

LEARNING ENVIRONMENT AND EMPLOYEE SELECTION – AN EMPIRICAL STUDY

Dr. S. Poongavanam,

Assistant Professor,
AMET Business School,
AMET University, Chennai, India

ABSTRACT

Good learning environment is very important to enhance the employee learning which in turn increases the performance, improves the ability, skills and knowledge. Institution must be competitive in all aspects if the selection process followed is good. Since the selection process involves huge expenses company must keep in mind the genuiness of the selection process, otherwise the whole process will become waste not only money but also the precious time. This article focuses on the learning environment and whether it is encouraging or discouraging the employees. It also highlights the importance and satisfaction of leaning environment and selection process. Learning culture will differ from company to company, but it must support the individuals to enhance their skill and knowledge. This article concludes that employees will remain in the organization if it has good learning environments and appropriate selection policy.

Keywords: Quality, Recruitment, Training program & Performance.

INTRODUCTION:

Learning environment refers to the diverse physical locations, contexts, and cultures in which employees learn. Several factors have to be taken into account while studying the company learning environment. The learning environment can be formal or informal. Knowledge can be transformed if the learning environment is conducive. Equipments for learning is based upon the needs of work. Continuous learning for employees is an important value to the company. The only thing that can be assured for employee is change management based on learning things. Employees react to the changes in learning environments in different ways. For some of the employee's changes may be unpleasant, for others learning may be part of their life. Some employees may feel learning as a challenging and others fight against it. The employees who feel against learning wants to follow the familiar ways of thinking and the routines of working. But the end result will be achieved by the employees who accept the change and the uncertainty that follows the change. The learning cultures in companies are affected by the prevalent atmosphere in the organization. The support and promotion in learning is depends upon the style of organization and the motivation given to the employees. The learning cultures in the organization were fully supportable to developing individual, team, and organizational, by announcing acceptable reward systems, achievable structures and processes for organization. (Ashkenes 1995) (Ruohotie 2000) One of the main objectives of the immediate supervisors is to make learning easier, create constructive human relationships and share responsibilities and encourage employees to continuous learning. They have to get work from employees to achieve their vision. The clear vision commits everyone and they work hard for gaining the vision. The effects of learning are most visible when people are able to make true something that they see meaningful. (Ruohotie 2002). Selection is one of the important step in the in the process of man power planning. It is the process of choosing the candidate which matches the candidate skills and the job requirements (Bhattacharyya, 2010). Selection process will be lengthy for large organizations and will be wider for manufacturing organizations and it differs from one industry to other (Venkatesh, 2008). As this a manufacturing organization its process will be wider in departments and activities. According to the Dale Yoder selection means dividing the total job applicants into two classes as selected and not selected (K. Aswathapa, 2007). The selection process followed at yarntex private limited is a scientific one. There were many factors that had to be considered while selecting a candidate like group discussions, employment background, referral background, interviews, medical tests and etc. Various studies show that informal learning is an important driver in declining the unit costs of production in manufacturing and service sectors. The human capital literature focuses mainly on investments in formal education and training. However, a few studies have investigated learning by doing from a macroeconomic perspective and more recently from a microeconomic one. The microeconomic studies usually attempt to measure the effects of work experience or tenure. Education science has a large research pool on workplace learning, which is defined as the process of acquiring job-related knowledge and skills, through both formal training programs and informal social interactions among employees. Earlier theory dealt with workplace learning more explicitly, focuses on the learning potential of a job: The fundamental hypothesis predicts that individuals learn from their working experience. Firms supply learning opportunities in the form of different types of work-learning activities, and engage in a kind of joint production, Workers who all experience skill obsolescence seems to learn more on the job and participate more often in training, which lowers the risk of employment loss. Some studies suggest that the net effect of gradual technological and organizational change on workers' human capital is often positive, because workers continuously acquire new skills related to the new technologies they have to work with. The importance of workplace learning has been recognized in research and practice, there is little empirical support that describes how workplace learning, including both formal and informal learning, is linked to organizational performance. (Park, Y., & Jacobs, R. L. 2011). This study investigated the influence of investment in workplace learning on learning outcomes and organizational performance using the 2005 and 2007 Human Capital Corporate. Rosen, S (1972) in his paper analyzed the role of the labor market in the transmission and acquisition of skills and knowledge, hypothesis had proved that individuals learn from their working experiences. Wim J. Nijhof. (2008) concluded that from the economic perspective, workplace learning is considered to be an investment decision for both the worker and the

firm. So the economics studies particularly analyzed the returns on investments in workplace learning from the perspective of the human capital theory.

OBJECTIVES:

1. To study the learning environment in BHEL
2. To study the satisfaction level of employees on learning environment and selection process
3. To study the employee's selection process followed in BHEL

METHODOLOGY:

It is a descriptive research where primary data is collected through questionnaire. The secondary data was collected from journals and internet. A convenient sampling technique is used to collect data. The sample size for this study is 120. A structure questionnaire is framed after discussion with the HR persons. Pilot study consisting of 20 respondents was done to refine the questions

LIMITATION:

Some respondents refused to respond or co-operate during the survey. They feel that the survey is an invasion of their privacy. The respondents were reluctant to participate because they were busy. Time factor & Survey cost depend on multitude of factors, the amount of professional time required to design the questionnaire length, availability and interest of the respondents increases the cost of the survey.

DATA ANALYSIS & FINDINGS:

Table 1: BHEL's Learning Environment

Description	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Discouraging	7	5.8	5.8
Partially encouraging	7	5.8	11.7
Encouraging	61	50.8	62.5
Highly encouraging	45	37.5	100.0
Total	120	100.0	

The above table shows that, 61 (50.8%) of respondents projected Encouraging, 45 (37.5%) of respondents projected highly encouraging and 7 (5.8%) of respondents projected partially encouraging and only 7 (5.8%) of respondents projected Discouraging of BHEL's learning environment. Thus, it clearly shows the learning environment at BHEL-Ranipet is Encouraging.

Table 2: Descriptive Statistics

Description	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Discouraging	7	2.57	.534	.202	2.07	3.06	2.00	3.00
Partially encouraging	7	2.57	.534	.202	2.07	3.06	2.00	3.00
Encouraging	61	2.32	.473	.060	2.20	2.44	2.00	3.00
Highly encouraging	45	2.24	.434	.064	2.11	2.37	2.00	3.00
Total	120	2.32	.470	.042	2.24	2.41	2.00	3.00

Table 3

ANOVA					
Description	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	1.143	3	.381	1.755	.160
Within Groups	25.182	116	.217		
Total	26.325	119			

H_0 – There is no significant difference between these mean values of BHEL's learning environment

$P = .160$

$P > .05$

Since P value (.160) is greater than the .05 at 5% level of significance. Null hypothesis is accepted. Therefore there is no significant difference between these mean values of BHEL's learning environment.

Table 4: Employee Selection is Appropriate

Description	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Never	1	.8	.8
Rarely	5	4.2	5.0
Occasionally	35	29.2	34.2
Often	45	37.5	71.7
Very Often	34	28.3	100.0
Total	120	100.0	

It is clear that, 45 (37.5%) of the respondents commented Often, that employee selection is appropriate, 35 (29.2%) occasionally, 34 (28.3%) Very Often, 5 (4.2%) rarely and only 1 (0.8%) Never. Thus, the employee selection is appropriate often.

Table 5: Descriptive Statistics

Description	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	Level		Minimum	Maximum		
					95% Confidence Interval for Mean					
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound				
Never	1	2.00	2.00	2.00		
Rarely	5	2.60	.547	.244	1.91	3.28	2.00	3.00		
Occasionally	35	2.22	.426	.072	2.08	2.37	2.00	3.00		
Often	45	2.35	.484	.072	2.21	2.50	2.00	3.00		
Very Often	34	2.35	.485	.083	2.18	2.52	2.00	3.00		
Total	120	2.32	.470	.042	2.24	2.41	2.00	3.00		

Table 6

ANOVA					
Description	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	.878	4	.219	.992	.415
Within Groups	25.447	115	.221		
Total	26.325	119			

H₀: There is no significant difference between these mean values of the employee selection is appropriate.

P =.415

P >.05

Since P value (.415) is greater than the .05 at 5% level of significance. Null hypothesis is accepted. Therefore there is no significant difference between these mean values of the employee selection is appropriate.

Table 7: Learning Environment and Selection Process

Description	Frequency	Percent
Highly satisfied	90	75
Satisfied	11	9
Neutral	10	8
Dissatisfied	5	4
Highly dissatisfied	5	4
Total	120	100.0

The above table shows that 75% of the employees were highly satisfied with present learning environment and selection process. 9% were satisfied with learning environment and section process. Only meager percentages were dissatisfied and highly dissatisfied.

RECOMMENDATION FOR FUTURE RESEARCH:

This article focuses only on the general concept of selection and learning environment. It does not consider the various attributes of selection and learning process. The author recommends future research which focuses on the specific issues such as educational psychology, neuropsychology, learning theory, and pedagogy.

CONCLUSION:

Good learning environment is essential for learning the training given during the apprentice period. Due to competitive situation employees has to the new techniques and improve their skills for their betterment and for the company future. Employees will apply and stay in the company for a long run only if there is any chance of learning new techniques. So, if employees are satisfied with learning and selection process it will be easy to achieve the objective of the company.

REFERENCES:

Aswathappa, K. (2007). Organizational behaviour, *Himalaya publishing house*, 7th edition.

Nokelainen, P., & Ruohotie, P. (2002). Modelling Student's Motivational Profile for Learning in Vocational Higher Education. *Theoretical Understandings for Learning in the Virtual University*, 177-206

Park, Y., & Jacobs, R. L. (2011). The Influence of investment in workplace learning on learning outcomes and organizational performance. *Human Resource Development*, 22(4), 437–458.

Rosen, S. (1972). Learning and experience in the labour market. *Journal of Human Resources*, 7(3), 326–342.

Sanghamitra Bhattacharyya, (2010). Measuring organizational performance and organizational excellence of SMEs – Part 1: a conceptual framework. *Measuring Business Excellence*, 14(2), 3-11.

Venkatesh, V. & Bala, H. (2008). Technology Acceptance Model and Research Agenda on Interventions. *Decision Sciences*, 39(2).

Wim Nijhof, J.. (2008). The Learning Potential of the Workplace. *Sense Publishers*, 36–38.
