



The Relationship between Employee Training and Development and Job Satisfaction in Uganda Management Institute: An Empirical Study

Epiphany Odubuker Picho

Muni University

Abstract

The purpose of the study was to investigate the relationship between employee training and development and job satisfaction in Uganda Management Institute – Uganda. A cross-sectional survey design was used with the sample size of 118. Purposive, stratified and systematic sampling techniques were used to select respondents. Data analysis involved frequencies and percentages, Spearman rank correlation, coefficient of determination, regression, and ANOVA. There was a weak positive correlation ($\rho = .343$) between employee training and developments and job satisfaction. The coefficient of determination expressed into percentage revealed that employee training and developments accounted for 11.8% of variation in job satisfaction.

Key Words: Human Resource Management (HRM), employee training and development, job satisfaction, Uganda Management Institute.

Introduction

Job satisfaction viewed as a positive emotional state resulting from the pleasure a worker derives from the job, a state where one's needs and one's outcomes match well and conceptualized in terms of satisfaction with work, involvement in work and commitment to work. Job satisfaction is a highly studied phenomenon because many experts believe that it has some relationship with labour market behaviour and is likely to influence productivity, work effort and decisions of employees to leave a job (Gazioglu & Tasel, 2002). Organizations have significant effects on the people who work for them as evidenced by how people feel about their work (Spector, 1997).

Employees are expected to be happy with their work; this makes job satisfaction an issue of substantial importance for both employer and employees. Unfortunately, many organizations have failed to include job satisfaction on their priority lists (Gazioglu & Tasel, 2002), perhaps because they have failed to assess its actual impact or failed to measure it. Despite the emphasis on job satisfaction worldwide, one of the limitations in literature is that it is not yet clear as to how exactly employee training and development as a Human Resource practice affect job satisfaction. This study focused on employee training and development and established its effect on job satisfaction.

Ideas and innovations which had indirect or direct influence on people management dates back in the 1780s and through to the twentieth and twenty-first centuries. Chronologically, there has been development from Social Reformers' in the 1780s to Welfare or Caring from 1840s to 1902 and then to Employment Management from 1910s to 1920s; this was followed by Personnel Management from 1920s to 1940s; in the 1940s to 1960s was Specialist Personnel Management; in the 1960s to 1980s was Professional Personnel Management and finally late 1980s - 1990s and Beyond it became Human Resource Management.

There are two schools of thought about HRM in this respect; the first camp argues that HRM does not suggest anything new but it is simply a renaming of the orthodox personnel management function. They contend that HRM is a synonym of personnel management and that it is merely 're-titling' the personnel management function in organizations (Fowler, 1987; Blyton and Turnbull, 1992, Legge, 1995, Torrington and Hall, 1989).

Several expressions have been used to deliver this message. To some writers HRM is 'traditional personnel administration dressed up' (Sisson, 1990; Hendry, 1995); and it is regarded as either the 'old wine in new bottles' or the 'Emperor's new clothes' (Armstrong, 2007). To others it is 'personnel management re-christened' (Strauss, 1999); a 'wolf in sheep's skin' and the 'epitome of good personnel' (Keenoy, 1990); as well as denoting the 're-labeling' or 'repackaging' of progressive personnel management (Torrington and Hall, 1989; Bratton and Gold, 1999). In this school of thought, the concept of HRM is fundamentally indistinguishable from personnel management on the grounds that there is little, if any, substantive difference between HRM and its predecessors, including Personnel management.

This camp opines that the term human resource management does not give a new meaning to what has traditionally been called 'personnel management', but instead, is used to accommodate or capture the prevailing mood and contemporary fashion (Redman and Wilkinson, 2001, Storey, 1992). This point is well echoed by Bratton and Gold who posit that the vocabulary of management, like language as a whole, is not immune to fashion, with a growing awareness among practitioners and management scholars of using gender-neutral language, human resource management has been adopted by some to avoid gender-biased phrases such as manpower planning and manpower administration (1999, p.14). In the developing countries such as African organizations, the terms 'manpower management', 'manpower administration' and 'personnel' have been used predominantly in the public sector, particularly in the public services for a long time. It is in the recent past that the term HRM was adopted to describe the employee management function.

According to Guest (1987), from the foregoing HRM, arguably, does not offer anything new; it is simply "good personnel management described in a fashionable way". The supporters of this viewpoint contend that proactive and dynamic personnel practitioners have always applied concepts that are embodied in HRM (Cumming, 1993; Torrington,