

## Performance of Employees with the Help of Training and Development Programs –A Study of Private and Public Sector Banks of Jodhpur Region

Aarti Khanchandani

MBA (FINANCE), RSET

Assistant Professor

Faculty of Commerce and Management Studies

Lachoo Memorial college of Science and technology Jodhpur, Rajasthan India

---

**Abstract:** Training has become need of an hour due to changing environment. Today, the banking organizations are facing the challenges of competition as globalization has increased the spate of such competition. In accordance to survive into this environment banking organizations need to transform the workplace and make it dynamic for the talented people who align themselves with business goals and make the banking business a successful one.. The banking industry is also becoming popular to provide full range of financial services to the investors according to their needs and requirements. With the increase in innovative financial products which are designed according to the needs of the customers and are tailor made too, the corporate sector is responding to the banking sector for the development and growth of equity and capital with the competitive cost. The technical skills of the employees are changing as the technology responsiveness and adaptation has become important to perform the functions in an effective way. The employees need to build the professional competencies .This has to be done by industry itself. The basic objective of this research paper is to analyze the performance of employees with the help of Training and Development programs –A study of private and public sector banks of Jodhpur region.

**Keywords:** Banking sector, Performance Training and development and Skills.

---

### I. INTRODUCTION

In the early 2000 B.C., the **Babylonians** developed a banking system, there was ample evidence which showed that the temples of Babylon were used as banks, and such temples were the most powerful of Greek banking system. Later due to spread of irreligion, the general public's sense of security in depositing money and valuables in temples was destroyed (**Praveen and Venugopalan, 2011**)<sup>[1]</sup>

Banking means accepting for purpose of lending of investment of deposits of money from the public, payable on demand or other wise and withdraw able by cheque, draft or otherwise.”(**Nakkiran, 1980**)<sup>[2]</sup>

**Banking Regulation Act of India, 1949** defines Banking as “accepting, for the purpose of lending or of investment of deposits of money from the public, repayable on demand or otherwise or withdrawable by cheque, draft order or otherwise”. The Reserve Bank of India Act, 1934 and the Banking Regulation Act, 1949, govern the banking operations in India (**Iyengar, 2007**)<sup>[3]</sup>

A number of small banks and financial companies were started between the period 1863-1865, and almost all of them proved a failure (**Gomez 2011**)<sup>[4]</sup>. Banking in India as we see today is the result of slow and gradual development. Though India had a system of Indigenous banking from very early times, it was not similar to the banking of Modern times (**Maheswari 2015**)<sup>[5]</sup>

A major historical event in the history of banking in India after independence is the nationalization of 14 major banks on 19 July, 1969. In 1980, six major private banks were nationalized (**Gktoday.in, 2011**)<sup>[6]</sup>

Indian banking system has several exceptional achievements to its credit, the most remarkable of which is its reach. Indian banks have made their reach to the remote corners of our country. In terms of the number of branches, India's banking system is one of the largest in the world. According to the Banker 2004, India has 20 banks within the world's top 1000 out of which only 6 are within the top 500 banks (**Reddy, 2004**)<sup>[7]</sup>

**Jadhav (2013)** studied the training and development programmes undertaken by banks for their employees. The main objectives of the present study were to analyze effectiveness of training and development programmes for employees to discharge their duties and to study how training and development programmes helps to achieve customer satisfaction. For this study primary data was collected through questionnaire filled by the bank employees. A sample of 40 employees was selected by the use of random sampling from different banks like HDFC, ICICI, Vijaya bank, Bank of Baroda, and Dena Bank located in suburban area of Mumbai. It is concluded that private and public Indian banks undertake training and development programmes for their employees to increase their efficiency. Banks provide training programmes to enhance their knowledge and

---

skills to satisfy the customers. Growth of banking sector in India is the result of skilled manpower which is the outcome of training and development. (Jadhav, 2013)<sup>[8]</sup>

**1.1 EVOLUTION OF HUMAN RESOURCE MANAGEMENT**

|  |
|--|
| <p><b>END OF 20<sup>th</sup> CENTURY AND PRESENT(HR)</b><br/>alignment between individual needs and company goals, culture and development</p> |
| <p><b>MID 20<sup>th</sup> CENTURY (IR)</b><br/>Effective personnel administration and participative management.</p>                            |
| <p><b>EARLY 20<sup>th</sup> CENTURY (EMPLOYEE WELFARE)</b><br/>Formulation of and compliance with, personnel rules.</p>                        |

“Fig-1”

Source; French, W.The *Personnel Management Process: Human Resource Administration*, 3rd ed, NY: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1974<sup>[9]</sup>

Organizational learning, which makes use of training and development as one of the several responses, deals with the acquisition of understanding, know-how, techniques and practices. These intellectual intangibles can be translated into an organizational resource through the people that acquire, infer and utilize such towards the achievement of the organization-wide training and development (Armstrong, 2006)<sup>[10]</sup>

Training and development are planned learning experiences which teach employees how to perform current and prospective jobs more effectively.

**RESEARCH PROBLEM**

Performance of employees with the help of Training and Development programs –A study of private and public sector banks of Jodhpur region.

The banks selected for the study are as follows

| S.No | PRIVATE SECTOR BANK | PUBLIC SECTOR BANK               |
|------|---------------------|----------------------------------|
| 1    | INDUSIND BANK       | STATE BANK OF BIKANER AND JAIPUR |

“Fig-2”

- **Population** -The employees of selected banks of the private and the public sector banks in the city of Jodhpur. Jodhpur as geographical region of study was chosen because of convenience and availability of diverse profile of subjects.

**II DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION**

“Table-1”

Frequency

|         |   | Statistics |     |
|---------|---|------------|-----|
|         |   | New total  |     |
| Public  | N | Valid      | 200 |
|         |   | Missing    | 0   |
| Private | N | Valid      | 200 |
|         |   | Missing    | 0   |

“Table-2”

|                |       | New total |         |               |                    |
|----------------|-------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Public/Private |       | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Public         | Valid | Low       | 24      | 12.0          | 12.0               |
|                |       | Medium    | 66      | 33.0          | 33.0               |
|                |       | High      | 110     | 55.0          | 55.0               |
|                |       | Total     | 200     | 100.0         | 100.0              |
| Private        | Valid | Low       | 113     | 56.5          | 56.5               |

|  |               |     |       |       |       |
|--|---------------|-----|-------|-------|-------|
|  | <b>Medium</b> | 67  | 33.5  | 33.5  | 90.0  |
|  | <b>High</b>   | 20  | 10.0  | 10.0  | 100.0 |
|  | <b>Total</b>  | 200 | 100.0 | 100.0 |       |

- There are 200 respondents of public banks and 200 respondents of private banks divided into three categories: low at 34, medium at 40, high at 46.

**2.1 T Test**  
**“Table-3”**

| Group Statistics             |                |     |       |                |                 |        |                |
|------------------------------|----------------|-----|-------|----------------|-----------------|--------|----------------|
|                              |                | N   | Mean  | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean | t      | Sig.(2 tailed) |
| <b>HR_OUTCOMES</b>           | <b>Public</b>  | 200 | 5.06  | .843           | .060            | 9.246  | .000           |
|                              | <b>Private</b> | 200 | 4.23  | .950           | .067            | 9.246  | .000           |
| <b>RELATIONAL_ATTRIBUTE</b>  | <b>Public</b>  | 200 | 5.14  | .728           | .051            | 13.147 | .000           |
|                              | <b>Private</b> | 200 | 4.03  | .940           | .066            | 13.147 | .000           |
| <b>FINANCIAL_ATTRIBUTE</b>   | <b>Public</b>  | 200 | 5.06  | .818           | .058            | 10.626 | .000           |
|                              | <b>Private</b> | 200 | 4.09  | .998           | .071            | 10.626 | .000           |
| <b>RELIABILITY_ATTRIBUTE</b> | <b>Public</b>  | 200 | 4.94  | .900           | .064            | 9.109  | .000           |
|                              | <b>Private</b> | 200 | 4.10  | .954           | .067            | 9.109  | .000           |
| <b>DEVELOPMENT_ATTRIBUTE</b> | <b>Public</b>  | 200 | 5.16  | .811           | .057            | 9.513  | .000           |
|                              | <b>Private</b> | 200 | 4.32  | .959           | .068            | 9.513  | .000           |
| <b>LEADERSHIP_ATTRIBUTE</b>  | <b>Public</b>  | 200 | 5.10  | .830           | .059            | 10.837 | .000           |
|                              | <b>Private</b> | 200 | 4.11  | .981           | .069            | 10.837 | .000           |
| <b>CONTEXTUAL_ATTRIBUTE</b>  | <b>Public</b>  | 200 | 4.89  | .861           | .061            | 9.520  | .000           |
|                              | <b>Private</b> | 200 | 4.04  | .923           | .065            | 9.520  | .000           |
| <b>BEHAVIOUR_ATTRIBUTE</b>   | <b>Public</b>  | 200 | 4.92  | 1.065          | .075            | 8.032  | .000           |
|                              | <b>Private</b> | 200 | 4.09  | .988           | .070            | 8.032  | .000           |
| <b>Total_Impact</b>          | <b>Public</b>  | 200 | 39.96 | 5.074          | .359            | 12.193 | .000           |
|                              | <b>Private</b> | 200 | 32.87 | 6.472          | .458            | 12.193 | .000           |

Interpretation: there is highly significant difference between public and private banks in relational to these variables.

**2.2 REGRESSION: TOTAL IMPACT- VARIABLES PUBLIC**

**“Table-4”**

| Model Summary |                                    |          |                   |                            |                   |          |     |     |               |
|---------------|------------------------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------------------|-------------------|----------|-----|-----|---------------|
| Model         | R                                  | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate | Change Statistics |          |     |     |               |
|               | Public/Private = Public (Selected) |          |                   |                            | R Square Change   | F Change | df1 | df2 | Sig. F Change |
| 1             | .988 <sup>a</sup>                  | .975     | .974              | .816                       | .975              | 938.631  | 8   | 191 | .000          |

- a. **Predictors:** (Constant), BEHAVIOUR\_ATTRIBUTE, FINANCIAL\_ATTRIBUTE, HR\_OUTCOMES, DEVELOPMENT\_ATTRIBUTE, RELATIONAL\_ATTRIBUTE, RELIABILITY\_ATTRIBUTE, LEADERSHIP\_ATTRIBUTE, CONTEXTUAL\_ATTRIBUTE

The adjusted R Square is .974. That means 97.4% variability in total impact is explained by these variables.

“Table-5”

ANOVA<sup>a,b</sup>

|   | Model             | Sum of Squares | df  | Mean Square | F       | Sig.              |
|---|-------------------|----------------|-----|-------------|---------|-------------------|
| 1 | <b>Regression</b> | 4995.529       | 8   | 624.441     | 938.631 | .000 <sup>c</sup> |
|   | <b>Residual</b>   | 127.066        | 191 | .665        |         |                   |
|   | <b>Total</b>      | 5122.595       | 199 |             |         |                   |

a. **Dependent Variable:** Total\_Impact

b. **Selecting only cases for which Public/Private = Public**

c. **Predictors:** (Constant), BEHAVIOUR\_ATTRIBUTE, FINANCIAL\_ATTRIBUTE, HR\_OUTCOMES, DEVELOPMENT\_ATTRIBUTE, RELATIONAL\_ATTRIBUTE, RELIABILITY\_ATTRIBUTE, LEADERSHIP\_ATTRIBUTE, CONTEXTUAL\_ATTRIBUTE

The model fit is highly significant at p .000 lesser than p .05 and f is 938.631. This means the sample represents the population taken.

“Table-6”

Coefficients<sup>a,b</sup>

|   | Model                        | Unstandardized Coefficients |            | Standardized Coefficients | t      | Sig. |
|---|------------------------------|-----------------------------|------------|---------------------------|--------|------|
|   |                              | B                           | Std. Error | Beta                      |        |      |
| 1 | <b>(Constant)</b>            | .963                        | .491       |                           | 1.962  | .051 |
|   | <b>HR_OUTCOMES</b>           | 1.058                       | .093       | .176                      | 11.385 | .000 |
|   | <b>RELATIONAL_ATTRIBUTE</b>  | .905                        | .112       | .130                      | 8.063  | .000 |
|   | <b>FINANCIAL_ATTRIBUTE</b>   | .982                        | .100       | .158                      | 9.799  | .000 |
|   | <b>RELIABILITY_ATTRIBUTE</b> | .828                        | .095       | .147                      | 8.712  | .000 |
|   | <b>DEVELOPMENT_ATTRIBUTE</b> | 1.072                       | .097       | .171                      | 11.065 | .000 |
|   | <b>LEADERSHIP_ATTRIBUTE</b>  | .900                        | .106       | .147                      | 8.498  | .000 |
|   | <b>CONTEXTUAL_ATTRIBUTE</b>  | 1.008                       | .103       | .171                      | 9.819  | .000 |
|   | <b>BEHAVIOUR_ATTRIBUTE</b>   | .994                        | .075       | .209                      | 13.172 | .000 |

a. **Dependent Variable:** Total\_Impact

b. **Selecting only cases for which Public/Private = Public**

There is highly significant relationship between total impact and the variables at p .000.

**Total Impact =**

**1.058\*HR\_OUTCOMES+.905\*RELATIONAL\_ATTRIBUTE+.982\*FINANCIAL\_ATTRIBUTE+.828\*RELIABILITY\_ATTRIBUTE+1.072\*DEVELOPMENT\_ATTRIBUTE+.900\*LEADERSHIP\_ATTRIBUTE+1.008\*CONTEXTUAL\_ATTRIBUTE+.994\*BEHAVIOUR\_ATTRIBUTE+.963(Constant)**

- For every one unit change in HR Outcomes there is increase by 1.058 in Total Impact.
- For every one unit change in Relational Attribute there is increase by .905 in Total Impact.
- For every one unit change in Financial Attribute there is increase by .982 in Total Impact.
- For every one unit change in Reliability Attribute there is increase by .828 in Total Impact.
- For every one unit change in Development Attribute there is increase by 1.072 in Total Impact.
- For every one unit change in Leadership Attribute there is increase by .900 in Total Impact.
- For every one unit change in Contextual Attribute there is increase by 1.008 in Total Impact.
- For every one unit change in Behavior Attribute there is increase by .963 in Total Impact.

**2.3 REGRESSION: TOTAL IMPACT- VARIABLES PRIVATE**

**“Table-7”**

| Model Summary |                                     |          |                   |                            |                   |          |      |      |               |
|---------------|-------------------------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------------------|-------------------|----------|------|------|---------------|
| Model         | R                                   | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate | Change Statistics |          |      |      |               |
|               | Public/Private = Private (Selected) |          |                   |                            | R Square Change   | F Change | df 1 | df 2 | Sig. F Change |
| 1             | .992 <sup>a</sup>                   | .985     | .984              | .820                       | .985              | 1525.694 | 8    | 191  | .000          |

a. **Predictors:** (Constant), BEHAVIOUR\_ATTRIBUTE, FINANCIAL\_ATTRIBUTE, LEADERSHIP\_ATTRIBUTE, RELIABILITY\_ATTRIBUTE, RELATIONAL\_ATTRIBUTE, DEVELOPMENT\_ATTRIBUTE, CONTEXTUAL\_ATTRIBUTE, HR\_OUTCOMES

The adjusted R Square is .984. That means 98.4% variability in total impact is explained by these variables.

**“Table-8”**

| ANOVA <sup>a,b</sup> |                |          |             |          |          |                   |
|----------------------|----------------|----------|-------------|----------|----------|-------------------|
| Model                | Sum of Squares | Df       | Mean Square | F        | Sig.     |                   |
| 1                    | Regression     | 8206.928 | 8           | 1025.866 | 1525.694 | .000 <sup>c</sup> |
|                      | Residual       | 128.427  | 191         | .672     |          |                   |
|                      | Total          | 8335.355 | 199         |          |          |                   |

a. **Dependent Variable:** Total\_Impact

b. **Selecting only cases for which Public/Private = Private**

c. **Predictors:** (Constant), BEHAVIOUR\_ATTRIBUTE, FINANCIAL\_ATTRIBUTE, LEADERSHIP\_ATTRIBUTE, RELIABILITY\_ATTRIBUTE, RELATIONAL\_ATTRIBUTE, DEVELOPMENT\_ATTRIBUTE, CONTEXTUAL\_ATTRIBUTE, HR\_OUTCOMES

The model fit is highly significant at p .000 lesser than p .05 and f is 1525.694. This means the sample represents the population taken.

**“Table-9”**

| Coefficients <sup>a,b</sup> |                       |                             |            |                           |        |      |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------------|------------|---------------------------|--------|------|
| Model                       |                       | Unstandardized Coefficients |            | Standardized Coefficients | t      | Sig. |
|                             |                       | B                           | Std. Error | Beta                      |        |      |
| 1                           | (Constant)            | 1.003                       | .296       |                           | 3.390  | .001 |
|                             | HR_OUTCOMES           | .978                        | .115       | .144                      | 8.498  | .000 |
|                             | RELATIONAL_ATTRIBUTE  | .879                        | .108       | .128                      | 8.157  | .000 |
|                             | FINANCIAL_ATTRIBUTE   | .719                        | .093       | .111                      | 7.693  | .000 |
|                             | RELIABILITY_ATTRIBUTE | .991                        | .110       | .146                      | 8.999  | .000 |
|                             | DEVELOPMENT_ATTRIBUTE | .997                        | .112       | .148                      | 8.905  | .000 |
|                             | LEADERSHIP_ATTRIBUTE  | 1.022                       | .101       | .155                      | 10.075 | .000 |
|                             | CONTEXTUAL_ATTRIBUTE  | 1.045                       | .117       | .149                      | 8.964  | .000 |
|                             | BEHAVIOUR_ATTRIBUTE   | 1.090                       | .106       | .166                      | 10.301 | .000 |

a. **Dependent Variable:** Total\_Impact

b. **Selecting only cases for which Public/Private = Private**

There is highly significant relationship between total impact and the variables at p .000.

**Total Impact =**

$$.978*HR\_OUTCOMES+.879*RELATIONAL\_ATTRIBUTE+.719*FINANCIAL\_ATTRIBUTE+.991*RE$$

**LIABILITY\_ATTRIBUTE+.997\*DEVELOPMENT\_ATTRIBUTE+1.022\*LEADERSHIP\_ATTRIBUTE  
+1.045\*CONTEXTUAL\_ATTRIBUTE+1.090\*BEHAVIOUR\_ATTRIBUTE+1.003(Constant)**

- For every one unit change in HR Outcomes there is increase by .978 in Total Impact.
- For every one unit change in Relational Attribute there is increase by .879 in Total Impact.
- For every one unit change in Financial Attribute there is increase by .719 in Total Impact.
- For every one unit change in Reliability Attribute there is increase by .991 in Total Impact.
- For every one unit change in Development Attribute there is increase by .997 in Total Impact.
- For every one unit change in Leadership Attribute there is increase by 1.022 in Total Impact.
- For every one unit change in Contextual Attribute there is increase by 1.045 in Total Impact.
- For every one unit change in Behavior Attribute there is increase by 1.090 in Total Impact.

### III CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

At the initial stage, recruitment is done where skills and qualifications are given weightage at the private sector whereas the public sector goes for the IQ Level along with the interview skills. Further at the selection stage, the focus is more at the training of employees for both the sector. Training at the probation period in banks is more focused for overall development of organization and working process.

As per the findings, there was relative difference between the public and private banks in regard to impact of training and development on the performance of employees. The impact of training and development for public bank is more favorable as compared to private banks on the basis of variables considered in the present study.

There is highly significant relationship between total impact and the variables of both types of banks. The model is a good fit which implies that the sample taken represents the population of the study. The public banks have higher scoring for the variables like HR outcomes, Relational attribute, Financial Attribute and development of employees as compared to the private banks. The private banks have a good focus on the variables like reliability, contextual aspect, behavioral aspect and leadership development.

In a service oriented industry such as banking, employees are the important assets and banks are efficiently working and managing their employees during their every phase of employment .It is concluded that in order to enhance the knowledge and skills of employees, public sector banks undertake training and development programmes to increase their efficiency so as the customer base dealing with the bank is satisfied. Growth of banking sector in India is the result of skilled manpower which is the outcome of training and development.

Private sector banks are mainly trying to retain their employees through training and development programmes and are focusing on the determinants like as reliability, relational and contextual attributes.

### REFERENCES

- [1] Praveen, M. and Venugopalan, D. (2011). Basics of banking and insurance. Malappuram Kerala, p.6.
- [2] Nakkiran, S. (1980). Co-operative banking in India. Coimbatore: Rainbow Publications, p.543.
- [3] Maheswari, V., (2015). Customer's perception and satisfaction of Banking services a study with reference to nationalized commercial banks In Madurai district.
- [4] Jadhav Ajit (2013), "A Study on Training and Development in Indian Banks", ABHINAV National Monthly Refereed Journal of Research in Commerce & Management, Vol.1, No.1, pp34-39.
- [5] French, W.The Personnel Management Process: Human Resource Administration, 3rd ed, NY: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1974
- [6] Armstrong, M. (2006). A Handbook of Human Resource Management Practice, London, UK: Kogan Page, Ltd.
- [7] Gktoday.in. (2011). History of Banking in India: Phase-II - General Knowledge Today. [online] Available at: <http://www.gktoday.in/blog/brief-history-of-banking-in-india-3/> [Accessed 14 Mar. 2013].

#### Books

- [8] Iyengar, G. (2007). Introduction to banking. New Delhi: Excel Books, p.74.
- [9] Gomez, C. (2011). Banking and Finance: Theory, Law and Practice. New Delhi: PHI Learning Pvt. Ltd., p.17.
- [10] Reddy, D. (2004). In: Banking Sector in Global Perspective. [online]