Chapter-IV

DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Words</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classical Test Theory (CTT)</td>
<td>Customary Psychometric method such as factor analysis and Cranach’s Contrast Ratio Method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>A question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response</td>
<td>An answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item total correlation</td>
<td>Measure of the relationship between an item and the total score from the set of items surrounded by the range. High correlation point toward a strong connection linking the thing and the level grade.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Independence</td>
<td>Control of external factors affecting the design and analysis of questionnaire. There should be no significant association among the items.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polytomous Response Category</td>
<td>An item having two or more response categories. Here a 5-Point likert type scale.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale</td>
<td>Consists of multiple items that measure a single domain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Error of measurement (SEM)</td>
<td>Describes an expected observed score fluctuation due to error in the dimension instrument. Standard Deviation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Traditional approaches to quantity scales (i.e., Classical Test Theory) are based on averages or simple summations of the numerous items. In contrast, CTT models are founded on the prospect that a person will make a exacting response according to their level of the fundamental latent variable. Thus, CTT is equivalent to logistic regression, which is widely used in medical/psycho-social statistics. The objective is to model each item by estimating the properties describing its performance.

Classical test theory (CTT) has been the base for quantity theory for over 80 years. The theoretical foundations, assumptions, and extensions of the basic location of CTT have allowed for the expansion of some excellent psychometrically sound scales.
Because total test scores are most regularly used to make decisions or relate to other variable of interests. Shifting all the way throughout item-levels data may seem repetitive and uninteresting. However, the overall tally is only as good as the sum of its parts, and that means its items. Several analyses are available to assess item uniqueness.

**Assessment of Test Items:**

The approaches obtainable here have been built-up within the hypothetical framework of Classical Test theory. At the outset, it will be unspecified that a test is self-possessed of a number of items and has been administered to a example of respondents. Once the respondents have finished the test, the analyses can begin. There are several pieces of information that can be used to settle on if an item is useful and/or how it performs in relation to the other items on the test.

**Descriptive Statistics:**

At whatever time a statistics arrangement is examine, descriptive statistics comes first in our mind and work, and the mainly widespread of these are the mean and variation. The matching is real for experiment substance. The means and standard deviations of the matter can propose clue about which objects that will be helpful and which ones will not be helpful. For instance, if the variation of a thing is at a low level, this means that there is less inconsistency on the item and it possibly will not be practical. If the mean response to a thing is 4.5 on a 5-point scale, then the item is critically twisted and possibly will not make available the sort of in series desired. Therefore, while it is not customary to give the impression of being at item-level descriptive statistics in the majority investigation application, in helping to create and validate test being the critical I move. Normally, advanced the inconsistency of the thing and the added mean of the thing is at the middle position of the revealed, the change for the better thing shall be carried out.

Means and variances for items scored on a range (such as a five-point Likert-type scale) are calculated simply the way other means and variances are calculated. For
dichotomous items, they can be planned in the similar approach, however there are origin that make available much simplest of formulas.

The mean of a dichotomous item is equal to the quantity of individuals who endorsed/passed the item (denoted p). The variance of a dichotomous item is calculated by multiplying p × q (where q is the proportion of individuals who failed, or did not support, the thing). The standard deviation, then, of dichotomy substance

**Classical Test Theory – References**

**Gerianne de Klerk**

CTT consists of mainly 4 steps of Statistical Analysis.

1. Basic examination of effects of factors on the questionnaire and its analysis.


3. In-depth questionnaire scrutiny – Waited summation scale (WSS) method.

4. Inter-Intra Analysis – Various types of statistical analysis

The basic study of effects includes testing of effect of age/experience on the various parameters

- Nature of items and responses should be independent.
- Questionnaire study includes the conclusion part with respect to WSS.

References


A non-parametric method for one-way investigation of variance used to determine if three or more samples initiate from the same distribution. The Kruskal-Wallis test fundamentally a standard one-way examination of inconsistency, with position assign to the statistics point replaced by the facts point themselves, and is
equivalent to the Mann-Whitney U test, but appropriate to more than two sample groups.

Kruskal-Wallis also compares among the medians of two or more samples to settle on if the samples have come from different populations. If the distributions prove not to be usual and/or the variances are different then the Kruskal-Wallis should be used to match up to the group. If a considerable differentiation is originated then there is dissimilarity among the uppermost and lowest median. A non-parametric multiple comparison tests must then be used to determine whether the intermediate shore also is significantly different. These are found in UNISTAT and MANSHEAR 2.0 Software’s, but must be set up on a spreadsheet in Excel or done by hand.

**Reliability and Validity:**

The validity of a test is the amount to which differences in scores reflect differences in the measured characteristic. Analytical validity is a measure of the usefulness of a measuring instrument as a forecaster. Evidence of projecting authenticity is resolute by the correlation between results and actual behavior. Assemble validity is the extent to which a measuring instrument measures what it intends to determine.

Dependability is the extent to which a measurement is repeatable with the same results. A dimension may be dependable and not applicable. On the other hand, if a dimension is suitable, then it also is dependable and if it is not dependable, then it cannot be suitable. One way to show dependability is to show control by repetition of the test with the same results.

**Quality of Research Patton (2001)** in the article says power plus dependability can be the 2 feature wherein several qualitative investigators having distress regarding scheming of a reading, analyze consequences and judging dominance in the learning. Power on the whole, has a concern for the quantity to which a good reason is exact or truthful in addition to the amount to which a sentence is judged to enclose in a interpret in a accurate technique .We have 3 major type of legitimacy in qualitative investigation: inner legitimacy, outer authority also build accuracy.
Construct power Merriam having introduced the way of legitimacy throughout the facts gathering also facts code, mainly put up strength. Its reference was to set up appropriate procedures on behalf of the perception investigation from this learning. Many techniques are been of use for enhancing put up legitimacy.

Hsieh and Shannon (2005) recommended with the purpose of the facts code in intended for comfortable examination and ongoing through a speculation or appropriate investigate replica thus groups are created from the structure. In this article, they have selected 2 important categories. They can be 2 construction slab of the hypothetical structure in this learning, capacity preservation and aptitude expansion.

They took assembling of various categories for the reason that they accordingly directed towards response of the important subordinate question along with figuring the resolution of the main analysis matter. There will be significant changes in the employees Expansion which will go through High Leverage Training and summative evaluation in the training programme of the Quick service restaurants. Regarding the Human values, usage was done of the simple theories of Human values along with few ideas at the same time as a structure in the lead where facts were coordinated plus composed. The investigation of this subordinate group helped us to come to a wrapping up about significant changes in the employees Development which will go through High Leverage Training and summative evaluation in the training programme of the Quick service restaurants. As for our strategies, Choice was made obtainable in addition to approval and applied notional perception plus groups.

During the learning, principal information was collected with the help of questionnaire and secondary statistics with the help of presumption appraise websites, and research articles. As the over talked about feature, making an intention decision was possible. Consequently arguing that our construct validity is high.

In-house legitimacy:

In-house legitimacy gives reference towards the intensity of consequent plus resemblance of conclusion with relation to actuality. In-house legitimacy plays an extremely vital responsibility towards reaching a conclusion.
Recommendation means facts which do not communicate on behalf of themselves. The investigators are individuals in performance of the responsibility of interpreter’s. Interpretive soundness being gained for attainment of degree from the participant viewpoint, opinion, intention also know-how is specifically unwritten also being on the report. Many strategy be capable of furthermore useful with the purpose of improve In-house legitimacy. The author suggest the practice of triangulation being used by more than 1 researcher, in addition to moving away check by means of respondents, frequent explanation, friend appraisal along with combined mode of investigation. To begin with, getting improved combined acceptance along with clarification, investigation was conducted. Next, usage of 2 source of in sequence and facts which can be main facts with the help of questionnaires and less important facts. In brief, we conclusion is that our In-house legitimacy is on a higher scale. Consequences of a investigated learning are generalized, with reference to exterior strength of a learning. Exterior legitimacy concern the degree to which the empirical along with theoretical consequences which should have been on application with other situation excluding the current situation learning. Whereas in qualitative investigation before removal of fear to legitimacy is fewer probability, as qualitative study being extra inductive, also its center is mostly on tolerant in sequence towards a convinced degree than captivating in common to the worldwide.

Merriam (1998) suggests two applicable strategies for enhancing the option of simplification of case study: rich thick explanation which requires enough background provided, modal group which describe how distinctive the observable fact considered is. These method permit the reader to put together appropriate comparison associated to their individual condition of dealings.
Reliability:

Refers to ability of other interested persons to repeat the research and receive the same results. According to Joppe (2000) dependability is the extent to which results are reliable over time and an accurate illustration of the total population under study is referred to as reliability and if the results of a study can be reproduced under a similar line of attack, then the research instrument is considered to be reliable.

According to Yin the main method to guarantee dependability is to record all the steps conducted in details, like a administrator looks after every your action (Yin, 2003). So we documented all our steps carefully. We constructed questionnaire and used it for 500 companies, in order to ensure the quality of conclusions made. Importantly, we attach the questions and the answers to our thesis to ensure the reader that our explore results are reliable. In our research we used same questionnaires for all companies.

In sum, in our descriptive research, we use the qualitative research method, applying both secondary and primary data colleting approaches in order to interact as much as we can with the theoretical levels. Whenever we gather the first hand data or secondary data, we emphasize the strength and reliability of our research. We emphasize the validity and reliability of our research.
DETAILED STATISTICAL ANALYSIS:

Item Response Distribution Of Quick Service Restaurants I

**Fig. 4.1: Item Response Distribution for QSR 1**

**Source:** This Diagram reveals that the item response distribution for quick service restaurants I (Questionnaire 1)

a) Strongly agree

b) Agree

c) Neither /nor

d) Disagree

e) Strongly Disagree.
Out of 175 responses 123 are male and 52 are female.

**Source:** This diagram reveals the Gender Distribution of Responses in Quick Service Restaurants I (Questionnaire 1)

a) Male

b) Female
**Distribution of Responses – Age wise (Quick Service Restaurants 1)**

Fig. 4.3: *Distribution of Number of Responses - Age wise*

**Source:** This diagram reveals the distribution of Responses - Age between 18–50 (Questionnaire 1)
Distribution of Responses according to Longevity of Service (Quick Service Restaurants-1)

**Fig. 4.4: Distribution of Responses according to Longevity of Service QSR-1**

**Source:** This Diagram Reveals that the Distribution of Responses according to the longevity of Service in Quick service Restaurant-I (Questionnaire 1)

- a) Less than a six months
- b) Six months to one year
- c) One to three Years
- d) Above three years
Item-Response Distribution

Questionnaire analysis of QSR 1

Fig.4.5: Item-Response Distribution Quick Service restaurants I.

Source: This diagram reveals the item Response Distribution of Quick Service Restaurant-I. (Questionnaire-1)

a) Standard Error

b) Mean

Most answers given - B (Max 77, Mean 48.77, Median 49 with SE 3.67, P<0.01)
Fig. 4.6: Item-Response Distribution QSR2

Source: This Diagram reveals that the Item Response distribution of Quick Service Restaurants-II (Questionnaire-1)

a) Very Advanced

b) Advanced

c) Somewhat Advanced

d) Less Advanced
Gender Distribution of Responses of Quick Service Restaurants - 2

![Gender Distribution of Responses](image)

**Fig.4.7: Gender Distribution of Responses QSR II**

**Source:** This Diagram Reveals the Gender Distribution of Responses in Quick Service Restaurants-II(Questionnaire 1)

a) Male

b) Female
**Fig.4.8: Distribution of Responses – Age wise QSR II**

This Diagram reveals the distribution of Responses — Age between 18-50 years (Questionnaire-1)
Distribution of Responses according to Longevity of Service Quick Service Restaurants - 2

**Fig. 4.9: Distribution of Responses according to Longevity of Service QSR II**

**Source:** This Diagram Reveals that the Distribution of Responses according to the longevity of Service in Quick Service Restaurant-II (Questionnaire-1)

a) Less than a six months
b) Six months to one year
c) One to three Years
d) Above three years
Item-Response Distribution of Quick Service Restaurants - 2

Fig.4.10: Item-Response Distribution QSR II

Source: This diagram reveals the item Response Distribution of Quick Service restaurants II. (Questionnaire 1)

a) Standard Error

b) Mean

Most answers given - A (Mean 7.69 with SE 1.15, P < 0.01)
Fig. 4.11: Distribution of Item-Responses of QSR III

**Source:** This Diagram reveals that the Item Response distribution of Quick service Restaurants III (Questionnaire 1)

a) Very Advanced

b) Advanced

c) Somewhat Advanced

d) Less Advanced
Fig. 4.12: Gender Distribution of Responses of QSR III

Source: This Diagram Reveals the Gender Distribution of Responses in Quick Service Restaurants III (Questionnaire 1)

a) Male
b) Female
Age Distribution of Responses of Quick Service Restaurants - 3

**Fig.4.13: Age Distribution of Responses of QSR III**

**Source:** This Diagram reveals the distribution of Responses – Age between 18-50 years (Questionnaire-1)
Distribution of Responses according to Longevity of Service Quick Service Restaurants - 3

Fig. 4.14: Gender Distribution of Responses of QSR III

Source: This Diagram Reveals that the Distribution of Responses according to the longevity of Service in Quick Service Restaurant-III (Questionnaire 1)

a) Less than a six months

b) Six months to one year

c) One to three Years

d) Above three years
**Item-Response Distribution of Quick Service Restaurants - 3**

**Fig.4.15: Item-Response Distribution of QSR III**

**Source:** This diagram reveals the item Response Distribution of Quick Service Restaurant-III. (Questionnaire 1)

a) Standard Error

b) Mean

Most answers given - B (Mean 8.77 with SE 1.17, P < 0.001)
**Distribution of Item-Responses of – High Level Employees**

![Distribution of Item-Responses of High Level Employees](image)

**Fig.4.16: Distribution of Item-Responses of High Level Employees**

**Source:** This Diagram reveals that the Item Response distribution of High Level Employees. (Questionnaire II)

a) Very Advanced

b) Advanced

c) Somewhat Advanced

d) Less Advanced
Gender Distribution of Responses High Level Employees

![Graph showing gender distribution]

**Fig.4.17: Gender Distribution of Responses of High Level Employees.**

**Source:** This Diagram Reveals the Gender Distribution of Responses of High Level Employees. (Questionnaire-II)

a) Male

b) Female
Age Distribution of Responses High Level Employees

No of Responses

Fig. 4.18: Age Distribution of Responses of High Level Employees.

Source: This Diagram reveals the distribution of Responses – Age between 18-50 years (Questionnaire-II)
Distribution of Responses according to Longetivity of Service High Level Employees

Fig. 4.19: Distribution of Responses according to Longetivity of Service of High Level Employees.

Source: This Diagram Reveals that the Distribution of Responses according to the longevity of Service of High Level Employees (Questionnaire II)

a) Less than a six months
b) Six months to one year
c) One to three Years
d) Above three years
Item-Response Distribution High Level Employees

Fig.4.20: Item-Response Distribution of High Level Employees.

Source: This diagram reveals the item Response Distribution of High Level Employees. (Questionnaire II)

a) Standard Error

b) Mean

Most answers given - A (Mean 10.18 with SE 1.17 P < 0.001)
Fig. 4.21: Figure showing distribution of responses of QSR-I (Questionnaire-I)

**Source:** Pie chart showing distribution of responses of QSR-I (Questionnaire-I)

a) Very Advanced

b) Advanced

c) Somewhat Advanced

d) Less Advanced
Fig. 4.22: Figure showing Pearson’s Consistency of Responses of QSR I

Source: The standard error in all cases is within tolerance limits. Therefore, less risk factors, more consistence responses.
**Fig. 4.23: Figure showing the Distribution of Responses of QSR II**

**Source:** Pie chart showing distribution of responses of QSR-II (Questionnaire-I)

a) Very Advanced

b) Advanced

c) Somewhat Advanced

d) Less Advanced
**Fig. 4.24: Figure showing Pearson’s Consistency of Responses of QSR II**

**Source:** The standard error in all cases is within tolerance limits. Therefore, less risk factors, more consistence responses.
**Fig. 4.25: Figure showing the Distribution of Responses of QSR III**

**Source:** Pie chart showing distribution of responses of QSR-III (Questionnaire-I)

- a Very Advanced
- b Advanced
- c Somewhat Advanced
- d Less Advanced
Fig. 4.26: Figure showing Pearson’s Consistency of Responses of QSR-II

**Source:** The standard error in all cases is within tolerance limits. Therefore, less risk factors, more consistence responses.
Fig. 4.27: Figure showing the Distribution of Responses - High level employees

**Source:** Pie chart showing distribution of responses of High Level Employees (Questionnaire II)

- a) Very Advanced
- b) Advanced
- c) Somewhat Advanced
- d) Less Advanced
**Fig. 4.28: Figure showing Pearson’s Consistency of Responses of High Level Employees**

**Source:** The standard error in all cases is within tolerance limits. Therefore, less risk factors, more consistence responses.
Table-4.1: Descriptive statistics of Item-responses (QSR-1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>38.85</td>
<td>48.77</td>
<td>38.85</td>
<td>35.23</td>
<td>11.46</td>
<td>1.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Error</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>15.72</td>
<td>13.22</td>
<td>11.01</td>
<td>14.08</td>
<td>8.46</td>
<td>4.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample Variance</td>
<td>246.97</td>
<td>174.69</td>
<td>121.31</td>
<td>198.19</td>
<td>71.60</td>
<td>20.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurtosis</td>
<td>-0.88</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>-0.24</td>
<td>-1.45</td>
<td>3.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skewness</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.81</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>2.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidence Level (95.0%)</td>
<td>9.50</td>
<td>7.99</td>
<td>6.66</td>
<td>8.51</td>
<td>5.11</td>
<td>2.72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Descriptive Statistics of Item Responses (QSR I)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>a</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>c</th>
<th>d</th>
<th>e</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean</strong></td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>7.46</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard Error</strong></td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Median</strong></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mode</strong></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard Deviation</strong></td>
<td>4.87</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>2.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sample Variance</strong></td>
<td>23.73</td>
<td>17.10</td>
<td>20.73</td>
<td>11.19</td>
<td>7.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kurtosis</strong></td>
<td>-1.20</td>
<td>-0.69</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>9.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Skewness</strong></td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>2.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Range</strong></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minimum</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maximum</strong></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Confidence Level (95.0%)</strong></td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>1.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Descriptive Statistics of Item Responses (QSR II)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>a</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>c</th>
<th>d</th>
<th>e</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>6.62</td>
<td>8.77</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>5.38</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Error</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>6.27</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>5.69</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample Variance</td>
<td>39.26</td>
<td>17.86</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>32.42</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurtosis</td>
<td>-0.82</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>-1.06</td>
<td>-1.46</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skewness</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>-0.32</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidence Level (95.0%)</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Descriptive Statistics of Item Responses (QSR III)
Table-4.4: Descriptive statistics of Item-responses (High level employees)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>a</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>10.18</td>
<td>7.91</td>
<td>6.73</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Error</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample Variance</td>
<td>15.16</td>
<td>10.09</td>
<td>12.62</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurtosis</td>
<td>-1.42</td>
<td>-0.69</td>
<td>-1.09</td>
<td>2.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skewness</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>1.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidence Level (95.0%)</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** The skewness in above tables appeared to be slightly positive, but still considered as normal, with p value less than 0.01 and Risk factor : 0.00021 (*Bowly’s co-efficient Normality).

**Source:** Descriptive Statistics of Item Responses (High level employees)
Table-4.5: Questionnaire analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P-value</th>
<th>F crit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rows</td>
<td>26.03</td>
<td>0.000000</td>
<td>2.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columns</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.000000</td>
<td>1.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: There is a significant difference between the questions given

Therefore, Questions are independent in nature and questionnaire is said to be unbiased.
IN-DEPTH ITEM-RESPONSE ANALYSIS

QUESTIONNER - I

Question No 1

Training is a part of managerial strategy.

H₀: There is no significance that training is a part of managerial strategy.

Vs.

H₁: There is significance that the Training is a part of the managerial strategy.

66 Strongly Agree and 77 Agree

Total No of agree = 143 (82% with Kruskal Walli Statistic 2.5, P < 0.01)

Kruskal Walli Statistics falls under rejection region. Therefore, H₀ is rejected and in its place an alternative hypothesis H₁ is accepted. It infers that significantly more people agree that training is a part of the organizational strategy.

This is Significant.

Source: Significantly more people agree that training is a part of organizational study.
**Question No 2**

Company Takes training quite seriously

**H₀:** There is no Significance that the company takes Training quite seriously  
**Vs.**

**H₁:** There is Significance that the company takes training quite seriously  
62 Strongly Agree and 53 Agree  
Total No of agree = 115 (65% with Kruskal Walli Statistic 7.7, P < 0.01) which is Significant

Kruskal Walli Statistics falls under rejection region. Therefore, H₀ is rejected and in its place an alternative hypothesis H₁ is accepted. It infers that significantly more people agree that company takes training quite seriously.

**Source:** Significantly more people agree that company takes training quite seriously.

**Question No 3**

Restriction by rules, policies and procedures while undergo training

**H₀:** There is significance that there are restriction by rules, policies and procedures while undergoing training.  
**Vs.**

**H₁:** There is no significance that the restrictions by rules, policies and procedures while undergoing Training.  
45 Strongly Agree and 46 Agree  
Total No of agree = 91 (65% with Kruskal Walli Statistic 37.1, P > 0.01),

Kruskal Walli Statistics falls under acceptance region. Therefore Ho is accepted and infers that there is no significant difference between the responses.

This is not significant

**Source:** There is no significant difference between the responses for the question 3. Therefore restriction by rules, policies and procedures will not be significant.

**Question No 4**

Average duration of work before employees shift to other organization in your company
H₀: There is no significance that the average duration of work before employees shifts s to other organization.

Vs.

H₁: There is significance that the average duration of work before employees shifts s to other organization.

In 5 years, most of employees (158 Nos) leave the company, 91% with Kruskal Walli Statistic 1.125, P < 0.01), which is very significant value.

Kruskal Walli Statistics falls under rejection region. Therefore, H₀ is rejected and in its place an alternative hypothesis H₁ is accepted. It Infers that Significantly more number of people will shift the organization in 5 years.

Source: Significantly more number of people will shift the organization in 5 years.

Question No 5

Training in a year

H₀: There is no significance that the average Training taking place in the organization.

Vs.

H₁: There is significance that the average Training taking place in the organization.

Total training in a year is limited to 40 hours (174 Nos vouch for this with Kruskal Walli Statistic 0.001, P < 0.01), which is significant

Kruskal Walli Statistics falls under rejection region. Therefore, H₀ is rejected and in its place an alternative hypothesis H₁ is accepted. It infers that significantly 40 hours of training is given to the employees in a year.

Source: Significantly 40 hours of training is given to the employees in a year.

Question No 6

More training in a year given to

H₀: There is no significance that the more training is given to Junior and new staff.

Vs.

H₁: There is significance that the more training is given to Junior and new staff.

Junior and New Staff (105 Nos, 60%, Kruskal Walli 8.1, P < 0.01)
Kruskal Walli Statistics falls under rejection region. Therefore, $H_0$ is rejected and in its place an alternative hypothesis $H_1$ is accepted. It infers that Significantly Junior and new staff are given more training in a year.

This is significant

**Source:** Significantly Junior and new staff are given more training in a year.

**Question No 7**

What sort of training

$H_0$: There is no significance that the more Significance is given to Technical and personality development skills training.

Vs.

$H_1$: There is significance that the more Significance is given to Technical and personality development skills training.

Technical and personality skill development

$(53 + 53 = 106 \text{ Nos}, 61\%, \text{ Kruskal Walli } 8.15, P < 0.01)$

Kruskal Walli Statistics falls under rejection region. Therefore, $H_0$ is rejected and in its place an alternative hypothesis $H_1$ is accepted. It infers that Significantly Technical and Personality skill development training is given more emphasis.

This is significant

**Source:** Significantly Technical and Personality skill development training is given more emphasis.

**Question No 8**

Mode of training

$H_0$: There is no significance that the employees prefer Lectures and Job Rotation form of training.

Vs.

$H_1$: There is significance that the employees prefer Lectures and Job Rotation form of training.

$(49 + 48 = 97, 59\%, \text{ Kruskal Walli, } 9.12 P < 0.01)$

Kruskal Walli Statistics falls under rejection region. Therefore, $H_0$ is rejected and in its place an alternative hypothesis $H_1$ is accepted. It infers that significantly the employees prefer lectures and Job Rotation form of training.
This is significant

**Source:** Significantly the employees prefer lectures and Job Rotation form of training.

**Question No 9**

General soft skills

H₀: There is no significance that the employees are satisfied with the soft skills training provided.

Vs.

H₁: There is significance that the employees are satisfied with the soft skills training provided.

Satisfactory with Soft skills

(111 No of employees, 65%, Kruskal Walli, 7.78, P < 0.01)

Kruskal Walli Statistics falls under rejection region. Therefore, H₀ is rejected and in its place an alternative hypothesis H₁ is accepted. It infers that significantly the employees are satisfied with the soft skills training provided.

This is significant.

**Source:** Significantly the employees are satisfied with the soft skills training provided.

**Question No 10**

Informal forms to training.

H₀: There is significance towards the informal form of Training.

Vs.

H₁: There is no significance towards the informal form of Training.

Not productive and disagree

Kruskal Walli 32.11 P > 0.01

Kruskal walli statistics falls under acceptance and it infers that there is no significance towards the informal form of training.

This is insignificant.

**Source:** There is no significance towards the informal form of training.
Question No 11

Training in your organization is adopted for new recruitments

Ho: There is no significance that new recruits like to adopt Language and the management training Programme.

Vs.

H₁: There is significance that new recruits like to adopt Language and the management training Programme

(93 Nos with Kruskal Walli 8.91, P < 0.01)

Kruskal Walli Statistics falls under rejection region. Therefore, H₀ is rejected and in its place an alternative hypothesis H₁ is accepted. It infers that significantly the new recruits like to adopt Language and the management training Programme.

This is significant.

Source: Significantly the new recruits like to adopt Language and the management training Programme.
Question No 12
Skills to be effective
Ho: There is no significance that employees are positive toward the skill effectiveness
Vs.
H₁: There is significance that employees are positive toward the skill effectiveness
Positively skewed towards agreement (78.9% with Man Whitney 2.012, P < 0.01)
Kruskal Walli Statistics falls under rejection region. Therefore, H₀ is rejected and in its place an alternative hypothesis H₁ is accepted. It infers that employees are significantly positive toward the skill effectiveness
This is significant
Source: Significantly positive toward the skill effectiveness.

Question No 13
Upgrading new skill levels
Ho: There is no significance that employees are positive toward the New skill Levels
Vs.
H₁: There is significance that employees are positive toward the New skill Levels
Positively skewed towards agreement (81.9% with Man Whitney 1.929, P < 0.01)
Kruskal Walli Statistics falls under rejection region. Therefore, H₀ is rejected and in its place an alternative hypothesis H₁ is accepted. It infers that employees are significantly positive toward the new skill levels.
This is significant
Source: Significantly positive toward the new skill levels.
QUESTIONNER - II

HIGH LEVEL EMPLOYEES

Question No 1
Differences you find with regards to skills and training style of foreign Trainers

H₀: There is no significance that there is difference in the skills and training style of foreigners
Vs.

H₁: There is significance that there is difference in the skills and training style of foreigners

Strongly agree and Agree (98% with Kruskal Walli 0.056, P < 0.01)

Kruskal Walli Statistics falls under rejection region. Therefore, H₀ is rejected and in its place an alternative hypothesis H₁ is accepted. It infers that significantly there is difference in the skills and training style of foreigners

This is Significant

Source: Significantly there is difference in the skills and training style of foreigners

Question No 2
Average duration of work before employees shift to other organization in your company

H₀: There is no significance that the average duration of work before employees shifts to other organization.
Vs.

H₁: There is significance that the average duration of work before employees shifts to other organization

Strongly agree and Agree (94% with Kruskal Walli 0.053, P < 0.01)

Kruskal Walli Statistics falls under rejection region. Therefore, H₀ is rejected and in its place an alternative hypothesis H₁ is accepted. It infers that this is significantly averaged.

This is Significant

Source: This is significantly averaged.
**Question No 3**

Percentage of budget allocated for training and development

$H_0$: There is no significance that the Percentage of budget allocated for training and development is allocated.

$s.$

$H_1$: There is significance that the Percentage of budget allocated for training and development

Strongly agree and Agree (93.9% with Kruskal Walli 0.053, $P < 0.01$)

Kruskal Walli Statistics falls under rejection region. Therefore, $H_0$ is rejected and in its place an alternative hypothesis $H_1$ is accepted. It is inferred that it is significantly agreed with respect to the percentage of budget allocated.

This is Significant

**Source:** It is significantly agreed with respect to the percentage of budget allocated.

**Question No 4**

Budget for training and development in your company over last few years

$H_0$: There is no significance that the budget towards training is neither increasing nor decreasing.

$s.$

$H_1$: There is significance that the budget towards training is neither increasing nor decreasing.

It is neither increasing nor decreasing (97% with Kruskal Walli 0.0498, $P < 0.01$)

Kruskal Walli Statistics falls under rejection region. Therefore, $H_0$ is rejected and in its place an alternative hypothesis $H_1$ is accepted. It is inferred that it is significantly proved that the budget towards training is neither increasing nor decreasing.

This is Significant

**Source:** It is significantly proved that the budget towards training is neither increasing nor decreasing.
**Question No 5**

What sort of training you give?

H₀: There is no significance that more importance is given to Technical Training.

Vs.

H₁: There is significance that more importance is given to Technical Training

Every training with more important to Technical skills

(78% with, Kruskal Walli Statistic 1.125, P < 0.01)

Kruskal Walli Statistics falls under rejection region. Therefore, H₀ is rejected and in its place an alternative hypothesis H₁ is accepted. It is significantly proved that more importance is given to Technical Training

This is Significant

**Source:** It is significantly proved that more importance is given to Technical Training.

**Question No 6**

How many foreign staff on average in a year attend joint seminar on training and development in your company?

H₀: There is no significance that an average less than 10 foreign staff attends the Joint seminar on training and development

Vs.

H₁: There is significance that an average less than 10 foreign staff attends the Joint seminar on training and development

Less than 10 (98.78% with Kruskal Walli 0.0111, P < 0.01)

Kruskal Walli Statistics falls under rejection region. Therefore, H₀ is rejected and in its place an alternative hypothesis H₁ is accepted. It is inferred that significantly proved that on an average less than 10 foreign staff attends the Joint seminar on training and development

This is Significant

**Source:** It is significantly proved that on an average less than 10 foreign staff attends the Joint seminar on training and development.
**Question No 7**

What problem foreigners face up in training policies when they visit your country?

**H₀:** There is no significance that when foreigners do any training programme then their training styles and methods and language differences become hindrance.

**Vs.**

**H₁:** There is significance that when foreigners do any training programme then their training styles and methods and language differences become hindrance.

(93.9% with Kruskal Walli 0.053, P < 0.01)

Kruskal Walli Statistics falls under rejection region. Therefore, H₀ is rejected and in its place an alternative hypothesis H₁ is accepted. It is inferred that significantly proved that when foreigners do any training programme then their training styles and methods and language differences become hindrance.

This is Significant

**Source:** It is significantly proved that when foreigners do any training programme then their training styles and methods and language differences become hindrance.
Question No 8

General soft skills (people skills) of employees in your company are not so good

H₀: There is no significance that general soft skills have to be improved.

Vs.

H₁: There is significance that general soft skills have to be improved.

(78% with Kruskal Walli Statistic 1.798, P < 0.01)

Kruskal Walli Statistics falls under rejection region. Therefore, H₀ is rejected and in its place an alternative hypothesis H₁ is accepted. It is inferred that significantly proved that general soft skills have to be improved.

This is Significant

Source: It is significantly proved that general soft skills have to be improved.

Question No 9

Which type of training in your organization is adopted for new recruitments?

H₀: There is no significance that new recruitments adopt Technical training more.

Vs.

H₁: There is significance that new recruitments adopt Technical training more.

(93.77% with Kruskal Walli 0.05293, P < 0.01)

Kruskal Walli Statistics falls under rejection region. Therefore, H₀ is rejected and in its place an alternative hypothesis H₁ is accepted. It is inferred that significantly new recruitments adopt Technical training more.

This is Significant.

Source: It is significantly proved that new recruitments adopt Technical training more.
**Question No 10**

Trainer should possess many skills to be effective

H₀: There is no significance that trainers need not possess all the skills to be effective.

Vs.

H₁: There is significance that trainers need not possess all the skills to be effective.

Disagree (92.4% with Kruskal Walli 0.0493, P < 0.01)

Kruskal Walli Statistics falls under rejection region. Therefore, H₀ is rejected and in its place an alternative hypothesis H₁ is accepted. It is inferred that significantly the trainers need not possess all the skills to be effective.

It is Significant

**Source:** It is significantly proved that the trainers need not possess all the skills to be effective.

---

**Question No 11**

In your view of informal form to training

H₀: There is no significance that informal form of training is significant.

Vs.

H₁: There is significance that informal form of training is significant

Strongly agree and Agree (91.9% with Kruskal Walli 0.0473, P < 0.01)

Kruskal Walli Statistics falls under rejection region. Therefore, H₀ is rejected and in its place an alternative hypothesis H₁ is accepted. It is inferred that significantly that informal form of training is significant

It is significant

**Source:** It is significantly proved that informal form of training is significant.
POINTS NOTICED DURING THE ANALYSIS:

1. Questions are Independent in nature (Chi Square Value is 42.22, P < 0.001) - Significant

2. Answers by Male and Female are Independent (Chi Square Value is 18.85, P < 0.001) – Significant

3. Experiences of Employees are independent (Chi Square Value is 18.45, P < 0.001) - Significant

4. Three units are independent (No Effect of individual companies) - (Chi Square with Yates correction Statistic 12.26, P < 0.001) - Significant.

5. Risk factor is 0.012 which is not a significant value (Squared R = 0.001, P > 0.01)

6. Raw data is unbiased with (Student P Value 1.14, P < 0.05)

7. Sample size is significant with (Student T Value 1.17, P < 0.001)
TESTS USED IN THE PRESENT STUDY:

1. Kruskal Walli Test
2. Man Whitney U Test
3. Student T Test
4. Chi-square Test
5. Chi-Square with Yates Correction.
6. Student P Test
7. Squared R Test
8. Prospective Regression Analysis.