

F.No.	Factor	Chi-Square	df	Asymp. Sig.
F1	<b>Stumbling Blocks of Training</b>	28.547	3	<b>.000</b>
F2	Improper Designing of Training	3.476	3	.324
F3	Ill-assorted Facilitation	1.874	3	.599
F4	Dispiritedness	5.438	3	.142
F5	<b>Budget Shortage</b>	8.384	3	<b>.039</b>

**Table 14:** Multiple Comparisons using LSD Method between- Independent Variable: Experience on present position vs. Dépendent Variable: Stumbling Blocks of Training, Budget Shortage.

Dependent Variable	(I) Present	(J) Present	Mean Difference (I-	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval
--------------------	-------------	-------------	---------------------	------------	------	-------------------------

						Lower Bound	Upper Bound
<b>Stumbling Blocks of Training</b>	Below 5 yrs.	5-10	<b>.50868437(*)</b>	.13102409	.000	.2510783	.7662904
		10-15	<b>.84801371(*)</b>	.23361753	.000	.3886990	1.3073284
		above 15 yrs.	<b>.92785961(*)</b>	.27269250	.001	.3917197	1.4639995
	5-10	below 5 yrs.	<b>-.50868437(*)</b>	.13102409	.000	-.7662904	-.2510783
		10-15	.33932934	.25586562	.186	-.1637273	.8423859
		above 15 yrs.	.41917524	.29197820	.152	-.1548822	.9932327
	10-15	below 5 yrs.	<b>-.84801371(*)</b>	.23361753	.000	-	-.3886990
		5-10	<b>-.33932934</b>	.25586562	.186	-.8423859	.1637273
		above 15 yrs.	.07984590	.35023008	.820	-.6087404	.7684322
	Above 15 yrs.	below 5 yrs.	<b>-.92785961(*)</b>	.27269250	.001	-	-.3917197
		5-10	<b>-.41917524</b>	.29197820	.152	-.9932327	.1548822
		10-15	<b>-.07984590</b>	.35023008	.820	-.7684322	.6087404
<b>Budget Shortage</b>	Below 5 yrs.	5-10	<b>-.27475049(*)</b>	.13578060	.044	-.5417083	-.0077927
		10-15	<b>-.04232446</b>	.24209845	.861	-.5183135	.4336645
		above 15 yrs.	.24923177	.28259194	.378	-.3063714	.8048349
	5-10	below 5 yrs.	<b>.27475049(*)</b>	.13578060	.044	.0077927	.5417083
		10-15	<b>.23242603</b>	.26515420	.381	-.2888928	.7537449
		above 15 yrs.	<b>.52398226</b>	.30257775	.084	-.0709149	1.1188794
	10-15	below 5 yrs.	.04232446	.24209845	.861	-.4336645	.5183135
		5-10	<b>-.23242603</b>	.26515420	.381	-.7537449	.2888928
		above 15 yrs.	.29155623	.36294433	.422	-.4220275	1.0051399

	Above 15 yrs.	below 5 yrs.	-.24923177	.28259194	.378	-.8048349	.3063714
		5-10	-.52398226	.30257775	.084	- 1.1188794	.0709149
		10-15	-.29155623	.36294433	.422	- 1.0051399	.4220275

\* The mean difference is significant at the .05 level.

**Table 15:** K Independent Sample between Dependent variable: Factors of Training constraints vs. Independent Variable: Experience in present organization

F.No.	Factor	Chi-Square	df	Asymp. Sig.
F1	<b>Stumbling Blocks of Training</b>	55.575	3	<b>.000</b>
F2	Improper Designing of Training	4.911	3	.178
F3	Ill-assorted Facilitation	4.667	3	.198
F4	<b>Dispiritedness</b>	10.930	3	<b>.012</b>
F5	Budget Shortage	6.326	3	.097

**Table 16:** Multiple Comparisons using LSD Method between- Independent Variable: Experience in present organization vs. Dependent Variable: Stumbling Blocks of Training and Dispiritedness.

Dependent Variable	(I) Exp in present org.	(J) Exp in present org.	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound
<b>Stumbling Blocks of Training</b>	Below 5 yrs.	5-10	<b>.25196730</b>	.14145677	.076	-.0261504	.5300850
		10-15	<b>.57732455(*)</b>	.17962160	.001	.2241711	.9304780
		above 15 yrs.	<b>1.30356514(*)</b>	.15742587	.000	.9940506	1.6130797
	5-10	below 5 yrs.	-.25196730	.14145677	.076	-.5300850	.0261504
		10-15	.32535725	.21470446	.130	-.0967725	.7474870
		above 15 yrs.	1.05159784(*)	.19651207	.000	.6652361	1.4379596

	10-15	below 5 yrs.	-.57732455(*)	.17962160	.001	-.9304780	-.2241711
		5-10	-.32535725	.21470446	.130	-.7474870	.0967725
		above 15 yrs.	.72624059(*)	.22554577	.001	.2827958	1.1696854
	Above 15 yrs.	below 5 yrs.	-1.30356514(*)	.15742587	.000	-1.6130797	-.9940506
		5-10	-1.05159784(*)	.19651207	.000	-1.4379596	-.6652361
		10-15	-.72624059(*)	.22554577	.001	-1.1696854	-.2827958
<b>Dispirited ness</b>	Below 5 yrs.	5-10	-.09499044	.15205089	.533	-.3939372	.2039563
		10-15	-.56926760(*)	.19307400	.003	-.9488698	-.1896654
		above 15 yrs.	.23826871	.16921597	.160	-.0944263	.5709637
	5-10	below 5 yrs.	.09499044	.15205089	.533	-.2039563	.3939372
		10-15	-.47427716(*)	.23078432	.041	-.9280215	-.0205328
		above 15 yrs.	.33325915	.21122944	.115	-.0820384	.7485567
	10-15	below 5 yrs.	<b>.56926760(*)</b>	.19307400	.003	.1896654	.9488698
		5-10	<b>.47427716(*)</b>	.23078432	.041	.0205328	.9280215
		above 15 yrs.	<b>.80753631(*)</b>	.24243756	.001	.3308806	1.2841920
	Above 15 yrs.	below 5 yrs.	-.23826871	.16921597	.160	-.5709637	.0944263
		5-10	-.33325915	.21122944	.115	-.7485567	.0820384
		10-15	-.80753631(*)	.24243756	.001	-1.2841920	-.3308806

\* The mean difference is significant at the .05 level.