GLOBAL RESEARCH NETWORK
ONLINE RESEARCH HUB

ISSN: 2576-5973
Vol. 5, No. 5, 2022

Employee Training and Development, and Organisational Performance: A Study of Small-Scale Manufacturing Firms in Nigeria

Patrick Ohunmah IGUDIA, PhD
Department of Business Administration,
Ambrose Alli University,
Ekpoma

Abstract: *This study investigates the impact of employee training on organisational performance with focus on small manufacturing firms in the table (Sachet) water sub-sector. The organisational scope of the study consisted of two table water factories(Lumen Christi Table Water and Ever-Well Table Water) both at Uromi in Edo State, Nigeria. Organisations train their employees for several reasons one of which is to bridge the existing knowledge and skills gaps in order to increase the effectiveness and productivity level of the employees which ultimately would translate to the overall organisational productivity. Pursuant to this objective, a survey research design was adopted. One hundred and thirty seven (137) respondents made up the total population and sample size used for the study. The study made use of data from primary source – the questionnaire. Data was analysed using Person Product Moment Correlation Coefficient and the one-sample* Kolmogorov-Smirnov *test with the aid of the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) version 25. Results of the hypotheses tests revealed as follows: that the extent to which unsystematic approach to employee training impacted organisational performance was high; that the extent of impact of training design on employee performance was high; that the extent to which training delivery style affected employee performance was high; that there was a very strong positive relationship between employee perception of training and organisational performance; and finally, that the extent to which employee training impacted organisational performance was high. Based on these findings, the study recommends, among others, that a mechanism should be created for proper assessment and evaluation of employee performance after each training exercise as this will ensure that only employees who require training are sent on training.*

Keywords: Training, organisational performance, productivity, employee performance

Introduction

It is one thing to hire new employees but another to have them perform to expectation. Although it is true that employees can simplify operations and bring in more money through increased productivity, research shows that they can only do so if they are sufficiently and suitably trained and developed (Blakely-Gray, 2017). To train and develop employees cost huge sums of money. Records from developed countries show that the cost of training an average employee is about US$1,252 (Association for Talent Development, ATD, 2016). It is reasonable that after spending time and money searching for top talent, you might not want to hear that the work isn't over. You must spend time and money in making sure new employees understand their job responsibilities.

Money is not the only thing an organisation spends on training a new employee. It also needs to put in man/hour time. According to the ATD report (2016), employers use an average of 33.5 training hours per employee. Understandably, the cost of training programmes for employees do differ from one business to another depending on the size of the business, the skill set, the industry, the training method, the equipment used, and the productivity loss (Blakely-Gray, 2017).

Basically, training implies a deliberately organised programme of activities where people undergo, learn and acquire specialised knowledge and skills (Goswami & Saha, 2021). The particular knowledge and skills that are learned through such training sessions are then applied and used by the trainee to advance his/her performance in his/her role at workplace (Jehanzeb & Bashir, 2013). Given that the knowledge and skills acquired in formal schools are usually not sufficient to perform specialised tasks within the organisations there is need to give specific training to people to meet such specialised knowledge and skills(Vinita, 2016; Ndibe, 2014).

It is in realisation of this deficiency that the Federal Government of Nigeria (FGN) in 1962 set up a Manpower Board following the Ashby Commissions recommendations (Olalere & Adesoji, 2013:83). As a result, the FGN established some specialised institutions which included the Centre for Management Development (CMD), Administrative Staff College of Nigeria, Industrial Training Fund (ITF), and Federal Training Centre to train and retrain employees as well as give orientation to fresh graduates of formal academic institutions (Olalere & Adesoji, 2013).

Today, most organisations have found that to survive competition and stay alive into a foreseeable future they need to imbibe the strategy of sustainable staff training and development given the evolving knowledge-intensive and volatile markets of the present day internet and globalisation era (Ndibe, 2014). Training plays an important role in the enhancement of the human capital development (HCD) of an organisation, and HCD enhances organisational performance. One cannot over-emphasise the importance of developing the human resources of an organisation which usually come through various forms of training (Berge, 2001; Salas & Cannon-Bowers, 2001). As has been acknowledged, the human capital of any organisation is responsible for the productive performance of that organisation because training and retraining of employees help in the fortification of such employees (Vinita, 2016; Khan et al., 2011; Brum, 2007) in terms of capacity enhancement.

But despite the acknowledged importance of training to organisational performance, organisations have taken for granted the need to expand the content of training programmes over time (Ndibe, 2014). Some Human Resources (HR) departments rarely question the appropriateness of training a particular employee at a particular time. Often,

certain extraneous considerations take pre-eminence in such choices. Some HR managers show preference for some employees over others for training (Ogbu & Osanaiye, 2017).Sometimes, the procedures and processes they adopt to identify and select those employees that require training are worrisome. Often, the HR department deliberately neglect the idea of conducting training needs assessment. Employees' training selection criteria that ought to be systematic and free from biases are either completely neglected or undermined. Some of the reasons canvassed by Ogbu and Osanaiye (2017) as to why organisations neglect training their employees as and when due include, among others, to avoid incurring huge cost of training, and for the fear of losing those employees after training them. Others see training and development as a waste of time and financial resources that would have been deployed to the production of goods and services that could yield profit for the organisation.

To the employees, the training policies of their organisations have great impact on their work behaviour in terms of satisfaction and productivity. In other words, the perception and/or attitude of employees towards the training policies of their organisations can create in them either a positive or negative behaviour. If the employees are satisfied with the training policies of their organisation, it will have a positive impact on the organisation's productivity. The opposite is the case when they are dissatisfied. Employees sometimes go for training for personal reasons which include enriching themselves; preparing themselves for other positions in other organisations and so on. Sometimes, some employees go for training just because such an employee knows the person in-charge of training and not necessarily because there is an identified knowledge and skill gap which needs to be bridged through training (Enyioko & Ikoro, 2017).

However, literature reveals that much research has been concentrated on the impact, importance and benefits of employee training to organisations particularly in advanced countries while little or no attention has been paid by researchers to the challenges faced by the HR departments in the identification and selection procedures and processes of employees for training in developing countries. This is the identified knowledge gap. Therefore, the specific objective of this study is to investigate the impact of employee training and development on organisational performance.

To accomplish the research objective, this study posses the following research questions:

a. To what extent does the procedure/process for selecting employees for training impact organisational performance?
b. To what extent does training design impact organisational performance?
c. To what extent does training delivery style impact organisational performance?
d. To what extent does employee training impact organisational performance?
e. What is the relationship between employee perception of training and development and organisational performance?

Literature Review – Conceptual Review

Training and Development

Training and development are usually used as a compound word. However, training gives rise to and reinforces development. Although there are various definitions of training and development, one cannot but recognise, in particular, the one by Tharenou, et al. (2007). The trio defined training and development as "a systematic acquisition and development of the knowledge, skills, and attitudes required by employees to adequately perform a task or job or to improve performance in the job environment" (p. 252). Earlier, Jones et al. (2000) had defined training as a process by which organisation members are taught how to perform their current jobs and helping them acquire the knowledge and skills they need to

be effective performers. Beardwell & Holden (2001) also viewed training and development as "a planned process to modify attitude, knowledge or skill behaviour through learning experience to achieve effective performance in any activity or range of activities" (p. 324). Thus, the primary purpose of training is to develop the knowledge, skills and abilities of the individual trainee to satisfy the current and future human capital and competency needs of the organisation that is sponsoring the training. However, these definitions seem to erroneously suggest that employee training and development automatically translates to organisational performance. The definitions also seem to not recognise the dynamics of the operating environments of organisations (Okanya, 2008) including the knowledge and skills which the employees bring to bear in the performance of their tasks. Knowledge and skills change as a result of the ever rising improvement in information and technology (Holden, 2001). Notwithstanding the defects in the definitions, there seems to be a consensus among scholars that appropriate employee training and development programmes tend to improve employee effectiveness and consequently, organisational performance (Okotoni & Erero, 2005).

For an organisation to be at its optimum level of performance requires that that organisation must have a well motivated and satisfied staff members whose human capital needs have been met (Aguinis & Kraiger, 2009) to an extent. Training helps to ensure that organisational members possess the appropriate knowledge and skills they need to perform their jobs effectively, take on new responsibilities, and adapt to changing conditions (Jones et al., 2000). Similarly, training helps improve quality, customer satisfaction, productivity, morale, management succession, business development, profitability and organisational performance (Pai-Po et al., 2014). Training has become a developmental signpost and gauge for employees in organisations, an evidence of how much management truly cares about its workforce (Hamid, 2011). The effectiveness with which organisations manage, develop, motivate, involve and engage the willing contribution of those who work in them is a key determinant of how well these organisations perform (Hamid, 2011).

Organisational Performance

Traditionally, performance connotes creation of value (Monday et al, 2015). Thus, the idea of performance of a business firm indicates that an organisation can activate or manipulate its productive assets, including human, financial, physical, and capital resources, for the purpose of achieving a set organisational goal (Carton, 2004) given its competencies. To determine whether value has been created is dependent upon the definition of the organisation providing the resources and most times it represents the essential overall performance criteria of the organization. Most business organisations use different measurement criteria to measure their performance. Quite often, they use the financial and non-financial measures (Monday et al., 2015). The financial measures include profits, return on assets, return on investment and sales, while the non-financial measures may include such intangible things like customer`s satisfaction and customer`s referral rates, delivery time, waiting time and employee`s turnover. The combinations of these two measures (financial and non-financial) help owners or managers to gain a wider perspective on measuring and comparing their corporate performance, in particular the extent of effectiveness and efficiency in utilizing the resources, competitiveness and readiness to face the growing external pressure (Chong, 2008).

Organisations, most often than not, invest in training programmes because they believe it will lead to a higher employee and organisational performance (Kozlowski, et al., 2000). Usually, before training programmes are organised efforts are made through individual's

and organisation's appraisals to identify the training needs (Olaniyan & Ojo, 2008). Expectedly, after the training programmes, an evaluation is expected to be carried out to ascertain the effectiveness of the programme in line with the need, which supposedly would have been identified. The essence of such an evaluation is to determine the extent to which the training has affected the employee's productivity. The quality of employees and their development through training and education are major factors in determining long-term profitability of any business venture (Olaniyan & Ojo, 2008). HR professionals do believe that an organisation is only as good as its employees, and this understandably suggests that training and development should be more specifically responsive to employees' training needs (Noe, 2008). Bratton and Gold (2000) also affirm that successful corporate leaders recognise that their competitive edge in today's market place is their people. Smith (2010) opines that training motivates employee and makes them more productive and innovative. His reasons include that trained employees are more capable and willing to assume more control over their jobs; that trained employees need less supervision, relieve management and allows it to attend to other tasks; and that trained employees are more capable to answer questions from customers leading to enhanced customer loyalty and organisational performance. Furthermore, employees who understand their jobs are likely to complain less and they seem to be more satisfied and more motivated which together tends to improve management-employee relationships. Organisations achieve the training needs of their employees through two major approaches – 'On-the-Job' (Adamu, 2008; Baum & Devine, 2007) and 'Off-the-Job' (Okanya, 2008) training methods.

Theoretical Review

This study is underpinned by two main theoretical philosophies – the human capital approach and the technology-based approach. The human capital approach sees training as an investment in human capital (Luo, 2000). Thus, training is expectedly provided only when the benefits outweigh the cost of training. Conversely, the technology-based approach sees training as a knowledge and skills formation process (Seufert et al, 2021). Hence, expanded training in the contemporary period is said to be driven by the rapidly changing technologies and work reorganisation. Training is, therefore, said to be provided because it tends to satisfy the functional needs of an organisation as well as contribute to the human capital accumulation and/or skills formation of the organisation. As stated by Enyioko and Ikoro (2017), "human capital is considered to be a resource that can provide a competitive advantage to the extent that Human Resource (HR) practices produce skilled employees who provide value to the firm and have unique inimitable skills" (p.54). Nonetheless, both philosophies fail to recognise a fundamental aspect of training, and that is, the training content, which could be a resultant effect of training design and training delivery style.

Thus, applying the two theories–the human capital and the technology-based approaches – to employee training clarifies the nexus between human capital development (HCD) and organisational performance. The two philosophies suggest that training is an investment in human capital enrichment which offers employees that unique knowledge, skills and abilities including the knowledge in technology that can add value to the organisation through the performance of activities that are required to achieve organisational goals with the concomitant positive organisational-level outcomes (Enyioko & Ikoro, 2017; Tamkin, 2005).

The knowledge and skills of workers acquired through training have become important in the face of the increasingly rapid changes in technology, products, and systems (Thang et

al., 2010). Most organisations invest in training because they believe that it will improve the effectiveness and performance of their employees and consequently result in higher performance levels of the organisation (Kozlowski, et al. 2000). Although there are arguments or assumptions that what is good for the organisation is equally good for the employee, the Michigan School model is of the view that, more than anything else, it is most important to manage the human assets of an organisation in order to achieve strategic goals (Pinnington & Edwards, 2000). Thus, the two underlining theories of this study successfully link employee training and development to organisational performance by explicitly suggesting that no organisation can attain its set goals and strategy without a set of employees that have the right knowledge, skills, abilities, behaviour, and attitudes which only training and retraining, and human capital development (HCD) can seamlessly bring about. Indeed, training plays an important role in improving the quality of employees directly and indirectly affects organisational performance through HR outcomes (Thang et al.,2010).

Empirical Review

Several studies, most of which are within the developed countries' contexts, submit to the argument that staff training and development is positively related to organisational performance (see for example, Pai-Po et al., 2014; Olalere & Adesoji, 2013; Aguinis & Kraiger, 2009). For example, Aguinis and Kraiger (2009) conducted a study on the relationship between training and development and, organisational performance using a sample of 457 organisations in Europe. Results showed that organizations' training policies have positive relationships with employee satisfaction, customer satisfaction, shareholders' satisfaction, and workforce productivity. They further submitted that training and development has positive gains on employee job performance. Nonetheless, their argument is that the impact of employee training is dependent on the training delivery methods and the skills or task for which is training is meant (Pai-Po et al 2014).

Training also helps to develop skills. In this regards, some studies tend to confirm the suggestion that there exists a positive relationship between skills acquisition and employee performance and that a more highly skilled workforce can bring other associated benefits such as enhancing company survival (Penny, 2005; Albaladejo & Romijn, 2001; Dearden & Van Reenen (2000). For example, Haskel et al. (2003) argued that skills were positively related to total factor productivity (TFP) and that the skill gap between the top and bottom-performing firms explained some 8% of the productivity gap in UK firms.

Pai-Po et al. (2014) in their study of some employees of certain ministries and organistions in Gambia found that meeting employees' training needs basically significantly improved the skills and work attitudes of the trainees. The trainees were found to have manifested improved job-related behaviours, which undoubtedly contributed positively to the personnel management office outcomes and the timely overall service-delivery of individuals as well as the Ministries studied.

In a study of some mechanics in Northern India, Barber (2004) found that on-the-job training helped to improve the innovative and tacit skills capacity of the mechanics under study. It was found that the trained mechanics intuitively learned how to build Jeep bodies using homemade hammer, chisel, and oxyacetylene welding equipment. In conclusion, Barber (2004) noted that the tacit skills unknowingly acquired by these mechanics helped them to intuitive hit the metal at the right spot to remove dents which eventually allowed work to proceed seamlessly. This is a confirmation to the arguments by some researchers that training and development programmes directly relate to employees' competence, improve work behaviour and job attitude, and thus, reasonably accounts for the

improvement in the overall organisational-level service-delivery (Pai-Po et al 2014; Ford, 2004).

A particular study undertaken by Li et al, (2019) attempted to determine whether a high performance work system (HPWS) has any relationship with employee performance in organisations. The result showed that HPWS has a positive relationship with employee performance. The study indeed found that job satisfaction, perceived organisational support and employee engagement arising from organisational skills development programmes for employees such as training positively and significantly mediated between HPWS and employee performance. The study thus emphasised that organisations should develop strategies such as employee training programmes that could foster positive work attitudes and increase perceived organisational support to achieve higher levels of performance (Li et al, 2019).

Also, some studies have tended to determine whether high skills acquisition is a factor to a successful and higher performing firms. Results of such studies (see for example Jehanzeb & Bashir (2013); Tamkin, 2005; Haskel et. al., 2003) revealed that there is a significant positive relationship between a highly skilled workforce and organisational performance especially when performance is measured in terms of level of labour productivity.

Also, Reid (2000) in his study opined that a more skilled UK workforce was related to a greater commercial orientation and strategic awareness and propensity to innovate and to retain competitive advantage. Such an effect has been linked to the level of investment in skills and training programmes (Collier *et al.*,2002; Booth & Zoega, 2000). There seems to be a clear nexus drawn between higher skills acquisition and higher productivity especially at the intermediate skills level. The studies found that the greater skills and knowledge of their workforces are closely related to the higher average levels of labour productivity in firms in continental Europe. Within the manufacturing firms, lower skills levels in the UK were found to have a negative effect directly on labour productivity and on the types of machinery chosen (Keep, et al., 2002). Also, a higher training expenditure per employee has been found in literature to be associated with higher technological complexity and originality (Albaladejo & Romijn, 2001), hence, Tamkin (2005) argued that skill levels are associated with innovation performance.

Research Methodology

Survey research design was adopted for this study. The population of the study comprises 37 senior and 100 junior staff of Two Table water producing firms in Uromi town in Esan North East Local Government Area of Edo State as shown in Table 1. The total population of the two firms is 137. This number is regarded to be relatively small, and as a result, this study conducted a census rather than sample to eliminate any iota of variances (errors) as the study intends to generalise to the entire population (Saunders et al, 2007) with almost 100% confidence level.

Table 1: Population of the study

Name of Institutions	Population		Total Population
	Senior	Junior	
Lumen Christi Table Water, Uromi	15	47	62
Ever-Well Table Water, Uromi	22	53	75
Total	**37**	**100**	**137**

Source: Human Resource Departments of both firms

Published by "Global Research Network LLC"
https://www.globalresearchnetwork.us

Data collection was through the primary source using structured questionnaire strategy. A total of 137 copies of the questionnaire were distributed by hand (face-to-face) to all the respondents in the two firms and all 137 copies were properly filled, returned and used. The instrument was validated using the content validity test. The reliability of the instrument was confirmed with a Cronbach's alpha score of 0.71.. The questionnaire was based on 3-point Likert scale. Hypotheses 1, 2, 3 and 5 were tested using One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test (Z_c) while hypothesis 4 was tested using the Pearson Product Moment Correlation (r). Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 25 was used to perform the tests.

Presentation and Analysis of Data

Table 2:**Characteristics of Respondents**

Description	Frequency (*n*)	Percentage (%)
Gender of Respondents		
Male	89	65.0
Female	48	35.0
Job Position		
Junior	100	73.0
Senior	37	27.0
Age		
18-25	48	35.1
26-35	58	42.3
36-45	21	15.3
46-55	10	7.3
Educational Qualification		
Primary	15	11.0
SSCE/GCE	76	55.5
OND	24	17.5
B.Sc./HND	21	15.3
Master/PhD	1	0.7
Years of Job Experiences		
0-5 Years	75	47.4
6-10 Years	36	19.0
11-15 Years	18	13.1
Above 15 Years	8	5.8

The gender distribution of respondents as presented in Table 2 shows that 89 respondents or 65% of the respondents are males while 48(35%)of them are females. This implies that in water manufacturing companies in Nigeria more males are likely to be employed than females. This is understandable because it is a manufacturing outfit and males are more disposed to working in factories. However, more females were found to be in the packaging/wrapping and internal sales sections of the firms. There are 100 or 73% junior staff and 37(27%) senior staff. This shows that more of the employees of manufacturing organisations fall within the junior staff rank given the nature of the business line which is essentially marketing in nature.The age distribution of the respondents shows that 48(35.1%) of the respondents are within the age bracket of 18-25, 58 (42.3%) are within the 26-35 age bracket while 21 or 15.3% are within the age range of 36-45 years. 10(7.3%)are aged between 46-55 years. In all, 92.7% of the respondents are between 18 and 45 Years old. In the area of education, 15(0.7%) have the primary education. These

Published by "Global Research Network LLC"
https://www.globalresearchnetwork.us

are basically messengers and those who do the packing and cleaning. They also form the buck of the drivers/salespeople. 76 (55.5%) of the respondents hold the West African School Certificate/General Certificate of Education (WASC/GCE), 24(17.5%) and 21 (15.3%) hold the OND and First degree (B.Sc.) or their equivalents respectively. Surprisingly, one person representing 0.7% holds the Master degree. Cumulatively, 122 or 89.1% of the total respondents are educated beyond the post-primary education level. The implication is that more than half of the employees will not pay serious attention when sent on training since they have acquired basic education and their jobs are more or less a routine one. Table 2 also shows that 47.4% of the respondents or 75 in real number have worked with their employers for between 0-5 years. In all, about 79% of the total staff population have job experience ranging from 0-15 years and have remained with these organisations without finding the need to find another job elsewhere having undergone certain specific training.

Hypotheses Testing and Discussion of Findings

We employed the One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test (Z_c) and Pearson Product Moment Correlation (r) to test the hypotheses. Hypotheses one, two, three and five were tested with One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test while hypothesis four was tested with Pearson Product Moment Correlation.

Hypothesis 1

$H_0$1: The procedure/process of selection of employee for training does not have impact, to a high extent, on organisational productivity.

H_A1: The procedure/process of selection of employee for training has impact, to a high extent, on organisational productivity.

Given the result of the test statistic at (Z_c = 5.662>Z_t= 0.000; α = 0.05), it can be concluded that an unsystematic approach to the selection of employee for training has a significant impact on organisational productivity. Therefore, we reject the null hypothesis and accept the alternative hypothesis.

Table 3: Summary Statistics of the result of test of hypothesis 1 (See Appendix for the outputs)

Response	Z_c	Z_t
High Extent	5.662	0.000
Undecided	7.301	0.000
Low Extent	4.507	1.000

From the analysis of the respondents as shown in Table 3 and appendix 1, the respondents clearly indicated that an unsystematic selection approach of employee trainees adversely affects organisational productivity given that (Z_c = 5.662> Z_t = 0.000; α = 0.05). The respondents' views corroborate the findings of Olaniyan and Ojo (2008) that non-systematic approach of training – administrative, welfare, and political approaches – affects the overall performance of the organisation as these approaches tend to violate organisational policy and vision. Inversely, the result also corroborates the findings of Adamu (2008) that a systematic approach of trainees election depicts a deliberate corporate policy designed to guide its programme contents and choice in order to identify and evaluate its training needs.

Hypothesis 2

$H_0$2: The extent to which training design impacts organisational performance is low.

H_A2: The extent to which training design affects organisational performance is high.

Table4 depicts the summary results of the test statistics at (Z_c = 0.775> Z_t = 0.510; α = 0.05) which reveal that a good training design content significantly impacts organisational performance as much as it does when there is a bad training design content.

Table 4: Summary Statistic of the result of test of hypothesis 2 (See Appendix for the outputs)

Response	Z_c	Z_t
Low Effect	0.281	1.0
Undecided	0.323	0.308
High Effect	0.775	0.510

Therefore, the extent to which training design content affects organisational performance is high. The respondents opined that to a high extent, training design affects employee productivity as shown in Tables4 and appendix 2. The finding (Z_c = 0.775> Z_t = 0.510; α = 0.05) is in line with the positions of Enyioko & Ikoro (2017) and Ndibe (2014) that organisations that develop a training design according to the needs of the employees and that of the organisation always get good results.

Hypothesis 3

$H_0$3: The extent to which training delivery-style impacts organisational performance is low.

H_A3: The extent to which training delivery-style impacts organisational performance is high.

The test statistics (Z_c = 0.751> Z_t= 0.712; α = 0.05) reveal that the extent to which training delivery style affects organisational performance is significantly high. Therefore, we reject the null hypothesis and accept the alternative hypothesis. The respondents' standpoint is that training delivery style, to a high extent, significantly affects employee productivity (Zc = 0.751> Zt = 0.712; α = 0.05). The summary of the result is shown in Table 5 and appendix 3 **Table 5: Summary Statistic of the result of test of hypothesis 3(See Appendix for the outputs)**

Response	Zc	Zt
D	0.255	1.0
UD	0.344	1.0
A	0.751	0.712

The respondents' views support the findings of Mark and Andrew (2000) that if training is not delivered in an impressive and appropriate style and does not capture the attention of the audience, the trainer is wasting time. Similar conclusion was also reached by Phillip and Eves (2005) in their study when they submitted that training delivery style matters as it determines what goes into making the change expected in the trainee.

Hypothesis 4

H_o4: There is no significant relationship between employee perception of training and development, and organisational performance.

H_A4: There is significant relationship between employee perception of training and development, and organisational performance.

Table 6 shows the results of the Pearson Correlation (r = 0.783; α = 0.05) test. There is a significantly positive relationship between employee perception of training and organisational performance. This means that the perception of employees regarding their

training and development programmes as may be articulated by their organisations do significantly impact their performance behaviours.

Table 6: Correlations Result Output

		OrgPerf	EmPercTD
Correlation Organisational Performance (**OrgPerf**) (2-tailed)	Pearson	1	.783**
	Sig.	137	0000 137
	N	.783** 0000	1

** Correlations is significant at 0.05 level (2-tailed)

Given the correlation result, the null hypothesis was rejected while the alternative hypothesis was accepted at ($r = 0.783$; $\alpha=0.000<0.05$). This outcome corroborates the findings of Enyioko & Ikoro (2017) and Ndibe (2014); that people tend to learn and assimilate more from a training and human development programme if they perceive and accept the need for training and commit to it. Conversely, if employee's perception of the importance of training to their development is negative, no matter how well the training design and implementation are, organisational performance is very likely to be adversely impacted.

Hypothesis 5

H_o5: The impact of employee training on organisational performance is low

H_A5: The impact of employee training on organisational performance is high

Results of the test at ($Z_c = 0.705 > Z_t = 0.665$; $\alpha = 0.05$) as shown in Table 7 clearly indicates that, to a large extent, there is a significant statistical relationship between employee training and organisational performance. As indicated, majority of the respondents strongly agree that employee training impacts to a, 'high extent', organisational performance. Although employee training per se cannot on its own improve organisational performance (Enyioko & Ikoro, 2017; Ndibe, 2014) as indicated by the number of respondents who merely 'agreed', factors such as processes, procedures, employee perception, training design or contents and the delivery style cumulatively improve organisational performance.

Table 7: Summary Statistics of the result of test of hypothesis 5(See Appendix for the outputs)

Response	Z_c	Z_t
Low Extent	0.332	1.0
Undecided	0.589	0.851
High Extent	0.705	0.665

Therefore, based on this result, one can conclude that the impact of employee training on organisational performance is significantly high. Hence, we reject the null hypothesis and accept the alternative hypothesis. The respondents standpoint is that employee training, to a high extent, impacts organisational performance at ($Z_c= 0.705 > Z_t = 0.665$; $\alpha = 0.05$). This result corroborates the submissions of Enyioko and Ikoro (2017), Ndibe (2014), Jehanzeb and Bashir (2013) and Smith (2010) that training motivates employees to perform most effectively and perform their best.

Conclusion

Based on the objective and research questions of this study, and following the results of the hypotheses tested, it can be concluded that if the right employees are sent on training using a systematic training procedure to identify and select employees for such training, there would be a significant improvement in organisational performance. However, before identifying and selecting the trainees, there should be an appropriate training-needs assessment conducted by the organisation's human resource (HR) department. From the findings, organisations need to train its employees for it to become more productive and competitive, and to remain in business, especially in this era of globalisation and growing complexity of the work environment. It was also found that the two firms do conduct short internal training especially for the engineering components of their operational lines as well as the packaging aspect. They also have a mechanism for evaluating employee post training performance based on the after-training knowledge and skills they exhibit after such trainings.

Recommendations

In the light of the findings, this paper recommends as follows:

- that more appropriate training seminars and workshops should be organised for the other sections of these two firms especially for the HR departments to properly school them on the importance of a systematic approach to trainee identification and selection to match the assessed skills gaps in the various departments;
- that a more in-depth mechanism should be created to appropriately assess and evaluate an employee's performance after training in line with some of the employee performance indicators mentioned earlier;
- that each HR department should develop formal training design with rich content for their employee training as non of the two firms has any for now;
- that the two firms should also encourage their employees to be involved in external training including those involving other developmental courses that could impact on their general performance so as to improve organisational performance.

These recommendations, when heeded, are most likely to positively impact other organisations particularly those in the manufacturing sector.

Limitations of the Study

This research work adopted a one-sided approach by only looking at the benefits of employee training on organisational performance. The study deliberately overlooked or at best mentioned in passing the adverse consequences of training including cost and expensive nature of training. Another limitation is the number of firms studied within the industry of manufacturing, and specifically, water producing firms. The two case studies cannot in anyway be a fair representation of the entire water producing firms in Edo State let alone Nigeria. Thus, future research in this area can consider increasing the number of case studies with larger industry representation

Reference

1. Adamu, S. (2008). *Manpower planning and administration,* Lagos: National Open University of Nigeria.
2. Aguinis, H. & Kraiger, K. (2009). Benefits of training and development for individuals and teams, organizations, and society. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 60, 451-474.
3. Albaladejo, M. & Romijn, H. (2001). *Determinants of innovation capability in small UK firms*, ECIS working paper No. 00.13.
4. Association for Talent Development (2016). ATD Releases 2016 State of the Industry Report. Accessed at https://www.td.org/insights/atd-releases-2016-state-of-the-industry-report on 24/03/2022.
5. Baum, T. & Devine, F. (2007). Skills and training in the hotel sector: The Case of office employment in Northern Ireland. Tourism and Hospitality Research, 7, pp. 269–280.
6. Bean-Mellinger, B. (2019). Coaching and Understudy Assignments as Management Training Methods. http://www.ehow.com/list_7492561, Accessed 24 April, 2021.
7. Beardwell, I. & Holden, L. (2001). *Human Resource Management: A contemporary approach*. Essex: Pearson Education Limited.
8. Berge, Z.L. (ed) (2001). *Sustaining Distance Training: Integrating Learning Technologies into the Fabric of the Enterprise*, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
9. Blakely-Gray, R. (2017). **What is the cost of training employees? Accessed at** https://www.patriotsoftware.com/blog/payroll/ **on 24/03/2022.**
10. Booth, A.L. & Zoega, G. (2000). *Why Do Firms Invest in General Training? "Good" Firms and "Bad" Firms as a Source of Monopsony Power*, CEPR Discussion Papers 2536,Centre for Economic Policy Research.
11. Bratton, J. & Gold, J. (2000). *Human Resource Management: Theory and Practice,* New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
12. Brum, S. (2007). What impact does training have on employee commitment and Employee turnover?
13. Carton, R.B. (2004). Measuring organizational performance: An exploratory study. A Published PhD Dissertation of The University of Georgia, Athens, Georgia.
14. Chukwunenye, I.O. & Igbokwe, B.N. (2011). Training, manpower development and job performance: perception and relevance among civil servants in Ebonyi State, Nigeria. *Journal of Economics and International Finance,* 3(6), 399-406, http://www.academicjournals.org/JEIF Accessed 9 September 2021.
15. Collier, W., Green, F., Peirson, J., & Wilkinson, D. (2003). *Training and Establishment Survival*, Royal Economic Society Annual Conference.
16. Dearden, L., Reed, H., Van Reenen, J. (2000), *Who Gains when Workers Train? Trainingand Corporate Productivity in a Panel of British Industries*. IFS Working Paper No.WP 00/04, Institute for Fiscal Studies.
17. Enyioko, V.U. & Ikoro, E.I. (2017). Effect of Employees Training on Organizational Performance: A Study of Seven-Up Botlling Company, Enugu State Nigeria. *IIARD International Journal of Economics and Business Management*, 3(10), 48-63.
18. Ford, D.J. (2004). Evaluating performance improvement, *Performance Improvement*, 43(1), 36-41.

19. Goswami, S. & Saha, R.C. (2021). Impact of training on organisational productivity, *Asia-Pacific Journal of Management and Technology (AJMT)*, 1(3), 22-28.
20. Hamid, S. (2011). A study of effectiveness of training and development programmes of UPSTDG, India – An Analysis, *South Asian Journal of Tourism and Heritage*, 4(1),74- 82.
21. Haskel J, Hawkes D, Pereira S (2003), *Skills and Productivity in the UK Using Matched Establishment, Worker and Workforce Data*, CeRIBA.
22. Holden, L. (2001). *Human resource development: the organization and the national framework*, in Beardwell et al. (eds), Human Resource Management: a contemporaryapproach. Essex: Pearson Education Limited.
23. Jehanzeb, K. & Bashir, N.A. (2013). Training and development programme and its benefits to employee and organisation: A conceptual study. *European Journal of business and management*, 5(2), 243-252.
24. Jones, G.R., George, J.M., and Hill, C.W.L. (2000), *Contemporary Management*, New York: Irwin and McGraw Hills.
25. Keep, E., Mayhew, K. and Corney, M. (2002), *Review of the evidence on the rate of return to employers of investment in training and employer training measures*, NJ: SKOPEResearch Paper No. 34.
26. Khan, R.A.G., Khan, F.A. & Khan, M.A. (2011), Impact of training and development on organizational performance, *Global Journal of Management andBusiness Research*, 11(7).
27. Kozlowski, S., Brown, K., Weissbein, D., Cannon-Bowers, J., & Salas, E. (2000). A multilevel approach to training effectiveness, In K.Klein, &S.Kozlowski, (Eds.), *MultilevelTheory, Research, and Methods in Organizations: Foundations, Extensions, andNew Directions* (157-210). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
28. Li, C., Naz, S., Khan, S.M.A., Kusi, B. Murad, M. (2019). An empirical investigation on the relationship between a high-performance work system and employee performance: measuring a mediation model through partial least squares–structural equation modeling. *Psychology Research and Behavior Management*, 12, 397-416.
29. Luo, X. (2000). The rise of personal development training in organisations: A historical and institutional perspective on workplace training programmes in the U.S. *Perspectives*, 1(6).
30. Mark, A.G. & Andrew, N. (2000). Perceptions of safety at work: A framework for linking safety climate to safety performance, knowledge, and motivation. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 5(3), 347-358.
31. Monday, J.U., Akinola, G.O., Ologbenla, P., & Aladeraji, O.K. (2015). Strategic management and firm performance: A study of selected manufacturing companies in Nigeria. *European Journal of Business and Management*, 7(2), 161-171.
32. Ndibe, B. (2014). The effect of employees training on organizational performance, An Unpublished M.Sc. Proposal of the University of Nigeria, Enugu Campus, Accessed on 22/03/2022 at https://www.academia.edu/33937063/.
33. Noe, R.A. (2008). *Employee Training and Development*, Irwin: McGraw-Hill.
34. Ogbu, J.O. & Osanaiye, J.I. (2017). Impact of employee training on organizational performance a study of selected insurance firms in Abuja-Nigeria. European Journal of Business and Management, 9(14), 64-72.

35. Okanya, S.P. (2008). *Reconciling organisational performance and employee satisfaction through training: The case of Soroti District Local Government*, An Unpublished Master of Arts Degree, at the Institute ofSocial Studies, Hague.
36. Okotoni, O. & Erero, J. (2005). Manpower training and development in the Nigerian service, *African Journal of Public Administration and Management (AJPAM16(1))*, 1-13.
37. Olalere, T.O. & Adesoji, A.A. (2013). Human capital development in First Bank of Nigeria Plc, *Mediterranean Journal of Social Science* 4(2). 783-801.
38. Olaniyan, D.A. & Ojo, L.B. (2008). Staff training and development: a vital tool for organisational effectiveness, *European Journal of Scientific Research, 24(3),* 326-331.
39. Pai-Po, L., Baboucarr, S., & Chih-Chien, S.L. (2014). Training and Development Impact on Employees' Performance in the Administrative Cadre of the Personnel Management Office in the Gambia, *Journal of International Cooperation*, 8(1), 51-86.
40. Phillip, S. &. Eves, A. (2005). The management of food safety - the role of food hygiene training in the UK service sector. *International journal of hospitality management*, *25(2)*, 278-296.
41. Pinnington, A. & Edwards, T. (2000). *Introduction to human resource management*, USA: Oxford University Press. Productivity. www.businessdictionary.com/, Accessed 12 June 2021.
42. Reid, G.C. (2000). *The development and survival of new small businesses.* Centre for Research into Industry, Enterprise, Finance and the Firm, Scotland: St Andrews University.
43. Salas, E. & Cannon-Bowers, J.A. (2001). The science of training: a decade of progress, *Annual Review of Psychology*, 52, 471–499.
44. Saunders, M., Lewis, P., & Thornhill, A. (2007). *Research methods for business students*, (4th edn), England: Prentice Hall Ltd.
45. Seufert, S., Guggemos, J., Sailer, M. (2021). Technology-related knowledge, skills, and attitudes of pre- and in-service teachers: The current situation and emerging trends. Computer in Human Behaviour, 115, 1-7.
46. Smith, G. (2010). *How to Increase Job Satisfaction and Improve Employee Engagement*, www.chartcourse.com/articlepride.htm.
47. Tamkin, P. (2005). *The contribution of skills to Business Performance*, UK: Institute for Employment Studies (IES) Technology (2nd ed), Maryland: International Society for Performance Improvement (ISPI).
48. Thang, N.N., Quang, T.,& Buyens, D. (2010). The relationship between training and firm performance: Aliterature review, *Research and Practice in Human Resource Management*, 18(1), 28-45.
49. Tharenou, P., Saks, M.A. & Moore, C. (2007). A review and critique of research on training and organizational-level outcomes, *Human Resource Management Review*, 17, 251-273.
50. Vinita, J. (2016). Training and Development Program and its Benefits to Employee and Organization : A Conceptual Study. *International Journal of Scientific Research in Science and Technology (IJSRST)*, 2(5), 80-86.

Appendix 1

Output of the One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test of the Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Min	Max
High extent	103	1.56	.498	1	103
Undecided	13	1.91	.285	1	13
Low extent	21	1.80	.399	1	21

Descriptive Statistics

		HE	UD	LE
N		103	13	21
Normal Parameter(s) (a, b)	Mean	1.77	1.61	1.50
	Std. Deviation	.473	.315	.409
Most Extreme Absolute Differences		.370	.523	.498
	Positive	.302	.378	.310
	Negative	-.390	-.534	-.495
Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z		5.662	7.301	4.507
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000	.000
Monte Carlo Sig. (2-Sig. tailed)		.000(c)	.000(c)	.000(c)
95% confidence	Lower Bound	.000	.000	.000
	Upper Bound	.032	.022	.012

One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test Result output

Appendix 2

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Min	Max
High Extent	107	64.00	36.806	1	185
Undecided	17	19.00	10.824	1	37
Low Extent	13	11.50	6.494	1	22

Descriptive Statistics

		HE	UD	LE
N		107	17	13
Normal Parameter(s) (a, b)	Mean	63.00	17.00	13.50
	Std. Deviation	45.80	10.824	8.49
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	.088	.054	.073
	Positive	.088	.054	.074
	Negative	-.088	-.054	-.074
Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z		.775	.323	.281
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		.746	.669	1.000
Monte Carlo Sig. (2-Sig. tailed)		.510(c)	.308(c)	1.000(c)
95% confidence	Lower Bound	.352	.234	.564
Upper Bound		.852	1.000	1.000

One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test output

Appendix 3

Hypothesis 3

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Min	Max
Disagree	8	4.50	2.449	1	8
Undecided	26	13.50	7.649	1	26
Agree	128	64.50	37.094	1	128

Descriptive Statistics

		D	UD	A
N		14	22	101
Normal Parameter(s) (a, b)	Mean	8.52	11.40	66.30
	Std. Deviation	2.124	7.746	35.79
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	.205	.078	.077
	Positive	.205	.078	.077
	Negative	-.205	-.078	-.077
Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z		.255	.344	.751
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		1.000	.979	.732
Monte Carlo Sig. (2-Sig. tailed)		1.000(c)	1.000(c)	.712(c)
95% confidence	Lower Bound	.686	.518	.729
	Upper Bound	1.000	1.000	.925

One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test output

Appendix 4

Hypothesis 5

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Minimum	Maximum
Low	10	19.22		1	10
U	22	36.30		1	22
High	105	71.53		1	105

Descriptive Statistics

		Low	U	High
N		10	22	105
Normal Parameter(s) (a, b)	Mean	1922	36.30	71.53
	Std. Deviation	5.219	21.302	47.791
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	.078	.061	.060
	Positive	.078	.061	.060
	Negative	-.078	-.061	-.060
Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z		.332	.589	.705
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		1.000	.879	.704
Monte Carlo Sig. (2-Sig. tailed)		1.000(c)	.851(c)	.665(c)
95% confidence	Lower Bound	.988	.806	.607
	Upper Bound	1.000	.895	.724

One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test Output

Published by "Global Research Network LLC"
https://www.globalresearchnetwork.us