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ABSTRACT

Learning transfer has become a main issue in training as it symbolises the effectiveness of the training programme and the return on the organisation’s investment. A deep understanding on the factors affect learning transfer will be valuable for organisations in managing training programmes. For instance, the identification of the relevant learning transfer factors in organisation can facilitate the application on the job in ensuring the effectiveness of the learning transfer. In this study, the literature of learning transfer factors will be reviewed theoretically followed by critical analysis discussion on possible factors in Malaysia context. There are extensive numbers of empirical studies from western context that have been investigated and discussed. Nevertheless, less researches attention has been paid to the factors of learning transfer in Malaysia context. Most of the studies conducted in Malaysia are influenced by factors from the west although there are some scholars who added other factors in the context of Malaysia in their studies. Thus, the researcher has analyzed theoretically the learning transfer factors and provides a summary in accordance findings from the perspective of both western and Malaysian. Based on the literature review, the factors of learning transfer can be divided to three main factors; trainee characteristics, training design and work environment. The wide range of potential learning transfer factors will categorize under this three dimensions based on its’ definitions and functions. This paper also provides a discussion in terms of the significant of this study to the body knowledge and practical. In addition, the identification of these factors in enhancing labor productivity associated with human capital theory in economics.
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INTRODUCTION

In this era of globalisation, the importance of training and development activities became the main weapon in the development of trained manpower resources and competitive. The continuous of training and development activities are not only interested to meet promotion requirements of the workers, but also be valuable to the organization's investment to produce the workers globally competitive. Definition of training described by Noe (2010) which states training as planned by the organization's efforts to assist employee provide the impression that the efficiency of training activities enable employees to acquire competencies in performing assigned tasks adequately. Competencies that include knowledge, skills or behaviors then be used for successful job performance. In addition, Buckley and Caple (2008) defined training as a planned and systematic effort in order to modify or develop employee knowledge, skill or attitude through learning experience. The advantages arising from improvement of employee performance will have an impact on organisational performance indirectly. As a result, organisation profit will increase and expenses for training activities deemed worthwhile. The conditions then will be creating competitive advantage to the organisation.

Malaysia as a developing country, providing a range of training and development activities through a variety of policies implemented by the government with a high amount of the provision. For instance, in the public sector itself, Service Circular 2005 Public Service Department sets a minimum of seven days of training per year per employee. It is also reinforced by the activities of training and development in the public service to be taking place as an event (Haslinda and Mahyuddin, 2009). Hence it is not surprising that the Malaysian government has announced 2011 as the Malaysia Skills Year to support the workers in improving the performance of their work. In addition, intervention of
Malaysia government in training and development area can be seen through the 10th Malaysia Plan, which government has aspiration to develop, attract and retain a first-world talent employee. For example, around RM 200 million allocated under the Human Resource Development Fund (HRDF) to 210,000 training places in Malaysia (Gobleee, 2011). One of the programs which are under the HRDF is known as the 1Malaysia Training Program with the main purpose in providing employees of Human Resource Development Council (HRDC) registered employers the opportunity to upgrade their skills. In order to achieve this initiative, training courses which related to attain higher skill level (‘upskill’) and to gain new skills (‘reskill’) are offered to them. The 1Malaysia Training Programme has received overwhelming response from 205 HRDC registered training providers by the first group of submission of 1,458 training courses. Therefore HRDF has also allocated an additional fund of RM40 million as a training incentive and to encourage registered employers to participate in the 1Malaysia Training Program (Gobleee, 2011). The facts of this program showed the positive feedback from the employers, institution as well as training providers in supporting government efforts.

Nevertheless, the efforts and investments undertaken will be futile without the application of acquired competencies to the workplace. Therefore, the application of the knowledge, skills and abilities learned during the training should be used whenever possible when the employee returns to work. The application of learning during training to the workplace commonly known as the “transfer of training”, “transfer of learning”, “training transfer”, “learning transfer” or “transfer” which is considered or perceived as one interchangeable terms in the field of HRD (Chen, et.al. 2005; Shahril 2008; Raja Suzana and Shariffah, 2011). However, this conceptual paper will use the term of “learning transfer” to refer the application of knowledge or skills after training at the workplace. Thus, this paper aims to discuss the learning transfer factors in the literatures from both western and Malaysian perspectives.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Learning Transfer

Learning transfer is one of the elements or criteria used to evaluate the effectiveness of training programme. As mentioned by Yaghi (2006), learning transfer is an aspect of training evaluation and concept in measuring the amount of abilities, skills, and experiences that participants retain to improve their performance. Organisations should collect outcome measures related to both learning and transfer in ensuring adequate evaluation (Noe, 2010). Therefore, transfer has become a main issue in training as it symbolises the effectiveness of the training programme from the perspective of the training team, and it symbolises the return on the organisation’s investment. Noe (2010) further stated that learning transfer should be planned even before the training although it may seem like something to be considered after the training programme. Before the extended discussion, the understanding of the meaning of the learning transfer needs to be explored. It is to be able to facilitate further understanding in identifying potential factors in the transfer.

Baldwin and Ford (1988) defined learning transfer as the generalisation of learning, trained skills, and behaviours obtained by the trainee during the training programme and how these learning, trained skills, and behaviours are transferred to the workplace and the retaining of the implementation of the new skills over a long period. It has been noted that learning transfer will occur when trainees apply or use the competencies learned from the training regularly and this requires continuous improvement in their job performances (Velada and Caetano, 2007). Shahril (2008) described the application of these competencies as an ongoing exercise rather than a once-off task. Therefore, the learning transfer emphasizes the application of the training content learned to the workplace and the consistency to maintain and adapt the knowledge or skill with the work environment.

Other researchers have provided different insights into definition of learning transfer. For instance, Nikandrou et al. (2009) divided transfer into two types: direct and indirect. A direct transfer is gained directly from the knowledge and skills required in the training to the workplace environment. This type of transfer has proven effectiveness and will bring benefits to the organisation and trainees. However, this kind of transfer is hard to achieve and it needs a lot of effort and commitment from everyone involved in the training. On the other hand, for indirect transfer, the content and the objective of the training will not be applied to the workplace but knowledge, experiences, and skills obtained from the training programme will be transferred and applied informally or by chance at the workplace. This transfer is easier to achieve than the direct transfer. Trainees most probably will become more confident, have high team spirit, and be more disciplined as a result from the training programme.
In other perspective, Demster (1990) categorised transfer results as positive transfer, zero transfer, and negative transfer. Positive transfer occurs when prior learning or training facilitates trainees in acquiring a new skill or reaching the solution to a new problem. It also refers to trainees successfully applying the skills gained in training into their jobs. In this situation, the trainees reach a higher level of job performance. In contrast, negative transfer occurs when prior learning or training hinders trainees from acquiring a new skill or reaching the solution to a new problem. In this situation, the trainees perform worse although they have prior learning or training. Finally, zero transfer occurs when trainees acquire a new skill or reach the solution of a new problem but there is no effect on their job performance.

Regardless how learning transfer is defined and how the results are categorised, a deep understanding on factors affecting learning transfer will be valuable for organisations in managing training programmes. The identification of the relevant learning transfer factors in organisation can facilitate the application on the job in ensuring the effectiveness of the learning transfer.

Model Of Learning Transfer

Research on learning transfer factors is not a recent study in western countries because this area of research is often discussed in the field of HRD. For instance, the study of learning transfer factors has been growing after Baldwin and Ford’s (1988) review. Therefore, since 1990, Human Resource Development Quarterly (HRDQ) has published at least one referred article associated with learning transfer study (Chen, 2005). Research by Baldwin and Ford (1988) is a good beginning for HRD practitioners and researchers to study the concept of learning transfer and understanding the factors involved. Baldwin and Ford (1988) established a model of learning transfer that consisted of three main factors or constructs influence learning retention, as illustrated in Figure 1.

Early model of the learning transfer process by Baldwin and Ford (1988) provides a guide to the HRD researchers and practitioners toward discussion on three main factors that influence learning transfer, i.e. trainee characteristics, training design and work environment. These three factors act as training inputs to facilitate trainee in achieving training output which known as learning and retention. In the same time, the condition of transfer that included generalisation and maintenance assist the training inputs to facilitate trainee in achieving training output which known as learning and retention. Research on trainee characteristics factor is also known as cognitive, psychomotor and physical ability construct that can affect the performance of the transfer task (Holton, et.al. 2000). These factors also influence trainees’ motivation to learn and transfer their learning. The role of self-efficacy and motivation to encourage trainee expectations and organisational commitment (Tesluk, et.al. 1995) and work engagement (Noe and Schmitt, 1986) reported the impact varies. Personality traits (Ford and Weissbein, 1997) and goal orientation (Fisher and Ford, 1998) have also been associated with the motivation to apply the competencies.

The second factor that is the training design which is defined as the characteristics of the learning environment that covered learning objectives, meaningful materials, feedback, opportunity to practice, organization and physical features of the training site. Baldwin and Ford (1988) categorized the training design into three sub-factors that involved the application of transfer theories, create learning environments and applications in self-management strategies. Similarly, other researches on training design factors contribute a variety factors which affect learning transfer. Training design strategies such as general principles (Schunk, 1996), using variable training stimulation, identical element as well as transfer setting strategies (Baldwin, 1992) facilitate in enhancing learning. Besides that, both over-learning and massed-learning as tried and tested conditions of practice also affect transfer in positive way (Enos, et.al, 2003).

Finally the work environment factors consisted of four dimensions that covered climate for transfer, management and peer support, opportunity to perform and technological support. Transfer climate factors are identified as mediating variables in the relationship between organizational context and work behavior and also with individual’s job attitudes (Holton, et.al., 2000). Conducive training climate can be used to enhance learning in the opportunity to use, supervisor and peer support played a major part (Baldwin and Ford, 1988). The use of technology as a motivating factor to the transfer involves the use of electronic performance support systems (EPSSs) that can provide access to information on the skills they have learned and the advice and guidance of an expert.
The research undertaken by the Baldwin and Ford (1988) encouraged other researchers (e.g., Noe and Ford, 1992; Tannenbaum and Yukl, 1992; Ford and Weissbein, 1997; Holton et.al. 1997) to explore research on learning transfer factors. After research by Baldwin and Ford (1988), a conceptual model by Holton et.al. (1997) is often cited and used in research of learning transfer. Holton, et al. (1997; 2000) developed a comprehensive learning transfer model that can be generalized across organisations. At first, Holton (1996) has adapted the instrument by Rouiller and Goldstein (1993) and developed the Concept of Evaluation and Learning Transfer Measurement Model. Then, the process continues in 1997 and in 2000 Holton and his colleagues have developed an instrument known as the Learning Transfer System Inventory (LTSI) (Holton, et.al., 1997; 2000).

The instrument consisted of 16 constructs which represent two distinct domains; Training in Specific and Training in General. The Training in Specific domain contains 45 items measuring 11 constructs which involved Learner Readiness, Motivation to Transfer, Positive Personal Outcomes, Negative Personal Outcomes, Personal Capacity for Transfer, Peer Support, Supervisor Support, Supervisor Sanctions, Perceived Content Validity, Transfer Design, and Opportunity to Use. Meanwhile, the Training in General domain included more general and less program specific factors that may influence any or all types of training being conducted. These factors involved 23 of items which measuring 5 constructs; Transfer Effort-Performance Expectations, Performance Outcomes Expectations, Resistance/Openness to Change, Performance Self-Efficacy and Performance Coaching. Totally these validated LTSI items contain 68 items in 16 constructs.

LTSI which is a theoretically-based, psychometrically-sound instrument and was developed by using factor analysis can be used to diagnose the strengths and weaknesses of organisational transfer systems accurately (Chen, et.al. 2005; Khasawneh, et.al. 2006). This instrument can assist training institution or training providers to identify factors affecting performance outcomes, intervening variables and take action to correct problem areas which inhibiting performance from learning. In addition, this instrument could be use in cross cultural condition as previous study in Thailand (Yamnill, 2001), Taiwan (Chen, et.al. 2005), Jordan (Khasawneh, et.al. 2006), Belgium (Devos, et.al. 2007), Ukraine (Yamkovenko, et.al. 2007), Germany (Bates, et.al. 2007) and Portugal (Velada, et.al. 2009). In addition, researches were revealed that instrument was tested with more than 5 000 subjects in the United States and has shown evidence of reliability as well as construct validity, criterion validity, convergent validity and divergent validity (Holton, et.al. 2000; Bates 2001).

Learning Transfer Factors Studies In Malaysia

Studies of the learning transfer area in Malaysia is mostly done in the public sector (e.g. Shahril, 2008; Hanafiah, 2009; Azmi, et.al. 2010; Raja Suzana and Sharrifah, 2011; Dayang Nailul Munnan and Jicky Chaong, 2011; Vimala and Hu, 2011; Ismail, et.al. 2011) compared to the private sector (e.g. Jalilah, 2007; Ailar, 2012). There are some studies by Malaysian researchers (e.g. Shahril, 2008; Jalilah, 2009; Hanafiah, 2009; Azmi, et.al. 2010) that used the 16 factors of learning transfer from Holton (2000). The use of these factors indicated that Malaysian researchers have a tendency and interest to study these factors in the context of Malaysia. This view was also due to the nature of the cross-cultural instrument and has been used by most of scholars, particularly in the west.

There are some researchers who added other factors to their studies according to their research contexts. For example Shahril (2008) who undertaken a study of the influence of knowledge sharing factor toward training transfer factors derived from Holton (2000). The findings indicated that knowledge sharing factor is stable and highly rated across training type and trainees' demographics. Hence, the knowledge sharing factors development received attention by the local researchers in exploring this factor either together with other variables (e.g. Mohd Bakhari and Zawiyah, 2009; Noorazah and Juhana, 2011) or has connection with the learning transfer study (e.g Farhad, et.al. 2011; Farhad and Roohangiz, 2011; Ailar, 2012). Similarly, other researchers such as Azmi, et.al. (2010) added three more learning transfer factors according to their research context. The addition of three factors that included curriculum design, instructional delivery and learning process associated with 16 factors from Holton (2000) were used to study the effectiveness of learning transfer among the automotive mechatronics course trainees of the National Dual Training System (NDTS) programme. The findings indicated that the dimensions for effective learning transfer are course content, training delivery and working tasks. The findings by Azmi, et.al. (2010) is in contrast to study by Jalilah (2009), which only incorporates the International Personality Inventory Pool (IPIP) with 16 factors Holton (2000). Jalilah (2009) using the two instruments by focusing the trainees according to the characteristics of IPIP well as other factors of Holton (2000). While Azmi, et.al (2010) incorporate three new factors other than the customized Holton research. Studies involving business writing skills training in a private organisation in Malaysia suggested that the learning transfer is influenced by
factors of motivation to transfer learning, transfer design and opportunity to use learning. However, the two researchers found that training design factors plays an important role in influencing the learning transfer. This finding is supported by Hanafiah (2009) study on transfer factors toward cognitive training and affective learning in the level 1 Sport Science Course by the Malaysian National Sports Council. Hanafiah (2009) only used 16 factors from Holton (2000) and suggested that individual, motivation and ability factors to be at a high level and effects on effective learning in sport context while environment factors were at moderate level. The using of Holton (2000) ability construct or factor also covered the perceived content validity factor and transfer design factors. This factor has a similar definition to the course content factor (Azmi, et.al. 2010) and transfer design factor (Jalilah, 2009). Thus, training design factors should also be taken into account in designing training in the context of sports.

There are also other researchers in Malaysia that does not use the constructs of Holton (2000). For example, Raja Suzana and Sharriffah (2011) who investigated the training design factors as content validity only and separating it from transfer design factor. The researchers also have continued their efforts to examine the motivation to transfer factor in their research. The research aimed on studying the factors of learning transfer to the learning transfer among support staff in higher education institutes revealed that the three factors contribute to the 65% of the transfer of learning. The contribution of factors such as motivation to transfer and training design by Dayang Nairil Munna and Jicky Chaong (2011) also showed that these factors (motivation to transfer and training design) has a significant correlation with the transfer of learning as well as transfer climate factors. A study conducted by Haslinda and Mahyuddin (2009) on the effectiveness of training and development in the public sector proposed four factors that support learning transfer which are support from the top management and peers, individual employee attitude, job-related factors and deficiencies in training practices. Interpretations of the employers’ role as learning transfer factor can be seen in the study by Ismail, et.al. (2011) that construct these factor to four sub factors ; support, communication, assignment and delivery mode factors. The study findings revealed that communication and delivery mode have played important roles as factor in managers’ role that influenced learning transfer. Studies of support factor also have been investigated by researchers who have been discussed previously (e.g. Shahrrl, 2008; Hanafiah, 2009; Jalilah, 2009; Azmi, et.al. 2010; Dayang Nairil Munna and Jicky Chaong, 2011) that used these factor in construct of environment factors. For example Jalilah (2009) which revealed that environmental factors are the strongest factors that prevent the learning transfer. The summary of the literature review related to the learning transfer factors in Malaysia is shown in Table 1.

**Economic And Learning Transfer**

Although the learning transfer in the workplace is synonymous with HRD research areas, however it also has significance and related to the labor economy. In the economic literatures, human capital theory provides a theoretical basis for the study of learning transfer in the workplace (Grip and Sauermann, 2013; Ferrer, and Riddell, 2010). The basic idea of this model involves the positive effects of training due to learning new skills and creating more productive employees. Grip and Sauermann (2013) stated that the economic literature discovered that participation in training will contribute benefit to both the employee and employer. For example, the transfer of knowledge and skills learned in training programee conceptualized as training improvement that influence employee productivity. If viewed in Kirkpatrick typology of four different levels in the process of training evaluation, many HRD literatures focus on the reaction, learning, and behavior levels (Grip and Sauermann, 2013). Meanwhile economy literatures are reflected in the results level of the training that effect on the business or environment. Moreover, the returns of training are better measured with individual productivity indicators against the entire firm results that may be influenced by other factors (Wang et al., 2002).

Substantial research in the economic literatures revealed that the increase in productivity not just due to the improvement in workers' skills. However it also was influenced by other factors such as training methods (De Corte, 2003) and work climate (Weisweiler et al., 2012). These factors also play a role in influencing the learning transfer in the workplace. Hence, the understanding and depth analysis of these factors is important to improve the transfer which in turn affects the productivity of the workers. Therefore, the convergence of added value in terms of returns or key performance indicators related to firm productivity contributes economy literatures as complementary to HRD literatures, specifically in learning transfer area. Both economic and HRD field are not only concerned with the application of the knowledge or skills learned (learning transfer), but the extent of the training that benefit the organisation.
DISCUSSION

Overall, the learning transfer factors in Malaysia much influenced by the studies of the west theoretically. However, efforts by Malaysian researchers to customize the learning transfer factors in the Malaysian context will inspire more future scholars to explore this area in more depth. Based on the literature review from western and Malaysian contexts, the learning transfer factors can be categorized into three main factors. These factors are the characteristics of trainees, training design and work environmental factors. The composition of these three factors has in common with the factors of Baldwin and Ford (1988) in their beginning model of learning transfer process. The transfer literature analysis also revealed that there is variety of factors in literature that can be overlapped or represent the similar meanings. For instance, factor for opportunity to use learning (Holton, et.al. 2000) which also involved technological support factor (Baldwin and Ford, 1988) as well as positive personal outcome and negative personal outcome (Holton, et.al. 2011) which represent the same meaning with perceived organizational support factor by Rhoades and Eisenberger (2000). Therefore, the researcher concluded the learning transfer factors in Malaysia and western as shown in Table 2.

IMPLICATION TO THE FUTURE RESEARCH

This paper provides an insight into learning transfer factors from the Malaysian context based on the literatures and subsequently can trigger ideas to other researchers in the future. This theoretical study provides a guide for the future researchers and academics to explore more details the relating transfer factors, particularly in Malaysia. In addition, this paper can also be a reference to examine learning transfer factors in the Malaysian perspective with other variables such as individual performance, job satisfaction or job commitments. In term of the implications to the HRD practitioners, this paper provides information to the practitioners to formulate strategies in facilitating learning transfer of their employees. HRD practitioners can identify and utilize learning transfer factors that are discussed in this paper for that purpose.

CONCLUSION

The challenges and direction of Malaysia's economic transformation also involves the development and management of quality human capital among employees. Thus, the analysis of the learning transfer area is important to contribute the effectiveness of training and development activities, particularly in Malaysia. The discussion of the literatures on learning transfer factors in Malaysia revealed that most of the researchers in Malaysia are affected by the research transfer from the west. In addition, some researchers use an instrument that has already proven cross-cultural as LTSI by Holton (2000) as the basis for their studies. There are also Malaysian researchers who added other factors (e.g. knowledge sharing, curriculum design, instructional delivery and learning process) and adapt it for their research context to explore this area. Consequently, this analysis provides insight into the learning transfer factors from the Malaysian perspective. There are three main factors, namely the transfer of trainee characteristics, training design and work environment factors. Although the composition of these three factors has in common with the early models of the transfer process by Baldwin and Ford (1988), but the sub factors or the constructs are different as shown in Table 2. In summary, the conceptual paper provides a theoretical reflection of the learning transfer factors in Malaysia and stimulates ideas to further researchers.
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**FIGURE 1:** A Model of the Learning Transfer Process (Baldwin and Ford, 1988)

**TABLE 1:** A Summary Of The Literature On Learning Transfer Factors In Malaysia.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AUTHORS</th>
<th>PURPOSE</th>
<th>FACTORS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Uses three key HRD models, which consists of LTSI model (Holton et al. 2000), HRD model (Holton 1996), and Theory of Planned Behaviour Model (TPB Model) devised by Ajzen (1991), to explore the areas of motivation and knowledge sharing. Incorporates 16 factors of training transfer by Holton (2000) with sharing behaviour elements in TPB Model as the conceptual framework to expand the view of the transfer of learning framework.</td>
<td>- Knowledge sharing factors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LTSI instrument is combined with International Personality Inventory Pool (IPIP) scales by Goldberg’s to determine the catalysts, barriers, and transfer factors.</td>
<td>- 10 factors as catalysts (the strongest : motivation to transfer &amp; transfer design) and 6 factors as barrier : the strongest is work environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haslinda and Mahyuddin (2009)</td>
<td>Examines the effectiveness of training and development in public sector.</td>
<td>- Support from top management and peers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Employee individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study/Author</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Factors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azmi, et. al. (2010)</td>
<td>Study on National Dual Training System (NDTS) Mechatronics Automotive Course in Malaysia use 16 factors of LTSI and add three more factors namely curriculum design, learning process, and instructional delivery (based on literature and expert group)</td>
<td>Deficiencies in training practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raja Suzana and Sharriffah (2011)</td>
<td>Analysed from the perspective of the low training transfer activities among the supporting staff of public higher learning institution in Malaysia.</td>
<td>Training design (content validity) Transfer design Motivation to transfer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ismail, et.al. (2011)</td>
<td>Examined the managers’ role factor toward transfer of learning in government sector</td>
<td>Managers’ role which consists support, communication, assignment and delivery mode factors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dayang Nailul Munna and Jicky Chaong (2011)</td>
<td>Investigated these 3 main factors on learning transfer</td>
<td>Motivation to transfer (goal setting) Training design (training content and sequence of content) Transfer climate (peer and supervisor support)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 2: The Summary Of Learning Transfer Factor In Malaysia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning transfer factors in Malaysia</th>
<th>Examples of others factors that have different term but similar meanings.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>(1) Trainee Characteristics</strong></td>
<td>Trainee’s ability to transfer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Performance Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>- Application in theories of transfer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Learner Readiness</td>
<td>- Creation a learning environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Motivation to Transfer</td>
<td>- Application in self-management strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Transfer Effort-Performance Expectation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Performance-Outcome Expectation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(2) Training Design</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Content Validity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Transfer Design</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(3) Work Environment</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Feedback/Performance Coaching</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Peer Support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Supervisor/Manager Support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Resistance/Openness to Change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Supervisor/Manager Sanctions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Personal Capacity for Transfer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Opportunity to Use Learning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Personal Outcome-Positive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Personal Outcome-Negative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Learning Organisation Culture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Sharing Behaviour</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>