

# Periodic Research

## To Examine the Relationship between Job Satisfaction at Work Place and Employee Training

### Abstract

Work place training and development provides innumerable opportunities for career planning and development. Despite the importance, the researchers have missed to acknowledge the importance of satisfaction related to Training in researches related to job satisfaction and vice versa. This study examines the relationship between satisfaction with employer-provided workplace training and overall job satisfaction using Structural equation modelling.

**Keywords:** On the Job Training Satisfaction, Job Satisfaction.

### Introduction

One of the important roles of the HR department is to take a careful look at the impact that their policies and programmes have on the employees. According to The Academy of Human Resource Development (AHRD), HR profession has a multidisciplinary reach with focus on training, career development, and organizational development and the goal of improving systems and processes while enhancing the learning and performance of individuals, organizations, communities, and society (AHRD Standards on Ethics and Integrity, 1999). Watkins (1991) defines HRD as "the field of study and practice responsible for the fostering of a long-term, work-related learning capacity at the individual, group, and organizational level of organizations. [The] human resource developer works to enhance individuals' capacity to learn, to help groups overcome barriers to learning, and to help organizations create a culture which promotes continuous learning" (p. 253).

To foster the spirit and culture of development individual and Organizational behaviour needs to be modified. Humans are referred to as a resource as they have a capacity to produce something. Through training and development interventions, the productive power of humans can be enhanced. For organizational success, it is imperative to evaluate the training programmes, from the employee perspective so that the training opportunities provided must be put to best use and it also boosts employee satisfaction. Satisfaction with training and development is a major factor in decisions regarding people's careers (Violino, 2001). According to Blum & Kaplan (2000), the most important factor in job satisfaction was the opportunity to learn new skills. This was highlighted in a survey that they carried out of 271 network professionals at Lucentcare. Also a survey of 1000 employees of Xerox's European Business Service Centre found training and education were key priorities for staff ("Continuous Training," 2001). An important study of nurses in the United Kingdom found that dissatisfaction with promotion and training opportunities had a stronger impact on job satisfaction than workload or pay (Shields & Ward, 2001).

### Objective of the Study

Given the facts that Training is important for Organizational success and likewise Job satisfaction is an important construct for retaining talented workforce, the objective of the research paper is to study and examine the relationship between Job satisfaction with workplace and employee training.

### Review of Literature

Landy (1985) defined job training as "a set of planned activities on the part of an organization to increase the job knowledge and skills or to modify the attitudes and social behavior of its members in ways consistent with the goals of the organization and the requirements of the job" (p. 306). Armstrong (2001) has defined training as "A systematic development of the knowledge, skills and attitudes required by an individual to perform the given task adequately.



**Ameer Agrawal**

Assistant Professor,  
Deptt. of Commerce and Business  
Management,  
The Maharaja Sayajirao University  
of Baroda,  
Vadodara, Gujrat

Becker, Bose, & Freeman, (2006) opine that the key determinants of competitive advantage in global marketplaces, is the capabilities, knowledge, and skills of talented employees.

In order to perform well on the job, training programs play an important role to effectively develop knowledge, skills and capabilities of employees and in supporting all organizational members (Meyer & Allen, 1997).

Hafeez and Akbar (2015) reported that the more the employees receive training, the more efficient their level of performance would be.

Job satisfaction is defined as "how people feel about their jobs and different aspects of their jobs. It is the extent to which people like or dislike their jobs" (Spector, 1997, p. 2). Thierry and Koopmann-lawma (1984) have several perspectives on job satisfaction. They posit that job satisfaction may be the result of a behavioral cycle reflecting the individual's way of aiming at attractive outcomes. Robbins and Coulter (1996) stated that job satisfaction is an employee's general attitude towards his or her job.

Definitions of job satisfaction (Spector, 1997) and job training (Landy, 1985; Patrick, 2000) can be synthesized to create the term job training satisfaction, defined as how people feel about aspects of the job training they receive. Job training satisfaction is the extent to which people like or dislike the set of planned activities organized to develop the knowledge, skills, and attitudes required to effectively perform a given task or job. Made up of multiple constructs (similar to job satisfaction), job training satisfaction examines employees' feelings about the job training they receive as a whole. It is not simply evaluation of a single course or training program. Second, job training satisfaction is a measure of the formal or planned (rather than informal or incidental) training activities offered by the organization. In their study of employee training, Tannenbaum and colleagues (1991) opined that "training can induce positive or negative impressions and attitudes [that] trainees carry with them into the workplace" (p. 767). Those attitudes were so important, Bartlett (2001) argued, that they could even be considered as outcomes of training. Rowden and Conine (2003) opine that "a large part of the worker's sense of job satisfaction can be attributed to workplace learning opportunities". According to a survey conducted by Lowry, Simon, and Kimberley (2002) the employees who received training scored significantly higher on job satisfaction surveys than those who had not.

Thus, an organization's training efforts not only help in enhancing Job satisfaction but also trigger positive feelings about the Job and the Organization, which helps in retaining them and reinstating Organizational commitment.

In spite of this research, many job satisfaction research studies do not consider job training satisfaction as an element of overall job satisfaction, and many job satisfaction survey instruments do not include a "satisfaction with

workplace training" as an important component. Thus there is a dearth of research on job training satisfaction in general.

Schwepker's study of salespeople (2001) used a job satisfaction scale that included these constructs: the job, promotion and advancement, pay, supervisor, company policy and support, customers, and coworkers. Koustelios and Bagiatis (1997) studied job satisfaction in general laborers using a six-factor scale of satisfaction with working conditions, immediate supervisor, pay, the job itself, the organization, and opportunity for advancement. The dynamic global economy of today makes on going learning throughout an employee's career important. As a pre requisite for continued employability, employees must continue to learn and grow on the job. It is important to not only examine job training satisfaction in a broad sense but also delve deeper into the components of training like Organizational support for training and employee satisfaction with training and development. As the workplace continues to evolve, employee satisfaction with on-the-job training permeates to all aspects of overall job satisfaction. This study examined the relationship between job training satisfaction and overall job satisfaction.

#### **Hypothesis Developed**

**H1:** There is a significant and positive relationship between Organizational support for training and Opportunities and rewards at workplace.

**H2:** There is a significant and positive relationship between Organizational support for training and Supervision at work place.

**H3:** There is a significant and positive relationship between Organizational support for training and Fringe benefits at work place.

**H4:** There is a significant and positive relationship between Organizational support for training and the operating rules and procedures at work place.

**H5:** There is a significant and positive relationship between Organizational support for training and healthy relationship with co-workers.

**H6:** There is a significant and positive relationship between Organizational support for training and the nature of work performed.

**H7:** There is a significant and positive relationship between Employee Satisfaction with training and Opportunities and rewards at workplace.

**H8:** There is a significant and positive relationship between Employee Satisfaction with training and Supervision at work place.

**H9:** There is a significant and positive relationship between Employee Satisfaction with training and fringe benefits at work place.

**H10:** There is a significant and positive relationship between Employee Satisfaction with training and the operating rules and procedures at work place.

**H11:** There is a significant and positive relationship between Employee Satisfaction with training and healthy relationship with co-workers.

**H12:** There is a significant and positive relationship between Employee Satisfaction with training and the nature of work performed.

### Research Methodology Instrument Design

The questionnaire contained demographic measures for gender, experience and education. It contained two scales: Employee training satisfaction scale and overall Job Satisfaction scale adapted from earlier researches. The scales selected have been adapted to study employee training satisfaction and Overall Job satisfaction across different countries. The Job Training and Job Satisfaction Survey developed by Schmidt (2004) is a 55-item instrument developed to assess employee attitudes about aspects of the job and aspects of job training. However, only twenty four items from original JSS scale were adapted as they were relevant in our Indian conditions. The JSS items measure Organizational support for training, employee satisfaction with training and other variables of Job satisfaction like Opportunities and rewards, Supervision, Fringe benefits, Operating Rules and Procedures, Co-workers and the nature of work performed. The scales have been extensively used by researchers and their applicability is well established. It was assumed using these scales would ensure reliable results. The responses of consumers were taken on a five-point Likert scale with responses varying on the scale of 5 for strongly agree and 1 for strongly disagree.

### Sample

A self-administered questionnaire was used to collect data from an Oil and Gas PSU. Employees were selected through convenience sampling from across various departments. Respondents were requested to participate in the survey. They were informed about the purpose of the survey and many were hesitant and declined to participate. Data collection was done over a period of one month. Out of 150 questionnaires distributed only a total of 126 completed questionnaires were collected back. However, there were some 25 unfilled questionnaires which were illegible and removed. So, finally, 101 complete questionnaires were considered for the analysis. The sample consisted of 13.9 percent females and 86.1 percent males. The sample consisted of a large group of male population as the sample was drawn from mostly from the production and allied departments. The age profile of the respondents was mostly middle aged where 22.8 percent respondents belonged to the age group of 41-45 and 72.3 percent of them belonged to the group of 46 and above. All the employees were graduates which consisted of 34.7 percent and majority of them were post graduates like 65.3 percent. Majority of the employees possessed an experience of more than 10 years i.e. 62.4 percent, 30.7 percent contained an experience of 8 to 10 years and 5.9 percent respondents had an experience of 5 to 7 years. (See table I for details)

### Findings and Discussion

To understand applicability of the Job Training and Job Satisfaction Survey scale on Indian sample, exploratory factor analysis was run on the two scales. Factor analysis identifies relevant factors (Churchill et al., 2010). The results of factor analysis

for Job Training revealed two factors. The factors were similar to the original scale and labelled as Organizational support for training and employee satisfaction with training as the original factors. However, one item was removed as they had factor loadings < 0.5 and failed to meet Nunnally's (1967) desired score for scale development (Table II).

The JSS contained 16 items. Factor analysis revealed six factors. The factors were identified as Opportunities and Rewards, Friendly supervision, Fringe benefits, Operating Rules and Procedures, Healthy relationship between co-workers, and the nature of work performed. (Table III). One item was removed from the Opportunities and rewards as it had factor loadings of less than 0.5 and failed to fit Nunnally's (1967) recommended level of internal consistency for scale development.

CFA indicated that all factor loadings and corresponding t-values were statistically significant ( $p < 0.001$ ) and provided support for convergent validity. Cronbach Alpha values for scales ranged 0.744 to 0.849 (See Tables II-VI). Chi-square significance level ( $p$ ) for all factors is 0.000. Goodness of fit indices were within the acceptable range (Hair et al., 1995). These outcomes confirmed the adequacy of the analysis. Following this procedure, a structural model was established in which the relationship between the identified factors could be tested as input variables. The objective of the study was to study and examine the relationship between Job satisfaction at work place and employee training.

### Structural Equation Model Analysis

The dimensions obtained through the validation process were carried forward as independent variables of the proposed model. In the model, relationships between all the factors obtained from the factor analysis were considered independently. The analysis enabled causal relationships that existed between dimensions to be assessed. Standardized residual values for the model were less than .05 and suggested a good model fit. The chi square represented a significance level ( $\chi^2 = 248.113$ ;  $p = .000$ ) below the threshold of 0.05. Regarding goodness of fit parameters, the Comparative Fit Index (CFI), and the Goodness of Fit Index (GFI) of 0.829 (>0.90), implied strong unidimensionality (Hair et al., 1995). The Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA) takes into account the error of approximation in the model (Byrne, 2010). This fit index ranges from 0.05 to 0.08 indicating good fit. In the current study RMSEA = 0.056, GFI = 0.829, TLI = 0.922, and CFI = 0.936 (>0.90). These fit indices suggested good fit for the model to the data.

### Causal Relationship Findings

Based on standardized path coefficients and significance levels, the hypothesized relationship that there is a positive relationship between Organizational support for training and Opportunities and rewards at workplace was rejected. The standardized path coefficients were insignificant ( $\beta = 0.029$  &  $0.790$ ). H1 was rejected. Organizational support for Training negatively influenced the healthy relationship between Fringe

benefits ( $\beta = -0.049$ ,  $p > 0.05$ ) and co-workers ( $\beta = -0.051$ ,  $p > 0.05$ ). So Hypothesis H3 and H5 were rejected. Organizational support for Training positively influenced the healthy relationship between Healthy supervision ( $\beta = 0.218$ ,  $p > 0.05$ , Operating rules and procedures ( $\beta = 0.315$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ) and Nature of work performed ( $\beta = 0.110$ ,  $p > 0.05$ ). Thus, the hypothesis H2 and H6 were rejected. But since the p value of H4 is significant, we accept the Hypothesis that there is a significant and positive relationship between Organizational support for training and the operating rules and procedures at work place.

Based on standardized path coefficients and significance levels, the hypothesis that there is a positive relationship between Employee Satisfaction with training and Opportunities and rewards at workplace was rejected. The standardized path coefficients were insignificant ( $\beta = -0.016$  &  $P > 0.05$ ). H7 was rejected. The hypothesis that the relationship between Employee Satisfaction with training positively influenced the Hypothesis number 8; Healthy Supervision ( $\beta = 0.092$ ,  $p > 0.05$ ), 10; Rules and Procedures ( $\beta = 0.202$ ,  $p > 0.05$ ) and number 12; Work performance ( $\beta = 0.002$ ,  $p > 0.05$ ). However, since the standardized path coefficients were insignificant we rejected the Hypothesis. The Hypothesis that the relationship between Employee satisfaction with training was found to be significant with Fringe benefits ( $\beta = 0.235$ ,  $p < 0.05$ , Hypothesis H 9) and Co – workers ( $\beta = -0.286$ ,  $p < 0.05$ , Hypothesis N 11). Since the path coefficients of H9 and H11 are significant, we accept the hypothesis.

#### Discussion

Previous studies on Job training satisfaction suggested a positive and significant relationship with overall Job satisfaction (Schmidt, 2007) however, in the present study not all the hypothesis were significant and supported. This may mean several things to employees, to organizations, and to researchers. Results of surveys noted in the introduction are a testament to the importance of job training in the minds of employees. This study confirms that employees value training and deem it a necessary part of the job. These connections to the larger view of the organization are extremely important to HRD practitioners, because they show the powerful relationship between training at the employee level and overall organizational performance. Organizations that offer effective job training may find they have better trained, more satisfied employees. As a precedent of Job training satisfaction the respondents shared a healthy relationship with co-workers and were happy and satisfied with the fringe benefits that the organization provided. As an outcome of Organizational support for training the respondents complied with the rules and procedures of the organization. The rest of the Job satisfaction variables like Supervision, Work performance, opportunities and rewards are not supported. As the data was collected from a public sector undertaking the employees there perhaps are strictly supervised, do not have a healthy relation with co-workers and since there is strict division of work, sometimes the routine tasks are disliked by the

employees. The employee's job design needs to possess a lot of Task independence and task identity. This brings a lot of Job satisfaction.

#### Managerial Implications and Limitations

The results of this study have several implications for future research and practice in the field of human resource development. In order to achieve Organizational success, it is imperative for the HR managers to provide training interventions to the employees which should be followed by various Opportunities for advancement and rewards, a friendly supervision, rules and procedures that do not inhibit meritorious performances, healthy peer relationship and the work which imbues a sense of pride in the minds of the employees. This will motivate the employees to participate in the training activities whole heartedly. Just as individual elements of job satisfaction can be examined, assessed, and potentially modified, so too can individual elements of job training satisfaction. This finding gives HRD practitioners and researchers a better understanding of the concept of job training satisfaction. Satisfaction with job training should be considered as an aspect of overall job satisfaction, and HRD practitioners should consider job training satisfaction from the standpoint of the employee in developing and implementing training programs.

From a research perspective, satisfaction with job training should be considered an element of job satisfaction and be included as a construct in job satisfaction surveys. Researchers studying job training satisfaction should consider time, content, and methodology as constructs of job training satisfaction.

Several limitations of this study should be considered together with the conclusion drawn above. Firstly, the small sample size may limit the generalization of this study. Furthermore, this study employed the use of convenience sampling, which cannot be considered representative of the population. The data obtained in this study might have been biased as it is collected from only one organization. This relationship can be further analyzed by collecting data from a few large private enterprises.

#### References

1. *Academy of Human Resource Development. (1999). Standards on ethics and integrity (1st ed.). Darlene Russ-Eft (Ed). Baton Rouge, LA: AHRD.*
2. *Michael Armstrong and Stephen Taylor (1997) 13<sup>th</sup> Edition, Armstrong's Handbook of Human Resource Management Practice; Kogan Page Limited.*
3. *Becker, W., Bose, A., & Freeman, V. (2006). An executive take on the top business trends: A McKinsey Global Survey.*
4. *Blum, R., & Kaplan, J. M. (2000, April 17). Network professionals' job satisfaction. Lucent Technologies Network Care.*
5. *CA Bartlett, and S Ghoshal (2002) MIT Sloan Management Review; Building competitive edge through people.*

6. Churchill G. A., Iacobucci, D., & Israel, D. (2010). *Marketing research: A South Asian perspective*. India: Cenage Learning.
7. Continuous training is vital for job satisfaction. (2001, September 6). *Irish Jobs Column*.
8. CT Conine Jr. and R W Rowden (2006) *Ethical climate and Job Satisfaction in small businesses; Journal of Business and Entrepreneurship; Durrant Vol18. Issue 2 (October) 35-48.*
9. Diannah S. Lowry, Alan Simon, Nell Kimberley (2002) ; *Toward Improved Employment Relations Practices of Casual Employees in the New South Wales Registered Clubs Industry; Human Resource Development Quarterly, vol. 13, no. 1, Spring 2002*
10. Hair, J.F., Anderson, R.E., Tatham, R.L. & Black, W.C. (1995) *Multivariate Data Analysis*. Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cleffs, NJ.
11. John P. Meyer, David J. Stanley, Lynne Herscovitch, and Laryssa Topolnytsky (2002) *Affective, Continuance, and Normative Commitment to the Organization: A Meta-analysis of Antecedents, Correlates, and Consequences; Journal of Vocational Behavior 61, 20-52*
12. Koustelios and Bagiatis (1997) *Employee Satisfaction Inventory (ESI) Development of a scale to measure satisfaction of Greek employees; Educational and Psychological measurement, Vol 57no:3; June 1997, 469-476.*
13. By Paul E. Spector (1997); *Job Satisfaction: Application, Assessment, Causes, and Consequences; Sage Publications, London.*
14. Landy, F. J. (1985). *Psychology of work behavior*. Homewood, IL: Dorsey Press
15. Nunnally, J. (1967). *Psychometric Methods*. NewYork ,NY: McGraw-Hill
16. Schwepker, Jr., C. H. (2001) *Ethical climates relationship to job satisfaction, organizational commitment and turnover intention in the sales force. Journal of Business Research. 54 (1) 39-52*
17. Shields, M. A., & Ward, M. (2001). *Improving nurse retention in the National Health Service in England: The impact of job satisfaction on intentions to quit. Journal of Health Economics, 20(5), 677-701.*
18. JE Mathieu, SI Tannenbaum (1992) *Influences of individual and situational characteristics on measures of training effectiveness; Academy of management*
19. Uzma Hafeez and Waqar Akbar (2015) *Impact of Training on Employees Performance; Business Management and Strategy ISSN 2157-6068 2015, Vol. 6, No. 1*

20. Violino, B. (2001, August 6). *(Still) in the money. Network Computing, 12(16), 66*
21. Watkins, K. E. (1991). *Many voices: Defining human resource development from different disciplines. Adult Education Quarterly, 41(4), 241-255*

**Table 1: Sample Profile of The Study**

Variable	Categories	Frequency	%
Gender	Male	87	86.1
	Female	14	13.9
Age	31-35 yrs	2	2
	36-40 yrs	3	3
	41-45 yrs	23	22.8
	46 and Onwards	73	72.3
Education	Diploma	-	-
	Graduate	35	34.7
	Post-Graduate	66	65.3
Experience	2-4 yr	1	1
	5-7 yrs	6	5.9
	8-10 yrs	31	30.7
	More than 10 yrs	63	62.4

**Table 2: Communalities**

	Communalities	
	Initial	Extraction
OS1	1.000	.648
OS2	1.000	.785
OS3	1.000	.676
OS4	1.000	.531
ES1	1.000	.738
ES2	1.000	.744
ES3	1.000	.679
ES4	1.000	.605
OR1	1.000	.714
OR2	1.000	.749
OR3	1.000	.694
OR4	1.000	.595
OR5	1.000	.578
S1	1.000	.763
S2	1.000	.806
FB1	1.000	.795
FB2	1.000	.786
RP1	1.000	.797
RP2	1.000	.758
WP1	1.000	.696
WP2	1.000	.765
WP3	1.000	.689
CO11	1.000	.746
CO22	1.000	.713
Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.		

**Table 3 Rotated Component Matrix**

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
<b>ES1</b>	0.835							
<b>ES2</b>	0.838							
<b>ES3</b>	0.810							
<b>ES4</b>	0.750							
<b>OS1</b>		0.766						
<b>OS2</b>		0.863						
<b>OS3</b>		0.788						
<b>OR1</b>			0.668					
<b>OR2</b>			0.845					
<b>OR3</b>			0.702					
<b>OR4</b>			0.578					
<b>S1</b>				0.833				
<b>S2</b>				0.856				
<b>FB1</b>					0.777			
<b>FB2</b>					0.797			
<b>RP1</b>						0.629		
<b>RP2</b>						0.806		
<b>CO11</b>							0.632	
<b>CO22</b>							0.498	
<b>WP1</b>								0.794
<b>WP2</b>								0.867
<b>WP3</b>								0.805

**(Table 4) Reliability of Scales**

Variable	Item	Corrected Item-to-total correlation	Cronbach's $\alpha$	$\lambda$	AVE	Composite Reliability
Employee Satisfaction with training and development	ES1	0.707	0.849	0.835	0.65	0.88
	ES2	0.755		0.838		
	ES3	0.674		0.810		
	ES4	0.618		0.750		
Organizational Support for training	OS1	0.561	0.767	0.766	0.65	0.85
	OS2	0.693		0.863		
	OS3	0.552		0.788		
Opportunities and Rewards	OR1	0.372	0.744	0.668	0.50	0.79
	OR2	0.685		0.845		
	OR3	0.631		0.702		
	OR4	0.494		0.578		
Supervision	S1	0.731	0.844	0.833	0.713	0.832
	S2	0.731		0.856		
Fringe Benefits	FB1	0.769	0.869	0.777	0.62	0.76
	FB2	0.769		0.797		
Operating Rules and Procedures	RP1	0.686	0.809	0.629	0.522	0.683
	RP2	0.686		0.806		
Coworkers	CO11	0.703	0.826	0.632	0.323	0.485
	CO22	0.703		0.498		
The nature of work performed	WP1	0.629	0.815	0.794	0.426	0.907
	WP2	0.710		0.867		
	WP3	0.663		0.805		

**Discriminant Validity**

	Organ. Support for Training	Employee Satisfaction With Training	Opportunities And Rewards	Supervision	Fringe Benefits	Operating Rules And Procedures	Co-workers	The nature of work performed
Organ. Support for training	<b>0.806</b>							
Employee Satisfaction With training	0.058	<b>0.806</b>						
Opportunities And Rewards	0.034	0.0068	<b>0.707</b>					
Supervision	0.0357	0.0148	0.030	<b>0.844</b>				
Fringe Benefits	0.0001	0.055	0.112	0.082	<b>0.78</b>			
Operating Rules And Procedures	0.104	0.049	0.101	0.043	0.004	<b>0.722</b>		
Co-workers	0.017	0.068	0.006	0.012	0.029	0.022	<b>0.568</b>	
The nature of work performed	0.008	0.000	0.024	0.000	0.026	0.028	0.1274	<b>0.652</b>

(Table VI)

**Explanatory Power and Fit Indices of Models**

Fit Indices and R2	Recommended Value
X <sup>2</sup>	248.113
df	189
X <sup>2</sup> /df	1.313
GFI	0.829
CFI	0.936
TLI	0.922
RMSEA	0.056
R <sup>2</sup>	63

(Table VII) SEM Results of the Model

Paths	Coefficients (β)	t-Value	Total Effect	Hypothesis Supported
Organizational Support- Supervision	0.218	1.869	0.218	NS
Organizational Support- Fringe Benefits	-0.049	-0.432	-0.049	NS
Organizational Support-Co-workers	-0.051	-0.452	-0.051	NS
Organizational Support-Rules and Procedures	0.315	2.641	0.315	S
Organizational Support-Nature of work performed	0.110	0.961	0.110	NS
Organizational Support-Opportunities and Rewards	0.029	0.266	0.029	NS
Employee Satisfaction-Supervision	0.092	0.815	0.092	NS
Employee Satisfaction-Fringe Benefits	0.235	2.014	0.235	S
Employee Satisfaction- Rules and Procedures	0.202	1.747	0.202	NS
Employee Satisfaction-Opportunities and Rewards	-0.016	-0.149	-0.016	NS
Employee Satisfaction- Coworkers	-0.286	-2.385	-0.286	S
Employee Satisfaction- Nature of Work performed	0.002	0.020	0.002	NS

**Model of the Relationship between Job Satisfaction at work place and Employee Training**

