

## Top Management Perception towards Training: An Empirical Study of Travel Agencies in India

<sup>1</sup> A. Singh Lather, <sup>2</sup> Sh. Garg, \* <sup>3</sup> S. Vikas

<sup>1,2,3</sup> School of Management Studies, Guru Gobind Singh Indraprastha University, Dwarka, Delhi, India

Received 13 August 2013, Accepted 8 January 2014

---

### ABSTRACT:

The need to develop the required human resources in the tourism industry has become imperative as a consequence of rapidly changing technology and dynamic changes in the international tourism market. And in this regard the role and commitment of the top management towards developing the human resources cannot be undermined. A study has been conducted to assess the perception of the top management towards training among travel agencies across India. Results indicate that the top management faces several issues in imparting trainings to the employees. The key problems contributing to the perception of the top management towards training and development are Industry Impediments, Cost Issues, Employee Attitude and Managerial Myopia. Since training plays a significant role in the tourism industry, the top management needs to shed the inhibitions and make a concerted effort to implement training so as to derive its benefits.

**Keywords:** *Training and development, Industry impediments, Cost issues, Employee attitude, Managerial Myopia*

---

### INTRODUCTION

Tourism is a human experience, a social experience, a geographical phenomenon, a resource value, and a business industry. It is a major social phenomenon of the modern society with enormous economic consequences. Its importance as an instrument for economic development and employment generation, particularly in remote and backward areas, has now been well recognized the world over. The industry today is globally recognized as a major economic contributor and employment generator. The investment flows into this field are constantly on the increase. The tourism industry faced with various challenges in the field of human resources, one of the crucial issues in this regard is the quality of manpower. The industry is vitally faced with the demand for

qualified quality personnel (Khan, 2008). The quality and efficiency of services is the primary concern of tourism industry. In order to achieve this, each of the components of tourism industry requires trained /skilled manpower (Chand and Chauhan, 2003). In the scenario of globalization, competition among global players of tourism related service industries is unavoidable. The global village concept increased the expectation of people from all spheres. In such a situation, only organizations capable of creating a competitive edge can continue their achievement. The apt way to reach such competitive edge in field is through human resource development. HRD is fast becoming a new competitive factor for the tourism industry (Ashraf and Mathur, 2003). Tourism industry is

---

\*Corresponding Author, Email: [sonavikas9@gmail.com](mailto:sonavikas9@gmail.com)

a fast changing industry and to succeed in a competitive market, the destination must keep up with the pace of change and adapt to new conditions brought by change. Therefore, human resources development must be dynamic and directed strategically in order to adjust to the perceived opportunities and threats in the environment (Bécherel, 2001). The need to develop the required human resources in various segments of the tourism industry has become imperative as a consequence of the rapid growth in tourism, rapidly changing technology and dynamic changes in the international tourism market (Raj, 2008). An organization which aspires to grow must be in tune with the changing needs of the society. Training becomes relevant in the context since it is only through training that the gap between performance of the organization and the felt need of a changing society can be neutralized. Training reduced the gap by increasing employees' knowledge, skill, ability and attitude (Reddy, 2007).

Nothing is possible without trained and skilled people (Doswell, 1994). Attracting and retaining good staff and ensuring consistent quality can only be achieved with management commitment to effective training (Raj, 2008). Present day trends of actual and potential users of tourism goods and services indicate a clamorous preference for quality experience, requiring higher levels of professional standards in the delivery system (Singh, 1997). It is felt that training is compulsory for each component of the tourism industry so as to improve efficiency and educate the employees regarding the current development in the trade (Swain and George, 2007). Tourism can be described as a hands-on industry, requiring employees with well-honed vocational skills. In fact, tourism industry needs educated, well-trained, bright, energetic, multi-lingual and entrepreneurial skill to manage the tourism business (Rebecca, 1998). Therefore, the tourism industry relies heavily on vocational training programs to develop its human resources (Bécherel, 2001).

Employers undertake and provide training for a variety of reasons (Green, 1997). Possible objectives include: raising workforce skills, increasing labor productivity, facilitating the introduction of new products or working processes, enhancing worker commitment to the enterprise, rewarding employees, reducing labor

turnover and, complying with legal requirements. The primary rationale for employers to provide training was to improve business performance, as defined by employers (Storey and Westhead, 1994). However, amidst growing acknowledgement of the value of training to individuals and organizations are sceptics who are yet to be convinced of its worth (Reddy, 2007). Recent evidence suggests that employers provide training to achieve short-term objectives such as solving specific problems or to help them perform their current jobs more efficiently rather than to achieve longer-term objectives such as, for example, business growth (Curran et al., 1996; Kitching and Blackburn, 1999). In fact, several studies indicate that management's misunderstanding of HRD techniques is a problem being faced by the tourism industry. Management was unable to understand that HRD is a continuous activity and consequently they ceased their responsiveness to employees' suggestions after initial enthusiasm was over (Ashraf and Mathur, 2003). Over the past one and half decades, various arguments have been made that firm's human resource may be its sole source of sustainable competitive advantage (Ferris et al., 1999). Employee Training Program increase performance of both organization and individuals (Becker, 1962). However this can be largely achieved if the managers and employees perceive training to have a positive effect on the firm performance. Top management perception towards training has been found as a deterrent and against this background, this study has been conducted to assess the perception among the top management of key travel agencies across India.

#### Literature Review

The tourism sector does have a reputation for under investing in training (Poulston, 2008). So far there is little evidence of HRD approach being followed by travel agencies. Even the travel agency literature is silent in this context (Chand and Chauhan, 2003). While giving an overview about the status of training and development in Hospitality, Roberts (1999) says that the hospitality industry has not been slow to recognize the importance of effective staff training and development with a significant increase in investment. Historically, management development practices in the

hospitality industry have been ad hoc and piecemeal, with development being typically seen as something that only occurs early on in a manager's career (Baum, 2006a; Watson, 2006). However, some studies have been conducted to highlight the significance of HR practices in hotel companies. For example, both Lucas (1995, 1996) and Price (1994) find personnel specialists to be more in evidence in the hotel and catering sector than elsewhere. Harrington and Kendall (2004) observed that hotels are taking HR practices more seriously. They are adopting modern HR techniques to train and develop their employees. It is in the travel agencies, where the training interventions are conspicuous by their absence. Earlier studies have looked at travel agencies in isolation and have inferred from the result that the industry is lagging in terms of professionalism (Chand and Chauhan, 2003).

Several studies have been conducted within the industry and outside that highlight the training-related problems being faced in organizations. Three main types of barriers to participation in job-related training have been identified in the literature: situational, institutional and dispositional or psychological (Sussman, 2002). Situational barriers arise from one's situation in life at a given time for example, being too busy at work and financial constraints. Institutional barriers consist of established practices and procedures that exclude or discourage participation such as limited course offerings, or courses offered at inconvenient times or locations. Dispositional barriers involve attitudes and opinions towards learning, as well as perceptions of oneself as a learner (Cross, 1981). A key issue that emerged in literature review was related to the industry – specific problems particularly lack of well-defined industry status for tourism; long, antisocial working hours, low pay, unstable, seasonal employment, low job status which make employment within the industry appear unattractive to many leading to high staff turnover; Inability to easily prepare syllabus for an integrated course of training, hardly any institutes for imparting training in tourism, almost non-existent institutional training tourism in India.

In another study, Sobaih (2011) tried to investigate why hospitality managers provide

fewer training opportunities to part-time employees in comparison to their full-time colleagues. The results showed seven main obstacles for training part-time employees: cost of training and return on investment; time of training; the working of irregular shifts; working background; low enthusiasm of part-time employees; high turnover of part-time employees; lack of resources, knowledge, and suitable training provision. These obstacles are all interlinked and they are all associated with managers' perception of part-time employees and their assumptions that part-time employees are not interested in training and development. Type of employment was a factor influencing imparting of training in the tourism industry, which is known for being high on part-time employment due to effect of seasonality.

An oft-cited concern by the top management is their perception that well-trained employees will be hired away by other firms and it dissuades them to invest in their workers (Bassi, 1992). Some organizations fear that their investment in training will be lost once an employee leaves. This fear is particularly common in businesses with a high a high turnover rate. In 2010, the tourism sector's average voluntary turnover rate was 26%, higher than the average across all industries, as per the Canadian Tourism Sector Compensation Study (2011). Some see this as justification for avoiding training. Unfortunately, this reluctance to train can exacerbate turnover. Many tourism workers interact directly with customers. Performing a job in public, without the skills to do it correctly, can be embarrassing for employees. This causes higher voluntary turnover, which reinforces the attitude that training is a wasted investment (Poulston, 2008).

Training is seen by many employers to be an expense rather than an investment (Bécherel, 2001). The top management feels that the financial resources consumed by a large number of training programs could be used for more productive and useful activities. They assert that training is often removed from ground realities and practice nor does it adequately prepare individuals for coping with the problems that they encounter at work in personal life and deals with certain crucial issues in a superficial and impractical manner (Reddy, 2007). The management's attitude towards HRD in most of

the organizations is not encouraging as most of them are under the impression that spending money on HRD for workers may not yield quantifiable returns. HRD is not seen as directly translating into returns and the top management feels that an educated worker may turn out to be a problem child.

Training requires an investment of either money or time and effort on the part of employers (Poulston, 2008). The most commonly mentioned barriers that prevented people from attempting desired employment-related courses were cost and time (Watane and Gibson, 2001). Investing in the training infrastructure, related to use of external trainers and external premises for conducting the training suggest a willingness to commit both money and time to training. Several companies did not even have a training budget, suggesting that it was not an important feature for the business (Aksu and Yildiz, 2011). In a Report conducted by Cambridge Policy Consultants (2007), managerial perception towards training indicates that most of the respondents never considered training as a means to improving the business nor did they see the need to improve the performance of their business. The majority said that they knew all they needed to know from running their business and considered the costs outweighed the benefits. The perception was that training was generally good but that they did not have time to release their staff. Some of the respondents felt that that training was a potential waste of money as trained employees are more likely to leave. Some more felt that there was no information to identify what training was appropriate or of good quality. Many of them thought that the skills learnt through training were not relevant to their business.

In his research, Pareek (2005) refers to managers' hostility to training. According to him, the top management considers training as a waste of time and may have a hostile attitude towards it. In some cases they tolerate training not because they think it is a useful activity but because historically it is being given some place and budget, and in some cases it may be seen as backward if they do not have this function in the organization. Then training loses its real value and is carried out as ritual. With such indifference and hostile attitude towards training those in-charge concerned with training become

helpless. Unless the top managers see training as a useful function and support it training cannot function effectively. Senior management's commitment to training is very crucial to its success (Wills, 1993). According to Watson (2008), management development requires senior management support and needs to be valued by both organizations and individuals. Lack of proper response from employees is another area of concern for the management (Ashraf and Mathur, 2003). Their study indicated that employees do not take training seriously and they tend to think it is a good time to be away for work. Employers have the perception that some employees even tend to leave organizations after getting trained. To empirically examine these issues amongst travel agencies across India, the heads of these travel organizations were contacted for this study.

#### **Objectives of the Study**

The main objectives of the Study are

1. To examine the existing training practices in travel agencies across India from the perspective of the top management
2. To study the problems faced by the top management in conducting training and development initiatives in travel agencies
3. To understand the managerial perception towards training and development

#### **RESEARCH METHOD**

The study has been conducted across India, amongst the top 50 travel agencies which are recognized by IATA (International Air Transport Association), have an annual turnover more than Rs. 5 crores (ten million) (as per MIDT data), are either Indian Private or Government Agency or Multi-national (MNC) Travel Agency or Online Travel Agency (OTA) in nature, and have minimum 10 employee strength. Based on the literature review, a questionnaire titled "*Training and Development in Travel Agencies,*" was developed and standardized as the research tool. Section I of the questionnaire was related to the Travel Agency Details; Section II consisted of 54 Statements on Likert Scale from 1 to 5 (ranging from Strongly Disagree – Disagree – Can't Say – Agree – Strongly Disagree). The questionnaire was administered personally. The Top Management (for this study) mean: Owner / Managing Director / CEO / President / Head. All

the responses were found to be complete in all respects and hence used for analysis. Data collected for the study was analyzed by applying Factor Analysis and one-way ANOVA using SPSS.

**RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

The details of the fifty travel agencies are summarized in table 1. Here, 60 % travel agencies are Indian while 26% are Multinational, 8% are OTA and 6% are Government agencies. 84% of the companies are located in North India while 12% are in the West and 4% are in the South. Turnover of 38% agencies was between INR 10-125 crores and 30% of the agencies have turnover over 500 crores. There were 16 agencies with employee strength between 10 to 50 and over 500. 7 agencies had employee strength 50 to 100 and 250 to 500 employees. 42% indicated that they budgeted their training expense and 58% indicated that they did not budget it.

Factor analysis with principal component extraction was applied with varimax rotation to understand the factor loadings across the components. Cronbach’s alpha was obtained to test the reliability of the data. Kaiser–Meyer–Olkin (KMO) was done for the sampling adequacy and Bartlett’s sphericity test was conducted. Using the Rotated Matrix

Component Table, the Factor Loadings were derived (Tables II-V). Objective I was achieved by a set of 24 items. The Kaiser- Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy came out to be 0.753 which is above 0.65 (the acceptable level). This shows that the items selected for the questionnaire are appropriate. The chi- square value of Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity was found to be significant (chi. sq. = 419.218, p= 0.000), this means the factor analysis is acceptable. The varimax rotation clubbed the items on 4 components, and using the Rotated Matrix Component Table, the Factor Loadings were derived (table 2). Total Variance Explained in the above for the 4 factors is 71.66% (Cumulative). The Cronbach’s  $\alpha$  value is 0.765, which exceeded the minimum standard of .7, suggesting and confirming about the reliability of the measures. From the 24 items, the following 4 dimensions were derived: *Organizational Support, Managerial Support, Training Practices and Financial Support*. It indicates that according to the top management, the employees are given the necessary training to do their job well and they are well-informed about the changes happening. The employees are encouraged to learn outside their job. The top management also feels that training is an investment and not a cost. They would not hesitate to invest in trainings for their employees.

**Table 1: Travel agency details**

Agency Type	Location	Turnover (in Indian Rupees or INR)	Employee Strength	Training Expense Budgeted (Y/N)
Government = 3	North = 42	Between 5-10 Crores = 6 agencies	Between 10-50 employees = 16 agencies	Yes = 21 agencies
Indian = 30	West = 6	Between 10-125 Crores = 19 agencies	Between 50-100 employees = 7 agencies	No= 29 agencies
MNC = 13	South = 2	Between 125-500 Crores = 10 agencies	Between 100-250 employees = 4 agencies	Total = 50 agencies
OTA = 4	Total = 50	Over 500 Crores = 15 agencies	Between 250-500 employees = 7 agencies	
Total = 50		Total 50 agencies	Between Over 500 employees = 16 agencies	
Total = 50 agencies				

Table 2: Showing factor loadings for objective I

Objective 1: To examine the existing training practices as per the top management	Component			
	1	2	3	4
<b>O1F1: Organizational Support</b>				
I ensure that all employees are given the necessary trainings to do their job well.	0.584			
I nominate employees for training depending on their performance.	0.644			
My employees receive whatever training assistance they require to handle the complexities of their jobs.	0.659			
My Company employs competent and skilled trainers.	0.740			
The training venues are kept comfortable.	0.838			
<b>O1F2: Managerial Support</b>				
Training imparted to my employees is job-related.		0.429		
Employees are trained on new technologies in travel and tourism.		0.458		
I keep my staff informed about any changes in business/ policies / systems that affects their work.		0.529		
The duration of the trainings are kept short in my organization so that work does not get affected.		0.686		
All new employees are given the required training to perform their job well in my organization.		0.761		
The trainings imparted to my employees cover technical aspects of the job.		0.775		
I give the employees all the support they require to develop themselves.		0.756		
I am responsible for the overall direction and resourcing of training in this office.		0.774		
<b>O1F3: Training Practices</b>				
I send my staff for any training that is related to product enhancements / updation for any developments in the industry.			0.504	
I send employees for training depending on requirement of the job.			0.579	
Employees are informed well in advance for the training.			0.704	
There is a lot of focus on product trainings in my Organization.			0.826	

Within a department, employees are randomly selected for attending a training program.	0.711
Seniority is an important criterion for me to recommend employees for training.	0.801
I encourage employees to learn outside the job (e.g. attending conferences, pursuing further education).	0.827
<b>O1F4: Financial Support</b>	
My company will not hesitate to employ services of external trainers if required.	0.847
I am ready to bear the cost of a useful training for employees.	0.851
My company can afford to send Employees away from work for attending trainings.	0.861
Training is an investment rather than a cost for my company.	0.597

**Table 3: Showing factor loadings for objective II**

<b>Objective II: To study the problems faced by the top management in conducting trainings</b>	<b>Component</b>	
	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>O2F1: Industry Impediments</b>		
Senior managers in my company have to be used as Resource persons for in-house training programs since external trainers are not available.	0.678	
I am not sure of behavioral trainings that my staff can be sent for.	0.769	
There is a lack of good institutions offering quality travel industry-related trainings.	0.800	
I am not aware of specialists who provide behavioral skills trainings to travel agency staff.	0.839	
Designing behavioral training programs for my employees is complex.	0.881	
It is difficult to get the precise training content for the travel industry staff.	0.908	
<b>O2F2: Time Constraints</b>		
Owing to hectic working hours, it is often difficult to send employees for training.		0.521
Due to the nature of our business, it is difficult to organize trainings for employees in my organization.		0.881
Employees are sent for training only if no work pressure.		0.826
<b>O2F3: Cost Constraints</b>		
I prefer to send my employees to in-house trainings as it saves cost.		0.923
Training incurs a lot of costs for my company.		0.532
Availability of funds sometimes becomes a constraint for employee development in my organization.		0.863

For Objective II, 12 items were identified. The KMO and Bartlett's Test of sampling adequacy was .620, which is greater than 0.5 for a satisfactory factor analysis to proceed. The chi-square value of Bartlett's Test of Sphericity was found to be significant (chi. sq. = 142.634,  $p=0.000$ ), indicating that the factor analysis was acceptable. The varimax rotation clubbed the items on three components, and using the Rotated Matrix Component Table, the Factor Loadings were derived (table 3). Total Variance Explained for the 3 factors is 76.1% (Cumulative). The Cronbach's  $\alpha$  value is 0.785. From the 12 items, the following 3 dimensions were derived: *Industry Impediments*, *Time Constraints* and *Cost Constraints*. There are various industry-related factors like lack of good institutions, non-availability of external experts, difficulty in designing behavioral trainings and getting the precise training content that act as impediments to the top management in conducting trainings for the employees. Hectic working hours and nature of business also creates problems for the top management in sending employees for training. Availability of funds is another constraint as felt by the top management.

Objective III was achieved by 18 items which had a KMO measure of 0.600 and significant Bartlett's Test of Sphericity (Ch. sq. = 370.189,  $p=0.000$ ). The total variance explained was 70.59%. The varimax rotation clubbed the items on four components, and using the Rotated Matrix Component Table, the Factor Loadings were derived as shown in table 4. The four dimensions that have been derived are: *Perceived Training Benefits*, *Managerial Myopia*, *Employee Attitude* and *Managerial Commitment*. The Cronbach's  $\alpha$  value is 0.765, indicating reliability of the measures. The top management in the travel agencies acknowledges that training improves work-life, helps in optimum utilization of human resources, increases employee productivity and builds positive perception about the organization. Managerial Myopia is the top management perception about usefulness of only product trainings and their view that behavioral trainings are not relevant to their business. Top management perception about Employee

Attitude is that employees hardly take training seriously and take it to be an opportunity away from work. Managerial Commitment refers to the perception of the top management that trainings are organized for all employees in their respective organizations, and they are committed to improving the skills of their employees.

One way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to study the differences in management perception amongst the various groups (Refer Tables 5-8). Table 5 shows the results of the ANOVA with Agency Type, and it indicates that none of the factors are found to be statistically significant indicating that there is no significant difference in the perception of the top management of different types of agencies (Indian, MNCs, OTAs and Government). The mean scores show high scores on all factors (Organizational Support, Managerial Support, Training Practices, Industry Impediments, Time Constraints, Perceived Training Benefits, Managerial Myopia, Employee Attitude and Managerial Commitment) for top management of all type of agencies except *Financial Support* and *Cost Constraints* and both these factors are related to training expenditures. Low mean scores on the factors related to costs of training indicate that the top management is not too convinced about training being an investment, and there is also a hesitation of hiring external trainers and incurring cost for imparting training.

Table 6 shows the results of the ANOVA with Agency Region, and it indicates that except one factor, *Perceived Training Benefits*, none of the factors were found to be statistically significant. There is a significant difference in the perception of the top management towards the benefits of training viz. the location of agencies (North, West and South). The mean scores for top management across all the regions, show high scores on all factors (Organizational Support, Managerial Support, Training Practices, Industry Impediments, Time Constraints, Perceived Training Benefits, Managerial Myopia, Employee Attitude and Managerial Commitment), except *Financial Support* and *Cost Constraints*. It seems that region-wise also, the top management is less open about incurring training related costs.



**Table 4: Showing factor loadings for objective III**

<b>Objective III: To understand the managerial perception towards training and development</b>	<b>Component</b>			
	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>O3F1: Perceived Training Benefits</b>				
I think training improves work-life.	0.585			
Training is responsible for developing technical skills of employees.	0.675			
A training manual for travel agency employees will be useful for my Organization.	0.714			
Training is responsible for developing behavioral skills of employees.	0.675			
I feel training improves quality of work.	0.585			
I feel training helps in optimum utilization of human resources.	0.833			
Training helps in improving the organizational culture of my company.	0.849			
I think training assists in increasing employee productivity.	0.833			
Training helps in building positive perception about the company.	0.849			
<b>O3F2: Managerial Myopia</b>				
It is useful to send employees only for product trainings.		0.746		
Behavioral Training is not relevant to the business I am involved in.		0.902		
For my business, it is financially wise for employees to learn on the job than be sent for training.		0.658		
I feel my staff does not require behavioral trainings.		0.927		
Only sound product knowledge is the most critical requirement of my employees.		0.560		
<b>O3F3: Employee Attitude</b>				
Employees tend to leave the company after acquiring training certification.			0.782	
The employees hardly take training seriously.			0.822	
Most of the employees do not complete the entire duration of the training.			0.594	
Employees take training as an opportunity to be away from work.			0.887	
<b>O3F4: Managerial Commitment</b>				
Training opportunities in my organization are adequately allocated across employees.				0.631
I am committed to improving the skills of the employees.				0.814
In my organization, trainings are organized for employees of all departments.				0.805
Trainings in my organization are conducted for employees of all levels.				0.577

**Table 5: Analysis of variance on various factors of top management perception towards training and development according to agency type**

		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Sig. / NS
Organizational Support	Between Groups	0.703	3	0.234	0.669	0.575	NS
	Within Groups	16.117	46	0.350			
	Total	16.820	49				
Managerial Support	Between Groups	1.071	3	0.357	1.976	0.131	NS
	Within Groups	8.309	46	0.181			
	Total	9.380	49				
Training Practices	Between Groups	0.634	3	0.211	0.749	0.529	NS
	Within Groups	12.986	46	0.282			
	Total	13.620	49				
Financial Support	Between Groups	0.659	3	0.220	0.370	0.775	NS
	Within Groups	27.341	46	0.594			
	Total	28.000	49				
Training Environment	Between Groups	0.228	3	0.076	0.333	0.802	NS
	Within Groups	10.492	46	0.228			
	Total	10.720	49				
Industry Impediments	Between Groups	0.144	3	0.048	0.206	0.892	NS
	Within Groups	10.736	46	0.233			
	Total	10.880	49				
Time Constraints	Between Groups	0.210	3	0.070	0.513	0.676	NS
	Within Groups	6.290	46	0.137			
	Total	6.500	49				
Cost Implications	Between Groups	1.136	3	0.379	1.158	0.336	NS
	Within Groups	15.044	46	0.327			
	Total	16.180	49				
Top Management Training Issues	Between Groups	0.013	3	0.004	0.211	0.888	NS
	Within Groups	0.967	46	0.021			
	Total	0.980	49				
Perceived Training Benefits	Between Groups	1.601	3	0.534	1.930	0.138	NS
	Within Groups	12.719	46	0.277			
	Total	14.320	49				
Managerial Myopia	Between Groups	0.841	3	0.280	0.944	0.427	NS
	Within Groups	13.659	46	0.297			
	Total	14.500	49				
Employee Attitude	Between Groups	0.589	3	0.196	0.615	0.609	NS
	Within Groups	14.691	46	0.319			
	Total	15.280	49				
Managerial Commitment	Between Groups	1.034	3	0.345	2.063	0.118	NS
	Within Groups	7.686	46	0.167			
	Total	8.720	49				
Managerial Perception	Between Groups	0.470	3	0.157	2.089	0.115	NS
	Within Groups	3.450	46	0.075			
	Total	3.920	49				
Top Management Perception	Between Groups	0.000	3	0.000	0.000	1.000	NS
	Within Groups	2.000	46	0.043			
	Total	2.000	49				

**Table 6: Analysis of variance on various factors of top management perception towards training and development according to region**

		<b>Sum of Squares</b>	<b>df</b>	<b>Mean Square</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>Sig.</b>	<b>Sig. / NS</b>
Organizational Support	Between Groups	0.034	2	0.017	0.048	0.953	NS
	Within Groups	16.786	47	0.357			
	Total	16.820	49				
Managerial Support	Between Groups	0.213	2	0.107	0.547	0.582	NS
	Within Groups	9.167	47	0.195			
	Total	9.380	49				
Training Practices	Between Groups	0.549	2	0.274	0.986	0.381	NS
	Within Groups	13.071	47	0.278			
	Total	13.620	49				
Financial Support	Between Groups	2.048	2	1.024	1.854	0.168	NS
	Within Groups	25.952	47	0.552			
	Total	28.000	49				
Training Environment	Between Groups	0.244	2	0.122	0.547	0.582	NS
	Within Groups	10.476	47	0.223			
	Total	10.720	49				
Industry Impediments	Between Groups	0.213	2	0.107	0.470	0.628	NS
	Within Groups	10.667	47	0.227			
	Total	10.880	49				
Time Constraints	Between Groups	0.095	2	0.048	0.349	0.707	NS
	Within Groups	6.405	47	0.136			
	Total	6.500	49				
Cost Implications	Between Groups	0.728	2	0.364	1.107	0.339	NS
	Within Groups	15.452	47	0.329			
	Total	16.180	49				
Top Management Training Issues	Between Groups	0.004	2	0.002	0.092	0.913	NS
	Within Groups	0.976	47	0.021			
	Total	0.980	49				
Perceived Training Benefits	Between Groups	1.844	2	0.922	3.473	0.039	Sig.
	Within Groups	12.476	47	0.265			
	Total	14.320	49				
Managerial Myopia	Between Groups	1.095	2	0.548	1.920	0.158	NS
	Within Groups	13.405	47	0.285			
	Total	14.500	49				
Employee Attitude	Between Groups	0.137	2	0.069	0.213	0.809	NS
	Within Groups	15.143	47	0.322			
	Total	15.280	49				
Managerial Commitment	Between Groups	0.244	2	0.122	0.676	0.514	NS
	Within Groups	8.476	47	0.180			
	Total	8.720	49				
Managerial Perception	Between Groups	0.015	2	0.008	0.092	0.913	NS
	Within Groups	3.905	47	0.083			
	Total	3.920	49				
Top Management Perception	Between Groups	0.000	2	0.000	0.000	1.000	NS
	Within Groups	2.000	47	0.043			
	Total	2.000	49				

Table 7 shows the results of the ANOVA with Agency Turnover, and it indicates that except one factor, *Managerial Myopia*, none of the factors were found to be statistically significant. There is a significant difference in the managerial myopia viz. the turnover of agencies, indicating that the difference in the size of the agency has a difference of opinion about investing in behavioral trainings. The focus is more on product trainings, due to the

question of affordability. The mean scores for top management across all agencies, irrespective of their turnover, show high scores on all factors (Organizational Support, Managerial Support, Training Practices, Industry Impediments, Time Constraints, Perceived Training Benefits, Managerial Myopia, Employee Attitude and Managerial Commitment), except *Financial Support* and *Cost Constraints*, indicating the hesitation to invest in training.

**Table 7: Analysis of variance on various factors of top management perception towards training and development according to agency turnover**

		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	f	Sig.	Sig./NS
Organizational Support	Between Groups	0.527	3	0.176	0.496	0.687	NS
	Within Groups	16.293	46	0.354			
	Total	16.820	49				
Managerial Support	Between Groups	0.687	3	0.229	1.212	0.316	NS
	Within Groups	8.693	46	0.189			
	Total	9.380	49				
Training Practices	Between Groups	0.827	3	0.276	0.991	0.405	NS
	Within Groups	12.793	46	0.278			
	Total	13.620	49				
Financial Support	Between Groups	1.382	3	0.461	0.796	0.502	NS
	Within Groups	26.618	46	0.579			
	Total	28.000	49				
Training Environment	Between Groups	0.369	3	0.123	0.547	0.653	NS
	Within Groups	10.351	46	0.225			
	Total	10.720	49				
Industry Impediments	Between Groups	0.192	3	0.064	0.276	0.843	NS
	Within Groups	10.688	46	0.232			
	Total	10.880	49				
Time Constraints	Between Groups	0.486	3	0.162	1.239	0.306	NS
	Within Groups	6.014	46	0.131			
	Total	6.500	49				
Cost Implications	Between Groups	0.276	3	0.092	0.267	0.849	NS
	Within Groups	15.904	46	0.346			
	Total	16.180	49				
Top Management Training Issues	Between Groups	0.033	3	0.011	0.528	0.665	NS
	Within Groups	0.947	46	0.021			
	Total	0.980	49				
Perceived Training Benefits	Between Groups	0.748	3	0.249	0.845	0.476	NS
	Within Groups	13.572	46	0.295			
	Total	14.320	49				
Managerial Myopia	Between Groups	2.219	3	0.740	2.771	0.049	Sig.
	Within Groups	12.281	46	0.267			
	Total	14.500	49				
Employee Attitude	Between Groups	1.624	3	0.541	1.823	0.156	NS
	Within Groups	13.656	46	0.297			
	Total	15.280	49				
Managerial Commitment	Between Groups	0.360	3	0.120	0.661	0.580	NS
	Within Groups	8.360	46	0.182			
	Total	8.720	49				
Managerial Perception	Between Groups	0.297	3	0.099	1.258	0.300	NS
	Within Groups	3.623	46	0.079			
	Total	3.920	49				
Top Management Perception	Between Groups	0.000	3	0.000	0.000	1.000	NS
	Within Groups	2.000	46	0.043			
	Total	2.000	49				

Table 8 shows the results of the ANOVA with Employee strength of agencies, and it indicates that none of the factors were found to be statistically significant. There is no significant difference in the perception of the top management viz. their employee strength. The mean scores for top management across all the agencies irrespective of employee strength, show

high scores on all factors (Organizational Support, Managerial Support, Training Practices, Industry Impediments, Time Constraints, Perceived Training Benefits, Managerial Myopia, Employee Attitude and Managerial Commitment), except *Financial Support* and *Cost Constraints*. The investment in training seems to be an area of concern for the travel agencies.

**Table 8: Analysis of variance on various factors of top management perception towards training and development according to agency employee strength**

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Sig./NS
Organizational Support	Between Groups	0.981	4	0.245	0.697	0.598	NS
	Within Groups	15.839	45	0.352			
	Total	16.820	49				
Managerial Support	Between Groups	0.326	4	0.082	0.406	0.804	NS
	Within Groups	9.054	45	0.201			
	Total	9.380	49				
Training Practices	Between Groups	0.754	4	0.188	0.659	0.624	NS
	Within Groups	12.866	45	0.286			
	Total	13.620	49				
Financial Support	Between Groups	1.304	4	0.326	0.549	0.700	NS
	Within Groups	26.696	45	0.593			
	Total	28.000	49				
Training Environment	Between Groups	0.256	4	0.064	0.275	0.893	NS
	Within Groups	10.464	45	0.233			
	Total	10.720	49				
Industry Impediments	Between Groups	0.300	4	0.075	0.319	0.864	NS
	Within Groups	10.580	45	0.235			
	Total	10.880	49				
Time Constraints	Between Groups	0.536	4	0.134	1.010	0.412	NS
	Within Groups	5.964	45	0.133			
	Total	6.500	49				
Cost Implications	Between Groups	2.019	4	0.505	1.604	0.190	NS
	Within Groups	14.161	45	0.315			
	Total	16.180	49				
Top Management Training Issues	Between Groups	0.042	4	0.011	0.510	0.729	NS
	Within Groups	0.937	45	0.021			
	Total	0.980	49				
Perceived Training Benefits	Between Groups	0.740	4	0.185	0.613	0.656	NS
	Within Groups	13.580	45	0.302			
	Total	14.320	49				
Managerial Myopia	Between Groups	0.598	4	0.150	0.484	0.747	NS
	Within Groups	13.902	45	0.309			
	Total	14.500	49				
Employee Attitude	Between Groups	1.664	4	0.416	1.375	0.258	NS
	Within Groups	13.616	45	0.303			
	Total	15.280	49				
Managerial Commitment	Between Groups	0.541	4	0.135	0.745	0.567	NS
	Within Groups	8.179	45	0.182			
	Total	8.720	49				
Managerial Perception	Between Groups	0.438	4	0.109	1.415	0.245	NS
	Within Groups	3.482	45	0.077			
	Total	3.920	49				
Top Management Perception	Between Groups	0.205	4	0.051	1.287	0.289	NS
	Within Groups	1.795	45	0.040			
	Total	2.000	49				

## CONCLUSION

The top management perceives to offer organizational and managerial support in conducting trainings for their employees. According to them, training is offered to the employees at all levels, and employees are encouraged to enhance their skills. However, the top management faces several issues like industry impediments, time constraints, cost constraints which hinder their efforts to impart training to the employees. The perception of the top management also acts as a barrier to invest time and cost in sending employees for training. Top management needs to understand that investment in training and education will have long and lasting returns through increased productivity and improved staff performance. Travel agency business may be facing several manpower issues, but they can be overcome by making a concerted effort in training and development. And unless top management are totally convinced in the benefits of training, not only for their employees but also for their organization, the function of training and development cannot achieve organizational objectives.

## REFERENCES

- Aksu, A. and Yildiz, S. (2011), Measuring Results of Training with ROI Method: An Application in a 5-Star Hotel in Antalya Region of Turkey. *Tourismos: An International Multidisciplinary Journal of Tourism*, 6 (1), pp. 193-212.
- Ashraf, S. H. and Mathur, P. (2003). *Human Resource Development in Tourism Industry*, in ed. Book Tourism Industry in India, Panda, T. and Mishra, S., New Delhi: Excel Books, pp. 141-157.
- Bassi, L. J. (1992). *Smart Workers, Smart Work: A Survey of Small Businesses on Workplace Education and Reorganization of Work*, Southport Institute for Policy Analysis, Washington, DC, p. 37.
- Baum, T. (2006a). *Human Resource Management for Tourism, Hospitality and Leisure: An International Perspective*, London: International Thomson.
- Bécherel, L. (2001). The WTO Tourism Policy and Strategy Course. *TedQual*, No. 2.
- Becker, G. S. (1962). Investment in Human Capital: A Theoretical Analysis. *Journal of Political Economy*, 70 (5), pp. 9-49.
- Cambridge Policy Consultants (2007). Evaluation of Tourism Training in Scotland, Newton Hall, Cambridge Canadian Tourism Human Resource Council (2011). Available: [http://cthrc.ca/en/research\\_publications/~media/Files/CTHRC/Home/research\\_publications/workplace\\_matters/PanelReport\\_TrainingReceived\\_EN\\_Current.ashx](http://cthrc.ca/en/research_publications/~media/Files/CTHRC/Home/research_publications/workplace_matters/PanelReport_TrainingReceived_EN_Current.ashx)
- Chand, M. (2000). *Travel Agency HRD Practices: An Investigation, Tourism in the New Millennium: Challenges and Opportunities*, in Bansal, S. P., Sushama, Khan, S and Mohan, C, ed. Abhisekh Publications, Chandigarh, pp. 429-444.
- Chand, M. and Chauhan, V. (2003). *Travel Agency HRD Practices: An Investigation*, in ed. Book Tourism Industry in India, Panda, T. and Mishra, S., p 158-168, New Delhi: Excel Books.
- Chand, M. (2000). *Travel Agency Management – An Introductory Text*, Anmol Publications Pvt Ltd, New Delhi.
- Cross, K. P. (1981). *Adults as Learners*, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Curran, J., Blackburn, R. A., Kitching, J. and North, J. (1996). Establishing Small Firms' Training Practices, Needs, Difficulties and Use of Industry Training Organizations. *Research Studies*, RS17, DfEE/HMSO, London.
- Doswell, R. (1994). *Tourism – How Effective Management Makes the Difference*, London: Butterworth and Heinemann, pp. 265-286.
- Ferris, G., Hochwarter, W., Buckley, M., Harrell-Cook, G. and Frink, D. (1999). Human Resources Management: Some New Directions. *Journal of Management (JOM)*, 25 (3), pp. 385 - 415.
- Green, F. (1997). *Review of Information on the Benefits of Training for Employers*, Research Report No. 7, London: DfEE.
- Harrington, R. J. and Kendall, K. W. (2004). Firm Performance and Strategy Implementation Success: Direct and Moderating Effects of Size and Involvement. *Proceedings of Asia Pacific CHRIE*, 2, pp. 290-302.
- Poulston, J. (2008). Hospitality Workplace Problems and Poor Training: A Close Relationship. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 20 (4), pp. 412-427.
- Kitching, J. and Blackburn, R. (1999). Management Training and Networking in Small and Medium-Sized Enterprises in Three European Regions: Implications for Business Support. *Environment and Planning: Government and Policy*, 17 (5), pp. 621-635.
- Lucas, R. E. (1995). *Managing Employee Relations in the Hotel and Catering Industry*, London: Cassell.
- Lucas, R. E. (1996). Industrial Relations in Hotels and Catering: Neglect or Paradox. *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 34 (2), pp. 267-286.
- Khan, N. A. (2008). Human Resource Development in Tourism Industry in India: A Case Study of Air India Ltd., No.14, New Delhi: El Periplo Sustentable, pp. 89-116.
- Pareek, U. (2005). Managers as Training Partners. *Indian Journal of Training and Development*, 5 (July – September).

- Price, L. (1994). Poor Personnel Practices in the Hotel and Catering Industry: Does it Matter. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 4 (4), pp. 44-62.
- Raj, A. (2008). Human Capital Needs and Challenges for the Tourism Sector. *South Asian Journal of Tourism and Heritage*, 1 (1).
- Rebecca, S. (1998). *Tourism Principles and Practices*, New Delhi: Longman Publishers, pp. 458-459.
- Reddy, B. R. (2007). *Effective Human Resource Training and Development Strategy*, Hyderabad: Himalaya Publishing House.
- Roberts, J. (1995). *Human Resource Practice in the Hospitality Industry*, London: Hodder and Stoughton.
- Singh, S. (1997). Developing Human Resources for the Tourism Industry with reference to India, *Journal of Tourism Management*, 18 (5), Great Britain: Elsevier Science Ltd., pp. 299-306.
- Sobaih, A. E. E. (2011). Half Job—Half Training? Management Perceptions of Part-time Employee Training in the Hospitality Industry. *Journal of Human Resources in Hospitality and Tourism*, 10 (4), pp. 400-420.
- Storey, D. and Westhead, P. (1994). Management Training and Small Firm Performance: A Critical Review. Working Paper No. 18, Centre for Small and Medium Sized Enterprises, Warwick University Business School.
- Sussman, D. (2002). Barriers to Job-related Training. *Perspectives on Labor and Income*, 3 (3), pp. 25-32.
- Swain, S. K. and George, B. P. (2007). HRD Practices in the Classified Hotels in Orissa: A Study of Employee Perceptions. *Pasos*, 5 (1), pp. 81-97.
- Watane, C. and Gibson, J. (2001). Barriers to Employment-Related Training in New Zealand: Differences across Ethnic Groups. *New Zealand Journal of Industrial Relations*, 26 (2), pp. 1-14.
- Watson, S. (2008). Where are we now? A Review of Management Development Issues in the Hospitality and Tourism Sector Implications for Talent Management. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 20 (7), pp. 758-780.
- Watson, S. (2006). Contextual Understanding of Hospitality Management Development: A Critical Perspective, Ph.D. dissertation, Napier University, Edinburgh.
- Wills, M. (1993). *Managing the Training Process: Putting the Principles into Practice*, Hampshire: Gower Publishing Ltd.