ABSTRACT

In today’s economy, companies are increasingly facing challenges in a global market and rapid shifts in technology. The competition due to the economy demands people’s knowledge and skills to be constantly updated. Making a growing number of companies developed a new learning culture. In the past, companies have viewed training as a necessary expense rather than an investment. As such, emphasis was placed by cutting the expenses of training and at the same time the training is hoped to be more efficient, as it is part of investment. The knowledge and skills of the employees are now being held on equal basis with the company’s monetary asset. Learning faster than other companies represents one of the most important competitive advantages. Here the Internet technology represents an unprecedented opportunity for training departments to add value to the companies through e-learning practice. The method is viewed as cost effective and is now overwhelmingly practiced by most companies. Despite its benefits, the companies are in doubt of whether e-learning is effective enough to be a sole method of training besides it is cost effective. This is particularly true when FCM company where this study was carried out, experienced increasing number of accidents when it applies e-learning as a primary method of training. The study was conducted to 50 technical employees in the Company to determine whether participant perceive e-learning training is more effective than blended training. A survey was used during the quantitative phase with the data analyzed using an independent t test and multiple regression test. From the t test, it is found that there is a significant difference in the training effectiveness between the two methods. While, multiple regression test was used to determine whether there were correlated between the relationship of two independent variables (behavior and cost of injury) and dependent variable (training effectiveness), which yielded sufficient evidence to reject the null hypothesis that there were correlation between the variables. During the qualitative phase, interviews were used to identify the attributes that enhanced or distracted from e-learning training. Results indicated that employees demonstrated a prefer blended training over e-learning training. Even though, top managements of the company are encouraged to emphasis an e-learning due to cost-effective and at the same time translate the e-learning model into practice.
ABSTRAK

Dalam ekonomi hari ini, banyak syarikat menghadapi cabaran dalam pasaran global dan perubahan pesat teknologi. Persaingan ekonomi menuntut pengetahuan orang ramai dan kemahiran yang sentiasa dikemas kini. Ia mempengaruhi semakin banyak syarikat membangunkan budaya pembelajaran yang baru. Pada masa lalu, syarikat melihat latihan sebagai perbelanjaan yang perlu dan bukannya sebagai pelaburan. Oleh itu, penekanan telah diletakkan dengan mengurangkan perbelanjaan latihan dan pada masa yang sama latihan itu adalah diharapkan untuk menjadi lebih efisyen, kerana ia adalah sebahagian daripada pelaburan. Pengetahuan dan kemahiran pekerja di dalam organisasi kini sebagai dasar aset kewangan syarikat. Pembelajaran yang lebih cepat berbanding syarikat lain merupakan salah satu kelebihan berdaya saing. Teknologi internet merupakan peluang yang baru dalam latihan pekerja untuk menamakan nilai sebuah syarikat melalui perlaksanaan latihan secara online. Memandangkan, latihan secara online dilihat sebagai kos yang efektif, semakin banyak syarikat mengamalkannya. Walau bagaimanapun, pada masa yang sama kemalangan masih berlaku di tempat kerja. Disebalik kos yang efektif, kebanyakkan syarikat masih ragu-ragu sama ada e-pembelajaran cukup berkesan untuk dijadikan sebagai kaedah tunggal latihan. Ini adalah benar khususnya apabila syarikat FCM di mana kajian ini telah dilakukan, mengalami kemalangan yang semakin meningkat apabila ia mengamalkan latihan secara online sebagai satu kaedah utama latihan. Kajian ini telah dilakukan untuk 50 orang pekerja teknikal dalam organisasi untuk menentukan sama ada peserta melihat latihan secara online adalah lebih berkesan daripada latihan dicampur. Tinjauan yang telah digunakan semasa fasa kuantitatif dengan data dianalisis menggunakan ujian t dan ujian regresi berganda. Dari ujian t, didapati bahawa terdapat perbezaan yang signifikan dalam keberkesanan latihan antara kedua-dua kaedah. Sementara itu, ujian regresi berganda telah digunakan untuk menentukan sama ada terdapat hubungan antara dua pemboleh ubah bebas (tingkah laku dan kos pekerja yang cedera) dan pemboleh ubah bersandar (latihan keberkesanan), yang menghasilkan bukti yang mencukupi untuk menolak hipotesis nol bahawa terdapat korelasi antara pemboleh ubah. Semasa fasa kualitatif, temu bual telah digunakan untuk mengenal pasti ciri-ciri terhadap keberkesanan latihan secara online. Hasil kajian menunjukkan responden memberi keutamaan kepada latihan kombinasi online dan traditional berbanding latihan secara online semata-mata. Oleh kerana kos yang efektif, pihak pengurusan atasan syarikat adalah digalakkan untuk memberi penekanan terhadap latihan secara online dan pada masa yang sama menterjemahkan model latihan secara online sebagai satu amalan.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 INTRODUCTION

Companies are increasingly facing new challenges in today’s new economy. Increasing competition in a globalised market, shrinking corporate resources, maturing markets, rapid shifts in technology, and the recruitment and retention of talented and skilled people are just a few of these challenges. Therefore, the Human resource developers are increasingly being challenged to respond to a changing work environment that is demanding “just-in-time training” for employees. The purpose is to produce competent human performance and to continually update their skills besides employees to getting familiar with the usual policies and new work system requirement of the company. They also have to adapt with the technology being employed.

Many manufacturers are creating enterprise-wide compliance training programmes by hiring additional trainers, recruiting supervisors to teach classes, extending shifts to provide additional training and constructing classrooms within the plant. Organisations are doubling their instructor-led training efforts to ensure that employees are receiving more hours of training. The strategy is to provide as much classroom training to employees as possible.

Traditionally, all the training classes have been taught in a face to face classroom. Recent years, most organisations acquired technology for business purpose. The question that arises, is whether use of this technology for training will effectively and efficiently enable employees to transfer the skills that they are taught for the workplace.