AENSI Journals

Australian Journal of Basic and Applied Sciences

ISSN:1991-8178

Journal home page: www.ajbasweb.com

Moderating Effects of Work Environment on Motivation to Learn and Perceived Training Transfer: Empirical Evidence from a Bank

Ng Kim-Soon, Nabila Ahmad, Abd Rahman Ahmad

Faculty of Technology Management and Business, Universiti Tun Hussein Onn Maalaysia, 86400. Malaysia.

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:
Received 25 January 2014
Received in revised form
8 April 2014
Accepted 20 April 2014
Available online 10 May 2014

Keywords:
works environment, learning, training, motivation to learn, training transfer

ABSTRACT

Background: Literature suggested that the ability and opportunities for individual trainees to effectively apply knowledge, skill and abilities learned during training seasons in performing their task at their respective workplace are vastly influenced by environmental training design, individual learning characteristic, and training delivery factors. In this empirical study, it determined the elements of work environments, motivation to learn and perceived training transfer factors affecting training of employee and investigated how work environment influences the relationship between these two factors of a Malaysian Bank. **Objective:** The general objective of this study is to examine whether elements of organizational environment factors, such as supervisor's support, supervisor's sanction, peer's support and opportunity to practice have any significant influence on individual perceived training transfer. However, the specific objectives of this study are to determine the elements of work environmental factors affecting training, elements of motivation to learn and perceived training transfer, determine whether is there a significant relationship between motivation to learn and perceived training transfer and, determining whether work environment influences the relationship between motivation to learn and perceived training transfer. **Results:** This study finds that the elements of work environments are the opportunity to use what is learned from the training, supervisor sanction and, supervisor and peer support. The elements of motivation to learn are intervention fulfillment, learning outcome, job attitude, target achievement, and expected utility. The perceived training transfer elements that are found affecting training are trainee reactions, job attitude and improved job competency. **Conclusion:** Work environment factors moderate the relationship between motivations to learn and perceived training transfer. Implications and limitations of this study are reported.

To Cite This Article: Ng Kim-Soon, Nabila Ahmad, Abd Rahman Ahmad., Moderating Effects of Work Environment on Motivation to Learn and Perceived Training Transfer: Empirical Evidence from a Bank. ***Aust. J. Basic & Appl. Sci.,*** *8(6): 344-361, 2014*

INTRODUCTION

Training is often done by organization to improve employees' job performance (Chiaburu and Marinova, 2005, Salas *et al*., 2006). The trend is that some kinds of training programmes are being implemented regularly in organization irrespective of its size to ensure that employee consistently perform their task at a desired level of performance. Training can be defined as the systematic acquisition of knowledge, skills and attitudes that together lead to improved performance in a specific environment (Salas *et al*., 2006). Effective training can improve individual, team and corporate performance, operational flexibility, attract high quality employees through the offerings of learning and development opportunities and increased in the commitment of employee by encouraging them to identify with mission and objectives of the organization (Amstrong, 2006).

Return on investment of training program depends on the extent of the skills, knowledge, and attitude learned in the program that are being transferred into job setting (Nijman *et al*., 2006). Galvin (2001) claimed that training and performance development program on the average represent between 1.3 percent and 13 percent of an organization payroll cost. In the Malaysian context, the Federal Government allocated RM 50,556 billions (about 20.6 percent) for education and training of the Ninth Malaysia Plan. In the United State, a total of US$ 1.1 billion was budgeted for normal training in 2005 (Dolezalek, 2005). However, it has been established that not more than 10 percent of these dollars resulted in improved job performance (Sivella and Wells, 1998). This means that the huge amount of investment allocated for training proved to be some form of fruitless effort as the return did not commensurate with amount of resource spent. In other words, the transfer of training is not

Corresponding Author: Ng Kim-Soon, Universiti Tun Hussein Onn Malaysia, Faculty of Technology Management and Business, Parit Raja, Batu Pahat, 86400. Johor. Malaysia.
Ph +6017-7263661, E-mail ksng@uthm.edu.my

encouraging. Trainees do not seem to be able to apply knowledge, skills, and attitudes aimed from training program at their workplace sustainably (Axtell *et al*., 1997; Najman *et al*., 2006).

Training is a paramount concern of organizations and researchers. However, many organizations are reporting failure to effectively develop skills and anticipate their future needs (IBM, 2008). Researchers are finding inconsistencies and organizations may find it difficult to pinpoint exactly which factors are most critical (Grossman and Salas, 2011). Burke and Hutchins (2007), Cheng and Hampson (2008) and Blume *et al*., (2010) reported inconsistency in their reviews on key components of training transfer and Grossman and Salas (2011) concluded that it remains somewhat ambivalent.

Work environmental factor is one of the major factors that organizations ought to consider seriously in ensuring a maximum transfer of training. According to Seyler *et al*., (1998), there are two types of environmental factors, firstly it is the organization climate (supervisor's support, supervisor's sanction and peer's support) and the other is the situational constrains or aids (opportunity to use). Both are related to trainees' motivation to transfer. Foxon (1993) urged organization to strengthen their supporting environment factor not only immediately after training but also once the trainee has returned to their workplace because environmental factor is one of the major factors that can enhance transfer of training. Present study attempts to examine the influence of environmental factor on transfer of training. This factor has not been systematically examined by previous researcher (Cheng and Ho, 2001). Earlier researchers who work primarily on transfer of training have mainly focused on issues that concern about training design and techniques, while the issues of environmental characteristic have received less attention. Ford and Weissbein (1997) reviewed that there is progress in understanding the influence of environmental factors on transfer of training. Chiaburu and Marinova (2005) reported that more researches are needed to clarify the nature of relationship between environmental factor and transfer of training as the relationships between these variables remained ambiguous.

Literature suggested that the ability and opportunities for individual trainees to effectively apply knowledge, skill and abilities learned during training seasons in performing their task at their respective workplace are vastly influenced by environmental training design, individual learning characteristic, and training delivery factors (Faxton, 1993). In this empirical study, it determined the elements of work environments, motivation to learn and perceived training transfer factors affecting training of employee and investigated how work environment influences the relationship between these two factors of a Malaysian Bank.

The general objective of this study is to examine whether elements of organizational environment factors, such as supervisor's support, supervisor's sanction, peer's support and opportunity to practice have any significant influence on individual perceived training transfer. However, the specific objectives of this study are to determine the elements of work environmental factors affecting training, elements of motivation to learn and perceived training transfer, determine whether is there a significant relationship between motivation to learn and perceived training transfer and, determining whether work environment influences the relationship between motivation to learn and perceived training transfer.

2.0 Research Mehtodology:

2.1 Research Framework and Hypotheses:

Based on expectancy-value theory (Vroom, 1973), self-determination theory (Deci and Ryan, 2002) and review of literatures, it is expected that the effect of trainee expectancy-value of motivation to learn variables are independent predictors of training transfer-related performance outcomes and would be moderated by the work environment factors. Thus, the research framework for this study conceptualized that motivation to learn will have a positive relationship with trainee reaction of perceived training transfer at workplace and this is moderated by work environmental factors.

2.2 Hypotheses:

The main hypotheses based on the Research Framework in Figure 1.0 are as below:

H1: Motivation to learn will have a positive relationship with trainee reaction of perceived training transfer at workplace.

H2: Motivation to learn will have a positive relationship with job attitude of perceived training transfer at workplace.

H3: Motivation to learn will have a positive relationship with improved job competency of perceived training transfer at workplace.

H4: Work environment factors moderate the relationship between motivations to learn and perceived training transfer.

H4.1 Opportunity to use of work environment factors moderates the relationship between motivation to learn and trainee reaction of perceived training transfer.

H4.2 Opportunity to use of work environment factors moderates the relationship between motivation to learn and job attitude of perceived training transfer.

H4.3 Opportunity to use of work environment factors moderates the relationship between motivation to learn and improved job competency.
H4.4 Supervisor sanction of work environment factors moderates the relationship between motivation to learn and trainee reaction of perceived training to transfer.
H4.5 Supervisor sanction of work environment factors moderates the relationship between motivation to learn and job attitude of perceived training transfer.
H4.6 Supervisor sanction of work environment factors moderates the relationship between motivation to learn and improved job competency.
H4.7 Supervisor and peer support of work environment factors moderate the relationship between motivation to learn and trainee reaction of perceived training to transfer.
H4.8 Supervisor and peer support of work environment factors moderate the relationship between motivation to learn and job attitude of perceived training transfer.
H4.9 Supervisor and peer support of work environment factors moderate the relationship between motivations to learn and improved job competency.

2.3 Questionnaire Design and Measurement:

The survey questionnaire designed for this study is made up of four Sections. Section A is questions requiring respondent to answer about their background. Section B comprises of questions related to perceived training transfer. These questions are related to training outcomes at the workplace which include trainee reactions, job attitude and improved job competency. The questions in Section C are related to motivation to learn. These questions were adapted from those used by Noe and Schmitt (1986) on job attitudes, intervention fulfillment by Holton (1996), expected utility by Holton (1996), and learning outcomes by Tannenbaum *et al*., (1991). In Section D, the questions related to work environmental factor were adapted from Seyler *et al*., (1998), and Mathieu and Martineau (1997) for items on supervisor support, Mathieu *et al*., (1992) on supervisor sanction, Russ-Eft (2002) on peer support, Ford *et al*., (1992) on opportunity to use and Connelly and Kelloway (2003) on knowledge sharing. Respondents rated their opinion by scoring (circle) on the number, the degree of their opinion of the respective statements, where 1=strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3=neither agree nor disagree, 4=agree, and 5=strongly agree.

3.0 Results:

This is a quantitative cross-sectional study. This study focuses on a Malaysian Bank, specifically the employees from Southern Regional Branches of this Bank. The response rate of this survey is tabled in Table 1.0. A total of 194 sets of questionnaires were distributed to the targeted respondents located at the 11 Branches of the Bank. All the supporting staff of this censor population responded to the survey giving a response rate of 100%.

Table 1.0: Response Rate.

No.	Locations of Branches of Bank	Frequency	Percent Responded	Cumulative Percent
1	Nilai	15	7.7	7.7
2	Seremban	25	12.9	20.6
3	Kuala Pilah	16	8.2	28.9
4	Tampin	17	8.8	37.6
5	Bandar Melaka	26	13.4	51.0
6	Masjid Tanah	18	9.3	60.3
7	Jasin	14	7.2	67.5
8	Port Dickson	17	8.8	76.3
9	Muar	16	8.2	84.5
10	Batu Pahat	15	7.7	92.3
11	Segamat	15	7.7	100.0
Total Respondents		194	100.0	

3.1 Profile of Respondents:

Table 2.0 tabulates the characteristics or profile of the respondents. A total of 57.2 percent of the respondents indicated that they work at the Operations Department, 36.6 percent from the Finance Department and the remaining 6.2 percent work at the other Departments. All the respondents age are 40 and below with youngest age 19 year of age.

Most of the respondents are female (73.7 percent) with 66 percent married and 34.0 percent single. The majority of the respondents are Malays (83.5 percent). There are 2.1 percent of the respondents with master degree holders, 13.4 percent degree holders, 35.6 percent diploma holders, 11.9 percent with STPM certificate, 33.0 percent SPM holders and the remaining 4.1 percent hold the PMR certificate. Most respondents have worked for the bank between 6 to 10 years. 35.6 percent of the respondents indicated that they have attended 1

to 5 times attended training, 32.5 percent indicated 6 to 10 times, 5.2 percent indicated 11 to 15 times and the remaining 26.8 percent indicated that they have attend 20 times and above.

Table 2.0: General Characteristics of the Respondents.

Respondents' Profile	*Categories*	Number of Respondent	Percentage (%)
Department	a. Operations	111	57.2
	b. Finance	71	36.6
	c. Others	12	6.2
Age Range	a. 19-25 years	34	17.7
	b. 26-30 years	42	21.6
	c. 31-35 years	89	45.9
	d. 35-40 years	29	14.9
Gender	a. Male	51	26.3
	b. Female	143	73.7
Marital Status	a. Single	66	34.0
	b. Married	128	66.0
Race	a. Malay	162	83.5
	b. Chinese	16	8.2
	c. Others	16	8.2
Education Level	a. PMR	8	4.1
	b. SPM	64	33.0
	c. STPM	23	11.9
	d. Diploma	69	35.6
	e. Degree	26	13.4
	f. Master	4	2.1
Years of Services	a. 1-5 years	35	18.0
	b. 6-10 years	89	45.9
	c. 11-15 years	18	9.3
	d. 20 and above	52	26.8
Number of times attended training programme	a. 1-5 times	69	35.6
	b. 6-10 times	63	32.5
	c. 11-15 times	10	5.2
	d. 20 and above	52	26.8

3.2 Goodness of Measures:

Factor analyses were performed on the 3 elements measuring the perceived training transfer, 5 elements measuring motivation to learn and the 3 elements measuring work environmental factors.

3.2.1 Factor and Reliability Analyses:

The purposes of factor analysis are data reduction (emphasizes summarizing the important information in a set of observed variables by a new, smaller set of factors expressing that which is common among the original variables) and substantive interpretation (concerns the identification of the factors or measures that underlie the observed variables). Varimax rotation method was used to factor analyze all the above groups of measures to give logical and relevant interpretation of the dimension of measures and its reliability. The results were reported accordingly in this report.

In this research, Eigenvalues (explanatory power) of over 1 is used for the factor analysis extraction because Eigenvalues of less that 1 is considered insignificant. An Eigenvalue of less than 1 indicates that the factor is not capable to explain the variance contained in a single variable. The cutoff used for saying the factor loading is significant is 0.5. The type of reliability analysis used to analyze reliability in this study is the Cronbach alpha also referred to as coefficient alpha. Cronbach's alpha is designed as a measure of internal consistency i.e., does all components or items within the instrument measure the same thing? The closer the Cronbach's alpha is to 1 the higher the internal consistency reliability. Reliability of at less than 0.6 is generally regarded to be acceptable, and those over .8 to be good (Sekaran, 2003).

3.2.2 Perceived Training Transfer at Workplace:

The factor analysis and reliability analyses for perceived training transfer at workplace were tabulated in Table 3.0. There are three factors loaded and it gave a total variance explained amount of 74.93 percent. The first factor for perceived training transfer making up of five elements is trainee reaction. It has an Eigen value (explanatory power) of 5.86 and the percentage variance explained by this factor of 41.86. The Cronbach's alpha for this factor is .89 showing that there is internal consistency as a measurement instrument. The second factor for perceived training transfer is job attitude. It is labeled as such because these elements of this factor are trainee's attitudinal in nature. The Eigen value is 3.15 and the percentage variance explained by this factor is 22.50. The Cronbach's alpha for this second factor is .84 indicating that there is internal consistency as a measurement instrument. The third factor of perceived training transfer is made up of elements on improvement in job competency and is named improved job competency. The Eigen value is 1.48 and the percentage variance

explained by this factor is 10.57. The Cronbach's alpha for this factor is .85. This shows that there is internal consistency as a measurement instrument.

Table 3.0: Factor and Reliability Analyses on Perceived Training Transfer at Workplace.

Dimension of Perceived Training Transfer	Factor Loading		
	Factor1	Factor2	Factor3
Trainee Reactions 1. I will do a plan to put into practice what I have learned after I get back to the office after each training attended.	.863	-.097	.251
2. I will work as hard as possible to put into practice what I have learned for job benefit.	.850	.214	.019
3. My work is more organized after I put into practice what I have learned from the training.	.796	.384	.085
4. I will be disgraceful if I do not put into practice what I have learned from the training attended.	.707	.333	.352
5. I am sure that what I have learned from the training are put into practice for job benefit.	.543	.445	.389
Job Attitude 1. I feel motivated toward my job after I attend training programmes.	-.056	.825	.371
2. My commitments towards my job have increase as a result of attending training programmes.	.198	.793	-.428
3. Supervisors or peers have told me that my behavior has improved following the training programmes have attended.	.059	.783	-.409
4. I work with more confidence after I put into practice what I have learned from the training.	.254	.758	.214
5. I have changed my job behavior in order to be consistent with the material taught in training programmes.	.526	.589	.069
Improved Job Competency 1. I knew that I would benefit from training.	-.034	.269	.897
2. My work performance improved after I attended each training.	.532	-.183	.730
3. My work will be rewarded if I put into practice what I have learned.	.474	-.128	.629
4. I am capable to put into practice what I have learned from the training even though I am busy.	.467	-.037	.619
Eigen-Value Percentage Variance Explained	5.86 41.86	3.15 22.50	1.48 10.57
Reliability (alpha)	0.89	0.84	0.85
Total variance explained	74.93		
Note: Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis. Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.			

3.2.3 Motivation to Learn:

On running factor analysis on the 16 items of motivation to learn, a total of five factors were generated. The total variance explained was 83.95 percent. Table 4.0 tabulated the results of factor and reliability analyses of motivation to learn.

The 4 items in the first factor are related to motivation to fulfillment is labeled as intervention fulfillment. The Eigen value is 7.11 and percentage explained is 44.45. This factor is composed of 4 elements and has a Cronbach's alpha of .98 which indicated that there is internal consistency as a measurement instrument. The second factor is composed of 4 items related to motivating towards the outcome of learning. Hence, it is labeled as learning outcome. The Eigen value is 2.37 and the percentage of variance explained is 14.79. This factor has a Cronbach's alpha value of .85. The third factor is also composed of 4 items related to motivation that lead to change in attitude. It is therefore labeled as job attitude. The Eigen value is 1.51 and it explained a variance of 9.42 percent. The Cronbach's alpha value of .82 has shown that there is internal consistency as a measurement instrument. The fourth factor composing of 2 items of motivation towards achievement and is labeled as target achievement. The Eigen value is 1.37 and this factor explained a variance of 8.57 percent. The Cronbach's alpha of this fourth factor is .71. Finally, the fifth factor which is made up of 2 items emphasizing motivation to use is named as expected utility. The Eigen value of this factor is 1.08 and explained a variance of 6.72 percent. This factor has a Cronbach's alpha of .73.

3.2.4 Work Environmental Factors:

Table 5.0 shows the results of factor and reliability analyses to ascertain the dimensionality and reliability of the work environmental factors characteristics. On running factor analysis for the 16 items of work environmental factors, it yielded three factors. The overall total variance explained by these factors is 79.93 percent. The first factor of work environmental factors is composed of seven items. These items basically described the opportunity to use what is learned from the training. It is therefore named opportunity to use. The Eigen value is 8.75 and explained a variance of 54.70 percent. This factor has a Cronbach's alpha of .95. The second factor is made up of 5 items. This factor composing of items about sanction from the supervisor and is labeled as supervisor sanction. The Eigen value is 2.68 and has a Cronbach's alpha of .93. The third factor is made up of 4 items to measure supervisor and peer support. The Eigen value is 1.36 and the variance explained is 8.51 percent. The Cronbach's alpha was .87.

Table 4.0: Factor and Reliability Analyses on Motivation to Learn.

Dimension of Motivation To Learn	Factor Loading				
	Factor 1	Factor2	Factor 3	Factor4	Factor5
Intervention Fulfillment 1. I likely to be focus on salary and benefits	.902	.062	-.096	,198	-.250
2. Personal development is likely to be importance.	.831	.363	.091	-.039	.260
3. I probably find opportunities for learning new skills motivating.	.785	.294	.181	.309	.082
4. I am likely to be motivating by responsibility and control	.696	.188	.308	.088	.318
Learning Outcome 1. Training will increase my personal productivity	.240	.881	.165	.181	.130
2. I believe that training help me do my current job better	-.029	.767	.084	.559	.044
3. When I leave training, I cant wait to get back to work to try what I have learn	.362	.767	-.172	.130	.014
4. Goal setting is likely to be very energizing.	.514	.581	.341	-.226	.330
Job Attitude 1. I am very likely to place a high value on the organization working ethically.	.093	-.019	.852	.227	.089
2. I am very likely to focus on producing of a high standard.	-.066	-.040	.814	.127	.378
3. A pleasant work environment is likely motivate	.283	.540	.641	-.066	.076
4. I likely to enjoy a culture that emphasizes achieving difficult targets.	.390	.531	.637	.155	-.073
Target Achievement 1. I likely to be strong motivated by opportunities to work independently.	.114	.153	.103	.840	.168
2. I being able to achieve targets and is likely to be major motivator.	.299	.172	.329	.708	.209
Expected Utility 1. I being allowed to use initiative and is likely to be very motivating.	-.063	.025	.339	.166	.847
2. I get excited when I think about trying to use my new learning on my job.	.434	.203	.006	.302	.743
Eigen-Value Percentage Variance Explained	7.11 44.45	2.37 14.79	1.51 9.42	1.37 8.57	1.08 6.72
Reliability (alpha)	0.98	0.85	0.82	0.71	0.73
Total variance explained	83.95				
Note: Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis. Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.					

Table 5.0: Factor and Reliability Analyses on Work Environmental Factors.

Dimension of Work Environmental Factors	Factor Loading		
	Factor1	Factor2	Factor3
Opportunity to Use 1. My colleague will support me to put into practice	.886	.101	.244
2. The resources I need to use what I learned will be available to me after training	.867	.153	.257
3. My colleague is willing to help me to put into practice what I have learned from the training	.853	.136	.353
4. I will be seen as skeptical if I do not put into practice what I have learned from the training	.762	.031	.552
5. At work, my colleagues expect me to use what I learn in training	.733	.397	.259
6. My supervisors meets with me to discuss ways to apply training on the job	.729	.385	.128
7. My supervisors meets with me regularly to work on problems I may be having in trying to use my training	.712	.461	.117
Supervisor Sanction 1. My supervisor would not allow me to use the different technique that I have learned in training.	.001	.929	.203
2. My supervisor sets goals for me which encourage me to apply my training on the job	.325	.846	-.016
3. My supervisor opposes the use of the techniques I learned in training	.240	.836	-.006
4. My supervisor thinks I am being in effective when I use the technique taught in training	.273	.833	.343
5. My colleagues are patient with me when I try out new skills or techniques at work	.133	.832	.195
Supervisor and Peer Support 1. My supervisor will support me to apply what I have learned from the training.	.155	.172	.925
2. My supervisor will help me to apply what I have learned from the training in carrying out duties.	.429	-.067	.707
3. My colleague will encourage me to apply what I have learned from the training in carrying out duties	.284	.278	.697
4. My supervisor will say that the application of what I have learned from the training will not bring any benefit	.438	.439	.636
Eigen-Value Percentage Variance Explained	8.75 54.70	2.68 16.72	1.36 8.51
Reliability (alpha)	0.95	0.93	0.87
Total variance explained	79.93		
Note: Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis. Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.			

3.3 Response Bias Test:

Table 6.0 shows the results of response bias test using the T-test using the method explained Armstrong and Overton (1977). A comparison is made between 99 respondents from the first 5 Branches (see Table 1.0) with

that of 95 respondents from the next 6 Branches on the variables under investigation. No variable turn out to differ significantly. It follows that there was no serious non-response bias in the sample collected.

3.4.1 Descriptive Statistic:

Descriptive analysis is carried out to show the mean, the items levels and standard deviation of all the variables to determine the extent of dispersion of each variable under study. The results for mean of value and the levels of perceived training transfer at workplace, motivation to learn, work environmental factors.

Table 6.0: T-Tests on Variables to Compare Respondents' First 5 Branches with the Next 6 Branches Responses.

Variable	Mean Value		t-value	Sig. (2-tailed)
	First 5 Branches	Next 6 Branches		
Perceived Training Transfer - Trainee Reaction	4.15	4.17	-.209	.835
Perceived Training Transfer - Job Attitude	4.09	4.08	.243	.809
Perceived Training Transfer - Improved Job Competency	4.33	4.33	.067	.947
Motivation to Learn - Intervention Fulfillment	4.18	4.21	-.360	.719
Motivation to Learn - Learning Outcome	4.13	4.13	-.001	.999
Motivation to Learn - Job Attitude	4.13	4.16	-.380	.704
Motivation to Learn - Target Achievement	4.16	4.16	-.030	.976
Motivation to Learn - Expected Utility	4.17	4.18	-.301	.764
Work Environmental Factors - Opportunity to Use	4.01	4.02	-.188	.851
Work Environmental Factors - Supervisor Sanction	4.05	4.05	-.080	.936
Work Environmental Factors - Supervisor and Peer Support	3.84	3.88	-.485	.629

3.4.2 Perceived Training Transfer at Workplace:

Table 7.0 tabulates the mean values for each of the value of perceived training transfer at workplace. The respondents rated value of improved job competency higher than all other two components. The standard deviation for all the 3 components of perceived training transfer ranged from 0.42 to 0.47.

Table 7.0: Components of Perceived Training Transfer at Workplace.

Perceived Training Transfer		Mean Value	Standard Deviation
1	Trainee Reactions *	4.16	.42
2	Job Attitude *	4.09	.43
3	Improved Job Competency *	4.33	.47

Note: Scale - *1 = Strongly Disagree to 5 = Strongly Agree

3.4.3 Motivation to Learn:

Table 8.0 tabulates the mean values for each of the value of motivation to learn. The respondents rated value of intervention to learn higher than all other four components. The mean values of the all the 5 components of motivation to learn ranged from 4.13 to 4.20 with standard deviation ranged from 0.36 to 0.48.

Table 8.0: Mean and Standard Deviation of Value of Motivation to Learn.

Motivation to Learn		Mean Value	Standard Deviation
1	Intervention Fulfillment*	4.20	.45
2	Learning Outcome*	4.13	.48
3	Job Attitude*	4.13	.39
4	Target Achievement*	4.16	.36
5	Expected Utility*	4.18	.40

Note: Scale - *1 = Strongly Disagree to 5 = Strongly Agree

3.4.4 Work Environmental Factors:

Table 9.0 tabulates the mean values for each of the value of work environmental factors. The respondents rated value of supervisor sanction higher than all other three components. The mean values of the all the 3 components of components of work environmental factors ranged from 3.86 to 4.05 with standard deviation ranged from 0.54 to 0.57.

Table 9.0: Components of Work Environment.

Work Environmental Factor		Mean Value	Standard Deviation
1	Opportunity to Use*	4.02	.57
2	Supervisor Sanction*	4.05	.54
3	Supervisor and Peer Supports*	3.86	.55

Note: Scale - *1 = Strongly Disagree to 5 = Strongly Agree

3.5 Hypotheses Testing:

The relationship between motivation to learn and perceived training transfer is tested by two steps linear regression. The first step is run with the control variables. The independent variable is added in the second step. This is to test whether there is significant relationship between the independent and the dependent variables after the controlling for the control variables. For the result of the regression to be valid, the threshold values for both the condition indices and the variance inflation factors are examined. Assumptions by Hair *et al*., (1998) are that threshold values of condition indices are usually in the range of 15 to 30. Threshold value of 2.5 standard deviation is used to check for outliner's case (Hair *et al*., 1998). All cases that are outside the set range are dropped from the regression. Several variables that may affect the hypothesized relationships were included as controls.

The moderating regression technique is used to test the anticipated regression of the environment factors on the relationship of motivation to learn and perceived training transfer factors affecting training of employee. To establish that a variable functions as a moderator steps regression as described by Baron and Kenny (1986) are carried out.

3.5.1 The Effect of Motivation to Learn on Perceived Learning Transfer:

The two-step hierarchical regressions are analyzing the effects of the effect of motivation to learn on three dimensions of perceived learning transfer.

The Effect of Motivation to Learn on Trainee Reaction of Perceived Training Transfer:

As shown in Table 10.0, Model 1 in the first step of the regression with R^2 as .16 indicates that the effect of motivation to learn on trainee reaction of perceived training transfer was explained by 16 percent of the control variable. With the addition of the five independent variables in step 2 of the regression, the R^2 increased to 79 percent. This R^2 change of .63 is significant ($p < 0.01$) implying that the motivation to learn dimensions explained an additional 63 percent of the variation in trainee reaction of the perceived training transfer. With F-statistics significant ($p < 0.01$), it indicates that the proposed model was adequate, hence there is relationship between motivation to learn and trainee reaction of perceived training transfer. Therefore, hypothesis H1 is supported.

Table 10.0: The Effect of Motivation to Learn on Trainee Reaction

Independent Variables	Beta standardized	
	Model 1	Model 2
Control Variables		
Education Level	.40***	.14***
Model Variables		
Intervention fulfillment of motivation to learn		-.01
Learning outcome of motivation to learn		.76***
Job attitude of motivation to learn		.25***
Target achievement of motivation to learn		-.22***
Expected utility of motivation to learn		.07
R^2	.16	.79
Adj. R^2	.16	.79
R^2 Change	.16	.63
F Change	37.19***	112.73***
Durbin-Watson	1.80	
Note: ***Sig. at .01 **Sig. at .05 *Sig. at .10		

The Effect of Motivation to Learn on Job Attitude of Perceived Training Transfer:

Table 11.0 tabulates the regression of motivation to learn on job attitude of perceived training. In the first step of the regression, the R^2 is found to be 0.10 indicating that 10% of enhancement of job attitude of perceived training transfer is explained by these control variables. In the second step, the adding of the five elements of motivation to learn dimensions has resulted in R^2 increasing to 10 percent. This R^2 change is .03. In the third Model, the R^2 .12 implies that the five motivation to learn dimensions has explained an additional 12% of the variation in job attitude of perceived training transfer. The F-statistics is significant ($p < 0.01$) suggesting that the proposed model is adequate. These results have thus provided evidence of hypothesis H1.2 is supported.

Table 11.0 : The Effect of Motivation to Learn on Job Attitude of Perceived Training Transfer.

	Beta standardized		
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
Control Variables			
Education Level	.27***	.24***	.21
Age		-.18**	-.21**
Model Variables			
Intervention fulfillment of motivation to learn			-.17**
Learning outcome of motivation to learn			.12
Job attitude of motivation to learn			.11
Target achievement of motivation to learn			.31***
Expected utility of motivation to learn			-.03
R^2	.07	.10	.22
Adj. R^2	.07	.09	.19
R^2 Change	.07	.03	.12
F Change	15.0***	6.40**	5.58***
Durbin-Watson	1.53		
Note: ***Sig. at .01 **Sig. at .05 *Sig. at .10			

The Effect of Motivation to Learn on Improved Job Competency of Perceived Training Transfer:

Table 12.0 shows the results of regression of motivation to learn with improved job competency of perceived training transfer.

Table 12.0: The Effect of Value of Motivation to Learn on Improved Job Competency.

Independent Variables	Beta standardized
	Model
Model Variables	
Intervention fulfillment of motivation to learn	-.41***
Learning outcome of motivation to learn	.69***
Job attitude of motivation to learn	.10
Target achievement of motivation to learn	-.15**
Expected utility of motivation to learn	.19**
R^2	.40
Adj. R^2	.38
R^2 Change	.40
F Change	24.94***
Durbin-Watson	1.85
Note: ***Sig. at .01 **Sig. at .05 *Sig. at .10	

The coefficient of determination (R^2) of .40 indicates that 40% of motivation to learn is explained by the control variables. The R^2 change of .40 is significant. The F-statistics is significant ($p < 0.001$) indicating that the proposed model is adequate. Hence, these results have thus provided evidence that hypothesis H1.3 is supported.

3.5.2 The Moderation Effect of Work Environmental Variables on the Relationships of Motivation to Learn and Perceived Training Transfer:

The fourth hypothesis is on firms' environmental variables moderate the relationship of motivation to learn with perceived training transfer. The moderated regression technique established by Baron and Kenny (1986) was used to test the anticipated regressions of these relationships. The three dimensions of environmental factors are opportunity to use, supervisor sanction, and supervisor and peer supports. The results of the four-step hierarchical regression undertaken to test the hypotheses that opportunity to use, supervisor sanction, and supervisor and peer supports moderate the relationship of motivation to learn and perceived training transfer of this study are shown in Table 13.1(a, b, c), 13.2 (a, b, c) and 13.3 (a, b, c) respectively.

Opportunity to Use:

As can be observed from Table 13.1 (a, b, c), the F-change in Model 4 of all these tables are significant. This means that opportunity to use of the works environmental factors serve as a significant moderator on the relationships of motivation to learn with perceived learning transfer. These results therefore supported the hypothesis of the present investigation.

Table 13.1a: Hierarchical Regression Results of Opportunity to Use as Moderator on Motivation to Learn and Trainee Reaction.

Variables	Beta standardized			
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4
Control Variables				
Age	-.15**	-.12***	-.12***	-.11***
Education	.46**	.24***	.24***	.19***

Year of Service	.24**	.25***	.25***	.21***
Motivation to Learn				
Intervention Fulfillment (X1)		.02	.02	1.70***
Learning Outcome (X2)		.80***	.80***	2.84***
Job Attitude (X3)		.15***	.15***	-3.46***
Target Achievement (X4)		-.28***	-.29***	1.17**
Expected Utility (X5)		.09**	.10**	-.35
Moderating Variable				
Opportunity to Use (M1)			-.01	.76
Interactions				
X1 x M1				-2.84**
X2 x M1				4.45***
X3 x M1				7.96***
X4 x M1				-3.32***
X5 x M1				1.16
R^2	.21	.83	.83	.87
Adj. R^2	.19	.82	.82	.86
R^2 Change	.21	.62	.00	.04
F Change	16.49***	131.97***	.02	10.70***
Durbin-Watson	1.74			
***Sig. at .001 **Sig. at .05 *Sig. at .10				

Table 13.1b: Hierarchical Regression Results of Opportunity to Use as Moderator on Motivation to Learn and Job Attitude of Perceived Training Transfer.

0.1	Beta standardized			
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4
Control Variables				
Age	-.25***	-.22**	-.21**	-.19**
Education	.28**	.12	.13	.41***
Year of Service	.16**	.04	.04	.25**
Motivation to Learn				
Intervention Fulfillment (X1)		-.16*	-.18*	-1.29*
Learning Outcome (X2)		.12	-.04	-.53
Job Attitude (X3)		.09	.05	-4.14**
Target Achievement (X4)		.30***	.37***	3.70***
Expected Utility (X5)		-.02	-.05	2.74*
Moderating Variable				
Opportunity to Use (M1)			.21	1.52
Interactions				
X1 x M1				2.14
X2 x M1				1.53
X3 x M1				9.24**
X4 x M1				-7.90***
X5 x M1				-5.54*
R^2	.12	.22	.23	.53
Adj. R^2	.11	.19	.19	.49
R^2 Change	.12	.10	.01	.30
F Change	8.82***	4.69***	2.25	22.30***
Durbin-Watson	1.66			
***Sig. at .001 **Sig. at .05 *Sig. at .10				

Table 13.1c: Hierarchical Regression Results of Opportunity to Use as Moderator on Motivation to Learn and Improved Job Competency.

Variables	Beta standardized			
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4
Control Variables				
Age	-.04	-.01	-.05	-.07
Education	.19**	.21**	.20***	.15**
Year of Service	.34***	.41***	.43***	.46***
Motivation to Learn				
Intervention Fulfillment (X1)		-.39**	-.35***	.49**
Learning Outcome (X2)		.78	1.33***	2.91***
Job Attitude (X3)		-.08***	.07	-1.12
Target Achievement (X4)		-.29***	-.53***	-3.07***
Expected Utility (X5)		.25***	.34***	-2.33**
Moderating Variable				
Opportunity to Use (M1)			-.69***	-6.81***
Interactions				
X1 x M1				-1.55
X2 x M1				-3.39*
X3 x M1				2.33
X4 x M1				5.09***

X5 x M1				5.41**
R^2	.10	.51	.62	.71
Adj. R^2	.08	.49	.60	.69
R^2 Change	.10	.42	.10	.09
F Change	6.86***	31.53***	49.64***	11.55***
Durbin-Watson	2.20			
***Sig. at .001 **Sig. at .05 *Sig. at .10				

b. Supervisor Sanction:

As can be observed from Table 13.2 (a, b, c), the F-change in Model 4 of all these tables are significant. It follows supervisor sanction of the works environmental factors is a significant moderator on the relationships of motivation to learn with perceived learning transfer. These results therefore supported the hypothesis of the present investigation.

Table 13.2a: Hierarchical Regression Results of Supervisor Sanction as Moderator on Motivation to Learn and Trainee Reaction.

Variables	Beta standardized			
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4
Control Variables				
Age	-.15**	-.12***	-.13***	-,10***
Education	.46***	.24***	.24***	,27***
Year of Service	.24**	.25***	.23***	,42***
Motivation to Learn				
Intervention Fulfillment (X1)		.02	.039	,16***
Learning Outcome (X2)		.80***	.82***	2,49***
Job Attitude (X3)		.15***	.14**	-1,32***
Target Achievement (X4)		-.28***	-.27***	-3,12***
Expected Utility (X5)		.093**	.077*	4,28***
Moderating Variable				
Supervisor Sanction (M1)			-.051	1,69***
Interactions				
X1 x M1 (Excluded in Analysis)				-
X2 x M1				-3,43***
X3 x M1				2,24***
X4 x M1				5,91***
X5 x M1				-7,02***
R^2	.21	.83	.83	.93
Adj. R^2	.19	.82	.82	.93
R^2 Change	.21	.62	.00	.11
F Change	16.49***	131.97***	.90	71.41***
Durbin-Watson	2.37			
***Sig. at .001 **Sig. at .05 *Sig. at .10				

Table 13.2b: Hierarchical Regression Results of Supervisor Sanction as Moderator on Motivation to Learn and Job Attitude of Perceived Training Transfer.

Variables	Beta standardized			
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4
Control Variables				
Age	-.25**	-.22***	-.21**	-.16***
Education	.28***	.12	.13	.25***
Year of Service	.16**	.04	.21**	.45***
Motivation to Learn				
Intervention Fulfillment (X1)		-.16*	-.29***	-.35***
Learning Outcome (X2)		.12	-.02	-4.06***
Job Attitude (X3)		.09	.18**	-3.76***
Target Achievement (X4)		.30**	.18*	4.85***
Expected Utility (X5)		-.02	.10	5.61***
Moderating Variable				
Supervisor Sanction (M1)			.39***	3.66***
Interactions				
X1 x M1 (Excluded in Analysis)				-
X2 x M1				8.27***
X3 x M1				6.59***
X4 x M1				-9.50***
X5 x M1				-8.97***
R^2	.12	.22	.27	.69
Adj. R^2	.11	.19	.24	.67
R^2 Change	.12	.10	.05	.42
F Change	8.82***	4.69***	12.60***	61.77***
Durbin-Watson	2.06			
***Sig. at .001 **Sig. at .05 *Sig. at .10				

Table 13.2c: Hierarchical Regression Results of Supervisor Sanction as Moderator on Motivation to Learn and Improved Job Competency of Perceived Training Transfer.

Variables	Beta standardized			
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4
Control Variables				
Age	-,04	-,009	-.018	-,012
Education	.185**	.213**	.212**	.335***
Year of Service	.336*	.407	.332***	.616***
Motivation to Learn				
Intervention Fulfillment (X1)		-.387***	-.328***	-.332***
Learning Outcome (X2)		.779	.845***	2.121***
Job Attitude (X3)		-.075***	-.115	-2.457***
Target Achievement (X4)		-.291***	-.236**	-4.237***
Expected Utility (X5)		.251***	.195**	2.999***
Moderating Variable				
Supervisor Sanction (M1)			-.177**	-3.411***
Interactions				
X1 x M1 (Excluded in Analysis)				
X2 x M1				-2.429***
X3 x M1				3.888***
X4 x M1				7.668**
X5 x M1				-4.667***
R^2	.10	.51	.52	.62
Adj. R^2	.08	.49	.50	.59
R^2 Change	.10	.41	.01	.10
F Change	6.86***	31.53***	3.94**	11.52***
Durbin-Watson	1.92			
***Sig. at .001 **Sig. at .05 *Sig. at .10				

c. Supervisor and Peer Supports:

Table 13.3 (a, b, c) show that the F-change in Model 4 of all these tables are significant. Thus, it indicate that supervisor and peer support of the works environmental factors is a significant moderator on the relationships of motivation to learn with perceived learning transfer. It follows that all the hypotheses of the present investigation are supported.

Table 13.3a: Hierarchical Regression Results of Supervisor and Peer Support as Moderator on Motivation to Learn and Trainee Reaction of Perceived Training Transfer:

Variables	Beta standardized			
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4
Control Variables				
Age	-.15**	-.12***	-.10**	-.00
Education	.46***	.24***	.24***	.13***
Year of Service	.24**	.25***	.30***	.14**
Motivation to Learn				
Intervention Fulfillment (X1)		.02	-.01	-.80
Learning Outcome (X2)		.80***	.78***	-1.09**
Job Attitude (X3)		.15***	.04	2.79***
Target Achievement (X4)		-.28***	-.34***	2.42***
Expected Utility (X5)		.09**	.12**	-2.24***
Moderating Variable				
Supervisor and Peer Support (M1)			.21***	1.27**
Interactions				
X1 x M1				1.73
X2 x M1				3.84***
X3 x M1				-5.67***

X4 x M1				-6.08***
X5 x M1				4.28***
R^2	.21	.83	.84	.92
Adj. R^2	.19	.82	.83	.91
R^2 Change	.21	.62	.02	.08
F Change	16.49***	131.97***	17.66***	34.34***
Durbin-Watson	1.90			
***Sig. at .001 **Sig. at .05 *Sig. at .10				

Table 13.3b: Hierarchical Regression Results of Supervisor and Peer Support as Moderator on Motivation to Learn and Job Attitude of Perceived Training Transfer

Variables	Beta standardized			
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4
Control Variables				
Age	-.25**	-.22**	-.20**	.28
Education	.28***	.12	.13	.01
Year of Service	.16**	.04	.09	.14
Motivation to Learn				
Intervention Fulfillment (X1)		-.16*	-.19**	.06**
Learning Outcome (X2)		.12	.11	.00**
Job Attitude (X3)		.10	-.01	.91**
Target Achievement (X4)		.30***	.25**	.00**
Expected Utility (X5)		-.02	.00	.38***
Moderating Variable				
Supervisor and Peer Support (M1)			.19*	.03**
Interactions				
X1 x M1				.09***
X2 x M1				.00***
X3 x M1				.95***
X4 x M1				.00***
X5 x M1				.36***
R^2	.12	.22	.23	.56
Adj. R^2	.11	.19	.20	.52
R^2 Change	.12	.10	.01	.32
F Change	8.82***	4.69***	2.99***	26.27***
Durbin-Watson	1.67			
***Sig. at .001 **Sig. at .05 *Sig. at .10				

Table 13.3c: Hierarchical Regression Results of Supervisor and Peer Support as Moderator on Motivation to Learn and Improved Job Competency of Perceived Training Transfer.

Variables	Beta standardized			
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4
Control Variables				
Age	-.04	-.01	-.08	-.02
Education	.19**	.21**	.21***	.06
Year of Service	.34***	.41***	.25***	.10*
Motivation to Learn				
Intervention Fulfillment (X1)		-.39***	-.29***	2.17***
Learning Outcome (X2)		.78***	.85***	1.70**
Job Attitude (X3)		-.08	.29***	1.25**
Target Achievement (X4)		-.29***	-.11*	1.68**
Expected Utility (X5)		.25***	.16**	-7.85***
Moderating Variable				
Supervisor and Peer Support (M1)			-.68***	-4.20***
Interactions				
X1 x M1				-5.20***
X2 x M1				-1.78
X3 x M1				-1.28
X4 x M1				-3.48**
X5 x M1				15.56***
R^2	.10	.51	.68	.88
Adj. R^2	.08	.49	.66	.87
R^2 Change	.10	.42	.17	.20
F Change	6.86***	31.53***	95.44***	58.41***
Durbin-Watson	2.10			
***Sig. at .001 **Sig. at .05 *Sig. at .10				

3.6 Summary:

This is a cross-sectional study. Factors and reliability analyses were carried out. T-test showed that there was no response bias between set of data. Based on the results of factor and reliability analyses, the research

framework and the hypotheses were revised accordingly. Regression analysis was used to test these hypotheses and the summary Exhibit 1.1 of the results of these testing is presented here.

Exhibit 1.1: The Summary of Hypotheses Tested Based on Multiple Regression Analyses:

Hypothesis Number	Statement of Hypothesis	Remarks
H1	Motivation to learn will have a relationship with trainee reaction of perceived training transfer at workplace.	Supported
H2	Motivation to learn will have a relationship with job attitude of perceived training transfer at workplace.	Supported
H3	Motivation to learn will have a positive relationship with improved job competency of perceived training transfer at workplace.	Supported
H4	Work environment factors moderate the relationship between motivations to learn and perceived training transfer.	Supported
H4.1	Opportunity to use of work environment factors moderates the relationship between motivation to learn and trainee reaction of perceived training transfer.	Supported
H4.2	Opportunity to use of work environment factors moderates the relationship between motivation to learn and job attitude of perceived training transfer.	Supported
H4.3	Opportunity to use of work environment factors moderates the relationship between motivation to learn and improved job competency.	Supported
H4.4	Supervisor sanction of work environment factors moderates the relationship between motivation to learn and trainee reaction of perceived training to transfer.	Supported
H4.5	Supervisor sanction of work environment factors moderates the relationship between motivation to learn and job attitude of perceived training transfer.	Supported
H4.6	Supervisor sanction of work environment factors moderates the relationship between motivation to learn and improved job competency.	Supported
H4.7	Supervisor and peer support of work environment factors moderate the relationship between motivation to learn and trainee reaction of perceived training to transfer.	Supported
H4.8	Supervisor and peer support of work environment factors moderate the relationship between motivation to learn and job attitude of perceived training transfer.	Supported
H4.9	Supervisor and peer support of work environment factors moderate the relationship between motivations to learn and improved job competency.	Supported

4.0 Discussion and Conclusion:

According to Cheng and Ho (2001), practitioners usually adopt a trial and error approach to manage training transfer. The trial and error approach is costly and time consuming. This study is expected to offer valuable insights to the theory and practice in the approach to manage training transfer particularly to practitioner for insights into factors that may help organization to improve the level of transfer of training in organization. In term of theoretical significance, this study intends to improve existing literature by addressing the following issues: investigate relationship between trainees' motivation to learn and perceived training transfer, and whether work environment influences this relationship.

4.1 The Elements of Motivation, Perceived Training Transfer and Work Environmental Factors Affecting Training:

4.1.1 Motivation Elements Affecting Training:

This study finds that the elements of motivation to learn are intervention fulfillment, learning outcome, job attitude, target achievement, and expected utility. The intervention fulfillment elements include fulfillment on salary and benefits, personal development, opportunity of learning new skills and fulfillment of motivation through responsibility and control. The learning outcome motivators include training will increase the individual personal productivity, helps in the betterment of doing the current job, put into practice what has been learned at the training and the trainer's being energized with new goal setting upon completing the training. The job attitude motivational factors that affect training transfer are the likelihood of placing higher values on the works, focus on higher standards, pleasant work environment and cultures that emphasize on achieving difficult targets. The target achievement factors are good opportunities to work independently and achieving the targets. As for the expected utilities elements of motivations, the factors include being allowed to use initiative and the excitement about using the new things learned to practice on the job to be very motivating.

Perceived Training Transfer Affecting Training:

The perceived training transfer elements that are found affecting training are trainee reactions, job attitude and improved job competency. Trainee reactions that affect training are planning to put into practice what have been learned, work harder to put what learns into the job to benefit the job, a more organized job, feeling honorable and making sure what's learned are put into practice. Trainee feels motivated toward their job, higher commitments, improved in behavior, works with more confidence and changed in behavior towards what's learned as a result of attended training. Expectancy theory put forward that an individual will perform certain actions if the individual perceives such action will result in valued outcome (Vroom, 1973). Perceived training transfer due to improved job competency are benefits from training, improvement in job performance, and increased level of work ability and capability.

Works Environmental Factors that Affects Training:

This study finds that the works environment factors that affect training are opportunity to use what is learned in training, supervisor's sanction, and supervisor and peer support. Colleague support, expectation and help, and the availability of resources are elements of opportunity to use of what is learned affecting training. The supervisor sanction elements are supervisor's approval on use of new technique, setting encouraging goals, and supervisor's opinion on training effectiveness. Supervisor and peer support elements include support to apply the new skills and techniques and help in carrying out duties.

Relationship between Motivation to Learn and Perceived Training Transfer:

The findings of this study show that there is relationship between motivation to learn and trainee reaction of perceived training transfer. The dimensions of works environmental factors include opportunity to use, supervisor sanction, and, supervisor and peer support. Opportunity to use include factor like colleagues support and help, resources availability at the workplace, self and supervisor's expectation of what learned to put it into practice after the training. Goals set by supervisor to encourage the application of what learned from the training, allowing the use of different technique learned to practice at workplace, an environment that support and encourage that application of learned play important roles at moderating the relationship to learn and training transfer. Motivation to learn is also related to job attitude and improved job competency of perceived training transfer at workplace. Individual with higher level of motivation to learn overcome discouraging learning factors, will follow, involve and commit to learning activities to improve attitude and behavior in the workplace (Axtell *et al*., 1997). Tziner *et al*., (2007) found that motivation to learn was the strongest contributor to training outcomes. Blume *et al*., (2010) meta-analysis has provided additional evidence of a positive relationship between motivation and transfer. Ismail *et al*, (2010) reported that supervisor roles in training programs will first invoke motivation to learn of employee at workplace which is able to lead to improved job performance at workplace.

Works Environment Factors Moderate the Relationship between Motivation to Learn and Perceived Training Transfer

Finding of this study shows that work environment factors moderate the relationship between motivations to learn and perceived training transfer. Opportunity to use of learning learned of the work environment factors moderates the relationship between motivation to learn and trainee reaction of perceived training transfer. Similarly, it is found that opportunity to use of learning at training of the work environment factors moderates the relationship between motivation to learn and trainee reaction of perceived training transfer, between motivation to learn and job attitudes, and between motivation to learn and improved job competency. Seyler *et al*., (1998) concluded that environmental factors (opportunity to use the new knowledge and skills, peer support, supervisor sanctions, and supervisor support) were their most important finding concerning the transfer of training and explained a large amount of variance in motivation to transfer. Opportunity to apply new learning and receiving supervisor support have been found to be some of the most consistent predictors of transfer outcomes (Burke and Hutchins, 2007). Gagne and Deci (2005) cited several studies which have found that managers' autonomy support leads to greater work satisfaction of the needs for competence, relatedness and autonomy and, in turn, to favourable work behaviours or attitudes.

Conclusion:

The finding of this study confirms that motivation to learn is significantly related to perceived training transfer. Works environment factors moderate this relationship.

There are several implications raised out of this research. This study has shown that there is relationship between motivation to learn and trainee reaction of perceived training transfer and that motivation to learn is also related to job attitude and improved job competency of perceived training transfer at workplace. Thus, implementation of adequate elements that support intervention fulfillment, learning outcome, job attitude, target achievement, and expected utility in motivation to learn factors are important for effective learning at

workplace. Such elements include items like fulfillment on salary and benefits, personal development, opportunity of learning new skills and fulfillment of motivation through responsibility and control.

This study has shown that learners are motivated by outcome of the training. This includes expectation it will increase the individual personal productivity, helps in the betterment of doing the current job, put into practice what has been learned at the training and the trainer's being energized with new goal setting upon completing the training. Proper implementation of training activities will assist in job attitude of the trainee of doing a better job. This is because trainees will have the likelihood of placing higher values on the works and focus on higher standards. Pleasant work environment and cultures that emphasize on achieving difficult targets are other motivators. The target achievement factors are good opportunities to work independently and achieving the targets. As for the expected utilities elements of motivations, the factors include being allowed to use initiative and the excitement about using the new things learned to practice on the job to be very motivating. Thus, it is expected that training will not only result in better transfer on the job, it also on trainee's work performance.

This study has also shown that motivation to learn affect training transfer which include trainee reactions, job attitude and improved job competency. Trainee should be allowed to plan their training needs as to allow them to put into practice what have been learned. This study has reflected that the opportunity for the trainee to put into practice will motivate them to work harder to benefit the job, a more organized job, and feeling honorable. Trainee's motivation towards their job, higher commitments, improved in behavior, works with more confidence and changed in behavior towards what's learned as a result of attended training are the result of training transfer. Training as such, improve job competency that will result in improvement in job performance, and increased level of work ability and capability.

Work environment factors moderate the relationship between motivations to learn and perceived training transfer. As such, works environment factors that affect training including opportunity to use what is learned in training, supervisor's sanction, and supervisor and peer support must not be taken lightly in implementing effecting learning in an organization. Supervisor may support or resist employee in sending them for training programs (Noe, 2010). Supervisor and peer support elements include support to apply the new skills and techniques and help in carrying out duties. Supervisors play key role which often include selecting employees to attend training courses, guide them prior, during and after attending the training and in helping employee to apply new skills in the workplace (Tai, 2006). Thus, a supportive work environment including colleague support, expectation and help, and the availability of resources must not be neglected for effective training transfer at workplace.

This study has a number of limitations. The data are collected based on perceived, self-rating, multiple-choice questionnaire. This approach is adequate to gather large amount of data within limited time. However, it is desirable to develop longitudinal study which is beyond the scope of this study. This study was done in a Bank in Malaysia only, implying that it might not be relevant to generalize to other sector of industries or in other countries. This study only focuses on the specific variables and aspects i.e. motivation to learn, work environment and perceived training transfer. Other aspects which are of importance such as leadership style of supervisor in the organization, training framework in the organization, learner's involvement in their work, leaner's characteristics, employee's readiness to learn, etcetera which are not within the scope of the study are worth to include in future research.

Although this study has presented a systematic analytical approach to investigate the relationships between the aspects of motivation to learn and perceived training transfer, it could not cover all the important issues and aspects in this field. More research works need to be carried out. Longitudinal research is proposed for future work. Others could include carrying out the investigation in other industries in Malaysia. In addition, other construct of variables in the work environment for further research may include leadership style of the supervisor, trainee characteristics, organization climate, training resources etc as extension of study on motivation to learn and training transfer.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This research project is supported by Universiti Tun Hussein Onn Malaysia through its Contract Grant Number C043 to Dr. Ng Kim-Soon. The research is also done in collaboration with the MIGHT. The authors wish to thank the respondents who have spent for their precious time and patience for participating in this project.

REFERENCES

Armstrong, M., 2006. *A Handbook of Human Resource Management Practice* (10th edition), London & Philadelphia, Kogan Page Ltd.

Armstrong, J.S. and T.S. Overton, 1977. Estimating non-response bias in mail surveys, *Journal of Marketing Research*, 14: 396-403.

Axtell, C.M., S. Maitlis and Yearta, 1997. Predicting immediate and longer-term transfer of training. *Personnel Review*, 26(3): 201-210.

Baron, R.M. and A.D. Kenny, 1986. The moderator-mediator variable distinction in social psychological research: Conceptual, strategic, and statistical considerations, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 51(6): 1173-1182.

Blume, B.D., J.K. Ford, T.T. Baldwin and J.L. Huang, 2010. Transfer of training: A meta-analytic review, *Journal of Management*, 39: 1065-105.

Burke, L.A. and H.M. Hutchins, 2007. Training transfer: An integrative literature review, *Human Resource Development Review*, 6: 263-96.

Cheng, E.W.L. and I. Hampson, 2008. Transfer of training: A review and new insights, *International Journal of Management Review*, 10: 327-41.

Cheng, E.W.L. and D.C.K. Ho, 2001. A review of transfer training study in the past decade, *Personnel Review*, 30(1): 102-118.

Chiaburu, D.S. and S.V. Marirova, 2005. What predicts skill transfer? An exploratory study of goal orientation, training self-efficiacy and organizational supports, *International Journal of Training and Development*, 9(2): 110-123.

Connelly, C.E., E.K. Kelloway, 2003. Predictors of employees' perceptions of knowledge sharing cultures, *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 24(5): 294-301.

Deci, E.L. and R.M. Ryan, Eds, 2002. *Handbook of Self-determination Research*, The University of Rochester Press, Rochester, NY.

Dolezalek, H., 2005. Industry Report. *Training*, 42(12): 14-28.

Ford, J.K., M.A. Quinines, D.J. Sego and Speer J. Sorra, 1992. Factors affecting the opportuninty to perform trained tasks on the job. Personnel Psychology, 5(3): 522-527.

Ford, J.K., D.A. Weissbein, 1997. Transfer of training: An updated review and analysis, *Performance Improvement Quarterly*, 10(2): 22-41.

Foxon, M., 1993. A process approach the transfer of training, *Australian Journal of Educational Technology*, 9(2): 130-143.

Gagne, M. and E.L. Deci, 2005. Self-determination theory and work motivation, *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 26: 331-362.

Galvin, T., 2001. Birds of a feather, *Training*, 38(3): 58-68.

Grossman, R. and E. Salas, 2011. The transfer of training: What really matters, *International Journal of Training and Development*, 15(2).

Hair, J.F., R.E. Anderson, R.L. Tatham and W.C. Black, 1998. *Multivariate Data Analysis* (Fifth Edition), Prentice Hall, Upper Saddle River, New Jersey.

Holton, E.F., 1996. The flawed four-level evaluation model, *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, *7*(1): 5-21.

IBM, 2008. *Unlocking the DNA of the Adaptable Workforce, the IBM Global Human Capital Study*, (Milwaukee, WI: IBM).

Ismail, A., L.L.C. Sieng, M.M.B. Abdullah and S.B. Francis, 2010. Linking supervisor's role in training programs to motivation to learn as an antecedent of job performance, *Intangible Capital*, 6(1): 1-25.

Mathieu, J.E., J.W. Martineau, 1997. Individual and situational influences on training motivation, In J.K. Ford, S.W. J. Kozlowski, K. Draiger, E. Salas & M.S. Teachout (Eds.), *Improving training effectiveness in work organizations* (page 193-221). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Mathieu, J.E., S.I. Tannenbaum and E. Salas, 1992. Influences of individual and situational characteristics on measures of training effectiveness, *Academy Of Management Journal*, 34(4): 828-847.

Nijman, D.J.M., W.J. Nijhof, A.A.M. Wognum, B.P. Veldkamp, 2006. Exploring differential effects of supervisor support on transfer of training, *Journal of European Industrial Training*, 30(7): 529-549.

Noe, R.A., 2010. *Employee training and development*, New York: McGraw Hill.

Noe, R.A. and N. Schmitt, 1986. The influence of trainee attitudes in training effectiveness: Test of a model, *Personnel Psychology*, 39(3): 497-523.

Russ-Eft, D., 2002. A typology of training design and work environment factors affecting workplace learning and transfer, *Human Resource Development Review*, 1(1): 45-65.

Salas, E., K. Wilson, H. Priest and J. Guthrie, 2006. Design, Delivery, and Evaluation of Training Systems, in G. Salvendy (ed.), *Handbook of Human Factors and Ergonomics*, 3rd ed. (Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley and Sons), 472-512.

Sekaran, U., 2003. *Research method for business*: A skill building approach (4th ed), John Wiley and Sons: India.

Seyler, D.L., E.F. Holton, R.A. Bates , M.F. Burnett and M.A. Carvalho, 1998. Factors affecting motivation to transfer training, *International Journal of Training and Development*, 2(1): 2-16.

Sivella, C. and T.D. Wells, 1998. Contracting to ensure training transfer, *Training and Development*, 10-11.

Tai, W.T., 2006. Effects of training framing, general self-efficacy and training motivation on trainee's training effectiveness, *Personal Review*, 35(1): 51-65.

Tannenbaum, S., J. Mathieu, E. Salas and J. Cannon-Bowers, 1991. Meeting trainees' expectations: The influence of training fulfilment on the development of commitment, self efficacy and motivation, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 76: 759-69.

Tziner, A., M. Fisher, T. Senior and J. Weisberg, 2007. Effects of trainee characteristics on training effectiveness, *International Journal of Selection & Assessment*, 15(2): 167-74.

Vroom, V.H., 1973. A new look at managerial decision making, *Organizational Dynamics*, 69-70.