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Testing the Role of Positivity within Training Transfer

Training and development activities often do not realise the benefits they were designed for because trainees tend to apply (too) little of what they have learned to their workplace. This ‘training transfer’ problem is of considerable concern as invested resources might not provide the desired returns. This paper proposes an approach rooted in social-cognitive theory and positive psychology to unpack mechanisms underlying training transfer: trainees’ positive cognitions (hope, optimism, self-efficacy, resilience) about their work experience affect their transfer motivation (can-do, reason-to, energised to) which in turn influences actual transfer of training. An exploratory study (n=800) suggest the notion of trainee positivity can offer new insights into how training transfer may be more effectively achieved and the transfer problem managed.
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"Knowing is not enough; we must apply. Willing is not enough; we must do."

Johann Wolfgang von Goethe

Training and development activities engaged by work organisations are known to generate considerable benefits for individuals, teams, organisations, and societies (Aguinis & Kraiger, 2009). However, evidence on the degree to which such benefits are realised, particularly within organisations, is surprisingly mixed (Alliger, Tannenbaum, Bennett Jr, Traver, & Shotland, 1997; Colquitt, LePine, & Noe, 2000; Tharenou, Saks, & Moore, 2007). It is critical to understand that training effectiveness is more than just a function of learning during a formal training experience. For training to be effective it must be applied on the job or ‘transferred’ to the workplace (Baldwin, Ford, & Blume, 2009). However, “training transfer does not just happen” (Subedi, 2004) and this has implications for organisations and economies alike.

A skilled and competent workforce is central to Australia’s ongoing competitiveness and prosperity and the application and utilisation of developed skills is also becoming an increasing focus for its government. For example, the Skills Australia National Workforce Development Strategy recognises that “the causal link between higher level skills and increased productivity is not simply
about the acquisition of skills but more broadly about both skills acquisition and their subsequent deployment” (Department of Education and Training, 2009).

In the USA it is estimated that organisations spent about $171.5 billion on employee learning and development in 2010, with an estimated average investment per employee of $1,228 or 2.27% direct expenditure of the payroll (American Society for Training & Development, 2011). Although the claim that trainees use only 10% of the trained skills at work, should be considered “a cautionary tale” (Ford, Yelon, & Billington, 2011), scholars agree that the time, money, and energy invested into training are insufficiently converted (Grossman & Salas, 2011). Thus, for researchers and practitioners training transfer remains a challenge.

THE TRAINING TRANSFER PARADIGM

Training can be understood as the systematic acquisition of knowledge, skills and attitudes that lead to improved work, individual or organisational performance (Grossman & Salas, 2011). Training transfer refers to whether trainees use what they learned in training back on the job; it requires that trainees generalize learning to the job content and maintain the use of trained knowledge or skills over time on the job (Baldwin & Ford, 1988). This training transfer challenge is leading researchers to seek to identify a range of factors that can affect the effective application of knowledge, skills and abilities acquired through training and development activities, resulting in increased work performance (Alliger et al., 1997; Burke & Hutchins, 2008; Ford & Weissbein, 1997; E Salas & Cannon-Bowers, 2001; Eduardo Salas & Kozlowski, 2009). Literature on training effectiveness has proliferated since Baldwin and Ford’s (1988) seminal paper on the transfer of training. Significant advancements in the scholarship of training and learning and their implications for practice have been seen. Despite these efforts, it has been recently suggested that more research is needed as “conclusions regarding the key components of transfer remain somewhat ambivalent” (Grossman & Salas, 2011).

A meta-analysis by Blume, Ford, Baldwin, and Huang (2010) revealed that only a few of those factors that have been identified as potentially influencing training effectiveness are consistent predictors. They conclude that the amount of actual research on strategies and malleable factors that
allow facilitating positive transfer of formal employee training is still insufficient. Thus, a more targeted focus is needed for factors that can be effectively managed and changed.

Conceptual models highlight the role of motivation in the training process (Beier & Kanfer, 2009; Kontoghiorghes, 2004), supported by empirical evidence suggesting that motivation is a key construct in the training process. It links trainee characteristics with contextual features of the work and training environment with outcome variables of increased job performance, work quality, safety, etc. (Baldwin & Magjuka, 1997; Colquitt et al., 2000; Machin & Fogarty, 2004; Warr, Allan, & Birdi, 1999). However, much of this research has focused on the assessment of variables associated with learning motivation or transfer motivation rather than providing a theoretical explanation of the motivational processes (Hutchins & Burke, 2007). There is substantial ambiguity about what is and what triggers training-related motivation. Thus, Noe, Tews, and McConnell-Dachner (2010) reason that we need to investigate workforce learning from a psychological perspective that promotes trainee engagement and call for research that identifies and operationalises key psychological processes underpinning the training transfer process.

In response to these shortcomings this paper suggests an approach rooted in social-cognitive theory and positive psychology. I claim that this allows expanding our research lens to explore untapped psychological mechanisms underlying training transfer. Moreover, to move inquiry further from an organisational perspective, this approach gives attention to factors that can be developed and managed.

The paper is structured as follows. First, I briefly review the cognitive-motivational paradigm and explain key constructs. Second, I propose a conceptual model and its hypotheses. Third, I describe the initial study and empirically test the model. At last, findings are discussed and implications for researchers and practitioners illustrated.

A COGNITIVE-MOTIVATIONAL APPROACH

The central premise of social-cognitive theory proposes that human individuals are reflective, self-regulating agents who are not only products but also producers of their environment (Bandura, 2001). That is, individuals do not have a direct read on reality, but their information about the world is
screened through their thought and belief systems. The ensuing attributions and cognitive judgments of oneself and the environment establish the motivation to act. Motivation, understood as a contextualised dynamic process, subsequently determines behaviour (Weissbein, Huang, Ford, & Schmidt, 2010).

Explicitly, cognitions about events are important mediators of the effect of events on a person’s motivation and behaviour. Therefore, I propose that elevated levels of positive thoughts and beliefs about the work experience generate higher levels of motivation to transfer received training to work. This in turn leads to increased training transfer. Thus, the case is made to investigate processes that link trainees’ cognitions with motivational states and ultimately training effectiveness.

**Trainee Positivity**

In recent times, much attention has been devoted to the study of four positively-framed cognitive constructs as they impact on behaviour in organisational settings. They are: *hope, optimism, self-efficacy, and resilience*. Luthans and colleagues (Luthans, 2004) conceive them jointly as a higher-order construct coined ‘psychological capital’. Stajkovic (2006) describes them as ‘core confidence’ constructs, pointing out that “employee’s concerns over their work are typically linked to a perceived lack of confidence to handle work demands rather than to the objective difficulty to executing such demands”. Although hope, optimism, and resilience have received considerable attention within social, clinical, and personal psychology, where they have been shown to have positive influence on human functioning, researchers have made few connections between these constructs and the learning and development domain. However, conceptually there is strong utility for all four constructs to be associated with training outcomes and effectiveness.

*Hope* is defined as “the perceived capability to derive pathways to desired goals, and motivate oneself via agency thinking to use those pathways” (Snyder, 2002). The construct hope is comprised of three elements: goals, pathways, and agency. Goals provide the targets for mental action sequences. Yet, they remain unanswered calls without the necessary means to reach them via thoughts of generating usable routes - pathways. Lastly, agency is the motivational component in hope,
manifesting in the perceived capacity to use one’s pathways to reach desired goals (Snyder, 2002). In short, hopeful individuals identify specific goals, want to achieve them, and know how to do that.

Optimism entails a future focus, whereby optimists hold positive expectations about the future. Regardless of present circumstances, they anticipate that future events will be positive in nature and negative events scarce. Consecutively this defines individual’s self-regulation processes; that is, how people identify, adopt, and pursue goals (Peterson, 2000). Thus, if encountering difficulties and one still believes that a goal can be achieved, continued efforts are made to eventually attain the goal.

Self-efficacy refers to a person’s belief that one is able to generate necessary resources and courses of action in order to perform well in a particular situation (Bandura, 1997). Self-efficacy has been widely studied with relative consistent findings: the higher the self-efficacy, the better the performance outcomes (Bandura, 2000; Alexander .D. Stajkovic & Luthans, 1998). The belief of one’s confidence was found to have extensive impact on various work-related performance and organisational outcomes.

Resilience is defined as the capability of individuals to cope successfully in the face of significant change, adversity, or risk (Masten, 2001) and may also be understood as “a capacity to rebound or bounce back from adversity, uncertainty, conflict, failure or even positive change, progress and increased responsibility” (Luthans, 2002). Resilience contributes to performance by producing renewed effort following failed attempts.

It may be argued that, in order to increase the motivation to transfer training, a trainee at work must know what to do, how to do it, and have the will to do it (hope). At work a trainee must also believe that efforts sooner or later lead to desired outcomes (optimism). A trainee must further have sufficient conviction that he or she can actually handle work demands (self-efficacy). Ultimately, a trainee must also believe in the capacity to persist at work if obstacles arise in order to succeed (resilience).

Given that researchers found significant desirable effects of hope, optimism, self-efficacy, and resilience in the wider work performance domain (Avey, Reichard, Luthans, & Mhatre, 2011; Schulman, 1999; Stajkovic & Luthans, 1998), there is reason to believe that they offer similar access to psychological mechanisms of and for enhancing training success via transfer motivation.
Transfer Motivation

Transfer motivation is described as the trainee’s desire to use the competencies learned in training on the job (Noe, 1986; Noe & Schmitt, 1986). It occupies a central role in existing conceptualisations of transfer processes, as a predictor of whether or not a trainee will choose to expend effort in order to apply newly acquired competencies in the workplace (Holton, Bates, & Ruona, 2000; Latham, 2007). However, for the most part, the training effectiveness literature has paid relatively limited attention to the underlying psychological mechanisms through which transfer motivation leads to desired outcomes. Existing constructs of transfer motivation are one-dimensional, ill-conceived, and insufficient (Gegenfurtner, Veermans, Festner, & Gruber, 2009).

Recently, Wenzel (Wenzel, 2012) crafted a multi-dimensional transfer motivation construct based on motivational theory by Parker, Bindl and Strauss (2010). Specifically, can-do, reason-to, and energised-to are suggested as three complementary motivational dimensions fundamental to prompt goal generation and sustain goal striving, thereby reflecting vital processes for training transfer.

Can-do motivation arises from perceptions of self-efficacy, control, and (low) cost. Individuals need to feel confident they can engage in an activity, such as trialling a new skill for the very first time. Aspinwall (2005) suggested that individuals may not engage in tasks if they perceive the effort involved as too costly in terms of time, money, energy, or other resources relative to the gain they may provide. Efficacy beliefs have also been shown to enhance persistence and increase individuals’ willingness to overcome obstacles (Bandura, 2000), both of which are essential when mastering and applying a new skill.

Reason-to motivation relates to why someone generates and strives for goals. For example, trainees might feel able to apply a new skill, but have no compelling reason to do so. Individuals therefore need to have a desire to transfer new knowledge, and thus see a value associated with getting involved in such a task. ‘Reason-to’ motivation is well recognised in existing theory, such as the concept of utility judgments in expectancy theory (Vroom, 1964). Individuals will pursue goals because they recognise that change toward the envisioned future outcome is important, for themselves and/or for others. A trainee thus may draw on reason-to motivation when the transfer action (though maybe not personally relevant) is accepted or owned as personally important.
*Energised-to motivation* refers to activated positive affective states that can affect the setting of and striving for goals. Energised motivation refers to momentary, elementary feelings that combine both valence and activation (Russell, 2003). For example, positive affect fosters the setting of more challenging goals (Ilies & Judge, 2005), helps individuals engage with a more problematic future (Oettingen, Mayer, & Thorpe, 2005), and promotes taking charge behaviours (Fritz & Sonnentag, 2009). A high degree of activation increases the amount of effort put into a behaviour by increasing the experience of energy (Brehm, 1999). A trainee with positive feelings thus may be more enthused to master a difficult transfer task.

In sum, transfer motivation is understood as a trainee’s direction, intensity, and persistence to apply new knowledge and use new competencies at work as a function of confidence beliefs, appreciation thoughts, and positive activating feelings.

**Research Model**

Altogether, trainees’ positive cognitions (hope, optimism, self-efficacy, resilience) about their work experience are hypothesised to affect their motivation to transfer (can-do, reason-to, energised-to) which in turn influences subsequent transfer of training to the work place. In its broadest sense, this cognitive-motivational system is likely greater than the sum of its parts. However, to make meaningful assertions about the role of each state, and ultimately understand how we can leverage different aspects for desired outcomes, we must study these individual parts. In addition, to further explore trajectories of transfer motivation onto outcome variables reflecting training success, the research model distinguishes between the initiation of training transfer and the effectiveness of the training. The former describes the enactment of change and transfer behaviours whereas the latter represents consequences of that change. All of the proposed relationships are visually summarised in Figure 1 below. To empirically investigating these proposed trajectories and the extent to which these individual mechanisms might impact training success, an exploratory study is described next.

Insert Figure 1 About Here
EXPLORATORY STUDY

Sample and Procedure

800 valid responses (20% response rate) were collected via an online self-report questionnaire from trainees who had undergone one of various formal work training courses offered by a major Australian training provider. The training courses cover a range of domains, job levels, as well as low and high complexity skills (e.g. software training, administration assistance, site safety, or people skills). Participants age ranges from 18 to 69 with a mean of 39 years, 47.6% respondents are male, 93.3% work in full-time positions, 81.9% have remained in the same position since undertaking the training.

Measures

Unless otherwise stated, respondents were asked how much they agree or disagree with certain statements on a 5-point self-report response scale: (1) Strongly disagree, (2) Disagree, (3) Neither, (4) Agree, (5) Strongly agree.

Trainee positivity was operationalised by selecting 6 items from each of the four construct’s original state scales and adapting them to fit the work context, if necessary. Optimism was measured using the Life Orientation Test-Revised (LOT-R) developed by Scheier, Carver, and Bridges (1994). A sample item reads: “When things are uncertain for me at work, I usually expect the best.” Hope was measured using the State Hope Scale (SHS) developed by Snyder et al. (1996). A sample item reads: “There are lots of ways around any problem that I am facing now at work.” Self-efficacy was measured using the New General Self-Efficacy Scale (NGSE) developed by Chen, Gully, and Eden (2001). A sample item reads: “I am able to achieve most of my goals at work.” Resilience was measured using the Resilience Scale (RS-14) developed by Wagnild (2009). A sample item reads: “At work, I usually manage one way or another.”

Transfer motivation was measured by an instrument specifically developed for this study. Feasible items from existing transfer motivation measures were collated and redundant items were merged or discarded. Based on its meaning each item was then associated with one of the three motivational dimensions or discarded due to non-fit. Based on conceptual suggestions by Wenzel (2012),
additional items were developed to complete typical aspects of training transfer. For the resulting initial 52 item pool, a consistent syntax was then applied to each item across the three dimensions. A basket-sorting exercise by ten PhD students resulted in 10 items being discarded due to inter-rater item matching problems. The remaining 42 items were then pilot tested in an independent trainee sample (n=369) of similar composition to the participants of this survey. The resulting 12 items (3x4) were sensibly selected considering sub-scale reliability (α = .90), item loadings (all above .65), and theoretical coverage of the three dimensions. A confirmatory factor analysis showed a three factor solution (Chi-square=387; CFI=0.959; DF=132; RMSEA=0.054) is a better fit to the data than a one-factor solution (Chi-square=433; CFI=0.924; DF=135; RMSEA=0.073). Sample items read: “I am able to apply new skills at work as a result of this training.” (can-do); “Using the new skills is of great practical value to me for my job.” (reason-to); “I feel enthusiastic about using this training on the job.” (energised-to).

Training Success was distinguished between training transfer behaviours and the effectiveness of these behaviours. Due to the highly heterogeneous sample covering various training programs and work contexts, the measure had to cover generic transfer aspects. Training transfer was measured using 3 items describing the actual initiation and application of a trained competency at work. A sample item reads “I made changes to how I do my work based on this training.” Ideally an applied competency has the effect it was intended to have originally based on the needs analysis and derived intervention design. Training effectiveness was measured using 3 items based on Xiao (1996). A sample item reads: “Supervisors, peers, or subordinates have told me that my work performance/quality has improved following the training.”.

Analysis

Descriptive statistics and scale intercorrelations are presented in Table 1. Testing for the presence of common method effect I conducted a Harman’s one-factor test (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Lee, & Podsakoff, 2003). All self-report variables were entered into an exploratory factor analysis (EFA), using unrotated principal components factor analysis and principal axis analysis with promax rotation. In both cases the EFA revealed five distinct factors (eigenvalue > 1.0, explaining 24, 12, 8, 7, and 6
standardised percent of the variance respectively) and not a single factor that would indicate a substantial amount of common method variance is present.

I used path analysis in structural equation modeling (SEM) software (MPlus) to test relationships proposed in figure 1. This SEM technique is considered more rigorous than typical stepwise regression techniques as all mediation paths are measured simultaneously rather than step by step. Measurement properties further indicated that structural equation modelling was appropriate. The theorised model showed a good fit ($\chi^2=545.258$, df = 377, $p<.01$, CFI = .984, TLI = .981 RMSEA = .024 SRMR = .027) and was more parsimonious than two possible alternate models (positivity partially and not mediated via transfer motivation on outcome variables).

**Findings**

Results suggest that individuals with more positive cognitions about their work experience are more motivated to transfer trained competencies to the job. Moreover, this elevated transfer motivation appears to convert to behaviour changes and increases in performance as reported by the trainee. However, some of proposed relationships in this study were not supported or insignificant. These differential effects are reported next.

Hope show significant relationships with can-do ($\beta = .358$) and reason-to motivation ($\beta = .328$). Self-efficacy in turn only show significant relationship with energised-to motivation ($\beta = .214$). Surprisingly, optimism and resilience show no significant relationships with any motivational dimensions.

All three motivational dimensions can-do ($\beta = .552$), reason-to ($\beta = .384$), and energised-to ($\beta = .207$) significantly affect training transfer. However, only can-do ($\beta = .375$) and reason-to ($\beta = .216$) motivation show significant effects on training effectiveness.

The significant paths from hope and self-efficacy to training transfer and training effectiveness are fully mediated by the motivational dimensions can-do and reason-to or energised-to respectively.
DISCUSSION AND OUTLOOK

The contributions of this paper are twofold. First, it suggests a new way of understanding the role of positive cognitions in the process of transferring training. And although transfer motivation is already considered a key construct for training effectiveness, there is still substantial ambiguity in its conceptualisation and operationalisation. The multi-dimensional construct used here is a useful attempt to explicate dynamic motivational mechanisms. The joint approach may be understood as a first step in unpacking processes that further help improving the effectiveness training. Relevance of such continued inquiry is justified when considering the strategic function of training and development for organisations’ competitiveness.

Second, the presented study is arguably amongst the earliest to merge multidimensional social-cognitive and motivational theory to illustrate how we should explore untapped psychological mechanisms underlying training transfer.

The limitations of a cross-sectional self-report study design need to be acknowledged. Although same source bias is unlikely, causation cannot be inferred. Conversely, the large and heterogeneous sample population can be considered a strength. Using trainees from different backgrounds that were trained in various competencies allows generalising the findings to some extent. Ultimately, the study’s differential findings are intriguing.

That is, given the substantial effect of hope, this positive construct may need to complement efficacious beliefs in future research and facilitation endeavours. And although optimism and resilience showed no significant effect in the current study, they shall not be ruled out. Both may be more relevant in other stages of the training process, such as learning during training. For instance, resilience helps to recover from mistakes whereas optimism shifts the attention to positive beliefs about the future, both potentially leading to heightened perseverance in the face of obstacles during skill learning and mastery attempts.

Moreover, the multi-dimensional transfer motivation allowed useful insights about discrete trajectories. In the presented study, positive affect (energised-to transfer motivation) seems vital for initiating training transfer behaviours. Future investigations should examine how features of the work
environment and characteristics of the training design and delivery affect trainee’s positivity, transfer motivation, and thus subsequent training transfer.

Also, the nature and complexity of the competencies trained most likely has to be considered. For instance, it is conceivable that high complexity skills may require elevated levels of hope (i.e. proximal goals, specific pathways) to activate sufficient energy-to motivation that initiates the transfer of this competency to the job.

Based on the malleable nature and theoretical grounding of hope and energised-to motivation, researchers and practitioners are invited to develop facilitating activities. Methods have been developed that enhance an individual’s hope (e.g. Snyder, 2002) or generate positive affect for particular behaviours (e.g. Isen, & Reeve, 2005). Interventions that combine these motivational facets may represent untapped levers for enhancing training effectiveness.

Taken together, for researchers, a clearer understanding of the complex interplay between cognitions, motivations, and behavioural responses can help to build a more complete theoretical framework on which future training transfer investigations can be built. For practitioners, a better understanding of how individual states may impact training success might be helpful for designing approaches that effectively elicit desirable transfer behaviours.
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APPENDIX

Figure 1

Figure 2

* $p < .05$  ** $p < .01$  (two-tailed tests)
### Means, Standard Deviations, and Intercorrelations of All Variables Included in the Study at the Individual Level (Pearson correlation computed in SPSS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Hope</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>3.7573</td>
<td>.55345</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Optimism</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>3.9052</td>
<td>.49092</td>
<td>0.470 **</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>4.0985</td>
<td>.40958</td>
<td>0.663 **</td>
<td>0.413 **</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Resilience</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>3.9112</td>
<td>.44221</td>
<td>0.546 **</td>
<td>0.443 **</td>
<td>0.584 **</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Can-do Transfer Motivation</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>3.9170</td>
<td>.52873</td>
<td>0.355 **</td>
<td>0.154 **</td>
<td>0.319</td>
<td>0.272</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Reason-to Transfer Motivation</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>4.0118</td>
<td>.51899</td>
<td>0.289 **</td>
<td>0.094</td>
<td>0.262</td>
<td>0.753</td>
<td>0.753 **</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Energised-to Transfer Motivation</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>4.0439</td>
<td>.53771</td>
<td>0.275</td>
<td>0.119</td>
<td>0.284 **</td>
<td>0.714</td>
<td>0.714 **</td>
<td>0.785 **</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Training Transfer</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>3.1792</td>
<td>.86231</td>
<td>0.296 **</td>
<td>0.094</td>
<td>0.251 **</td>
<td>0.600</td>
<td>0.600 **</td>
<td>0.611 **</td>
<td>0.618</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Training Effectiveness</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>3.3852</td>
<td>.67347</td>
<td>0.337 **</td>
<td>0.099</td>
<td>0.281 **</td>
<td>0.706</td>
<td>0.706 **</td>
<td>0.741 **</td>
<td>0.706 **</td>
<td>0.923 **</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: * p < .05, ** p < .01