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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study is to determine the effects of a near versus far transfer of training approach on trainee’s confidence to coach related and unrelated tasks. Based on the conditions identified in the literature for near and far transfer to occur, the study will examine whether trainee’s who are trained using a far transfer of training approach have equal confidence to coach related and unrelated tasks. In addition, it will investigate if trainee’s who are trained using a near transfer of training approach have greater confidence to coach related tasks and lower confidence to coach unrelated tasks. Further, the study will look at trainee’s general self-efficacy prior to training and their learning as a result of the training. Two instruments were developed to measure the variables. A transfer coaching questionnaire measured trainee’s level of confidence and a behavior rating scale measured trainee’s learning. Data was collected over a period of two days during four training sessions at two collection points either immediately before or immediately after the training sessions.

The results showed that supervisors who were trained using a far training transfer approach had equal confidence to coach both related and unrelated tasks. The results also showed that supervisors who were trained using a near training transfer approach had greater confidence to coach related tasks and lower confidence to coach unrelated tasks. Further, the results showed that supervisors who were trained using a far training transfer approach and those who were trained using a near training transfer approach acquired similar levels of knowledge as a result of participating in the training and had similar
levels of general self-efficacy prior to the training. This study provides several implications for future research important to the theory and practice of HRD.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Transfer of training continues to be an area of concern for both human resource development (HRD) researchers and practitioners. Transfer of training is usually defined as the extent to which the knowledge, skills, and abilities acquired in training can be applied, generalized, and maintained over time (Baldwin & Ford, 1988). Further, positive transfer of training is distinguished by the extent to which what is learned in training is applied to the job and improves job performance (Yamnill & McLean, 2001). Others have expanded on these definitions noting that the transfer process may involve using what one has learned in one situation in other situations, which can differ in some ways from the training situation (Broad & Newstrom, 1992; Holton, Bates, Seyler, & Carvalho, 1997).

For training to be effective, organizations need to ensure that trainees will be able to use what was learned during training back on the job. Many organizations spend a significant amount of time and money on training. Consider that the American Society for Training and Development (ASTD) (Bassi & Van Buren, 1998) estimated that $55 billion was spent by organizations on formal training programs. Still, it is suggested only ten percent of learning transfers to job performance. Thus, few organizations can show that their training investments result in improved employee job performance (Holton & Baldwin, 2000). In order for organizations to benefit from their investments in training
trainees must apply, generalize and maintain over time what they learn in training on the job (Salas & Cannon-Bowers, 2001).

Several models have been proposed to help understand transfer of training. Baldwin and Ford (1988) presented a model that consists of training inputs (trainee characteristics, training design factors, and work environment factors); training outputs (learning and retention); and conditions of transfer (skill generalization and maintenance). The model suggests that transfer of training is a function of these variables being in alignment. That is, training inputs affect learning and retention, which directly influence generalization and maintenance (Yamnill & Mclean, 2001). So, successful transfer of training is not determined by any one factor such as performance in the training program (Machin, 2002). Rather, obstacles to training transfer can occur in any part of the transfer process if any of these variables are mis-aligned.

Subsequent transfer models show that new ways to consider transfer are being explored. Some of these models emphasize viewing transfer as a process rather than an outcome. For example, Broad and Newstrom (1992) developed a model that included strategies for managing the transfer process before, during, and after training, and the role responsibilities of managers, trainers, and trainees in the transfer process. Kozlowski and Salas (1997) designed a three-level model incorporating the individual level, the team level, and the organizational level. Further, Thayer and Teachout (1995) added transfer climate to their model including cues such as goal cues and social cues and consequences such as positive or negative reinforcement that may enhance or inhibit transfer. Similarly, Holton (1996) developed a model that emphasized transfer motivation meaning that individual learning is influenced by the trainees’ motivation to learn,
reaction to the training climate, and ability and experience. Others have expanded on the Baldwin & Ford’s model. Noe (2002) adapted the model to include issues of self-management strategies and concern for the learning environment as relative to training design and assessing transfer climate as being important in assessing the work environment. Gielen (1996) presented another model that separates work environment factors affecting training transfer into work system factors and people factors. Work system factors include items related to culture such as open communication and change resistance (Rainey, 1983), opportunity to use training (Ford, Quinones, Sego, & Sorra, 1992; Clarke, 2002), and match between training goals and organizational goals (Richey, 1990; Montesino, 2002). People related factors include support from supervisors and co-workers (Ford et al; 1992; Richman-Hirsch, 2001), and availability of a mentor (Richey, 1990).

From the literature, two elements have emerged as conditions required for transfer of training: 1) generalizing training back to the work environment and 2) maintaining skills over time (Baldwin & Ford, 1988). Generalization is the extent to which knowledge, skills, and attitudes acquired in training are applied to different tasks or to settings beyond the training context (Adams, 1987).

Problem Statement

Transfer of training continues to be an important organizational issue that has received a great deal of attention in the literature. Few organizations can show that training results in improved employee job performance. For training to be effective, organizations need to ensure that trainees will be able to use what was learned during training back on the job. Models of training transfer have focused on combinations of
training inputs; (trainee characteristics, training design factors, and work environment factors); training outputs (learning and retention); and conditions of transfer (skill generalization and maintenance). These models suggest that transfer of training is a function of these variables being in alignment. That is, training inputs affect learning and retention, which directly influence generalization and maintenance (Yamnill & Mclean, 2001). Obstacles to training transfer can occur in any part of the transfer process if any of these variables are miss-aligned.

Although transfer of training has received much attention in the literature, most of this research has focused on the conditions for near transfer to occur (Barnett & Ceci, 2002; Clark & Voogel, 1985; Holton & Baldwin, 2000; Laker, 1990; Kim & Lee, 2001; Smith, Ford, & Kozlowski, 1997). In the literature near transfer of training is usually defined as a situation where the stimulus for the original learning event is similar to the stimulus for the transfer event (Royer, 1979). For example, if the original learning task involved adding two digit numbers, near transfer might be determined by adding three digit numbers. Clark and Voogel (1985) describe near transfer as the transfer of specific tasks learned in training back to the job. That is near transfer is contextual and implies a rather high degree of similarity between the training setting and the work setting. Thus, learning the repair procedures for a Hyundai engine would allow the trainee to repair only that one particular Hyundai engine once back on the job (Kim & Lee, 2001). This supports Laker’s (1990) definition that emphasizes that near transfer will be maximized based on the extent to which trainees apply what was learned in training to situations that are similar to those in which they were trained and Noe’s (2002) emphasis on the degree
of similarity between aspects of the learning setting and the work setting such as tasks, materials, and equipment.

In contrast, far transfer is an emerging area of interest, which has received little attention in the literature (Barnett & Ceci, 2002; Jacobs, 2003). Far transfer is described as a situation in which the stimulus for the transfer event would be somewhat different from the stimulus for the original learning event. For example, substituting addition word problems when the original learning had involved number problems presents far transfer (Royer, 1979). That is, far transfer is not contextual and involves the transfer of more general knowledge from the classroom to the job (Clark & Voogel, 1985). So, far transfer involves having trainees learn more general concepts and principles, which might be applied to broader contexts than those originally taught in the training (Kim & Lee, 2001). For example, a trainee a might learn to repair a Hyundai engine, but far transfer would mean the trainee could transfer what was learned about engines to various automobiles such as a GM or Chrysler product. Further, Laker (1990) defines far transfer as the extent to which trainees apply what was learned in training to situations that are different or new from those in which they were trained. Other definitions describe far transfer in terms of domain (such as transfer from school to work) or transfer between skills (such as a specific fact versus a general principle) (Barnett & Ceci, 2002).

In comparison, several factors distinguish near and far transfer. First, near transfer requires a close match between training content and the unit of work, whereas far transfer requires an approximate match between training content and the unit of work (Jacobs, 2003; Kim & Lee, 2001). Second, near transfer requires a close match between the training and task outcomes, whereas far transfer requires an approximate match
between the training and task outcomes (Kim & Lee, 2001). Third, near transfer emphasizes specific concepts, skills, facts, or procedures whereas far transfer emphasizes more general concepts, skills, principles, or strategies (Kim & Lee, 2001). Barnett & Ceci (2002) state that specific facts or procedures, which focus on surface aspects of the problem, apply only to specific situations, whereas principles or concepts, which focus more on deep, structural aspects of the problem, usually apply to more general situations.

It is proposed that if transfer of training is important to organizational performance, and if applying both near and far approaches to training transfer may potentially improve performance, even though most of the literature has focused on near transfer and not far transfer, then more should be known about the differences between near and far transfer and their impact on learning.

The purpose of this study was to determine the effects of a near versus far transfer of training approach on trainee’s confidence to perform related and unrelated tasks.

Research Questions

This study investigated differences in confidence and learning to perform specific and related tasks, for employees who were trained using either a near or a far transfer of training approach. Five research questions were investigated in this study:

(1) Do trainees who are trained using a far training transfer approach have equal confidence to coach both related and unrelated tasks?

(2) Do trainees who are trained using a near training transfer approach have greater confidence to coach related tasks?

(3) Do trainees who are trained using a near training transfer approach have lower confidence to coach unrelated tasks?
(4) Do trainees who are trained using a far and near training transfer approach differ in their assessment of learning outcomes?

(5) Do trainees who are trained using a far and near training transfer approach differ in their self-assessment of general self-efficacy?

(6) Do trainees who are trained using a near and far training transfer approach show different relationships between demographic factors and transfer coaching and learning?

Significance of the Study

The study contributed to the theory and practice of HRD in several ways. First, the study began a line of investigation regarding the use of far training transfer approaches to training. Specifically, results from the study improved theoretical understandings of the differences between near and far training transfer approaches, and how these differences might impact training outcomes and potential changes in job behaviors.

In addition to theoretical contributions, the study was important to HRD practitioners. The results of the study provided information about how a near and far transfer of training approach might impact training outcomes and potential changes in job behaviors. Practitioners can use this information to possibly reduce the amount of training conducted and potentially increase productivity by developing more flexible, multi-skilled employees.
Definition of Terms

Self-Efficacy. Beliefs in one’s capabilities to organize and execute the courses of action required to produce given attainments (Bandura, 1997). Judgment about task capability (Gist & Mitchell, 1992).

Training. The systematic acquisition of rules, concepts, skills, or attitudes resulting in improved performance in another environment (Goldstein & Ford, 2002). Training is a process of systematically developing expertise in individuals for the purpose of improving performance (Swanson, 1995).

Training Transfer. The extent to which the knowledge, skills, and abilities acquired in training can be applied, generalized, and maintained over time (Baldwin & Ford, 1988). The extent to which individuals can apply what was learned in one situation to another situation (Baldwin & Ford, 1988; Holton, Bates, Seyler, & Carvalho, 1997). The degree to which learners apply their trained knowledge, skills, and attitudes in the work context (Noe, 2002).

Near Transfer. The extent to which trainees apply what was learned in training to situations that are similar to those in which they were trained (Laker, 1990). Near transfer requires a close match between training and task content, a close match between the training and task outcomes, and emphasis on specific concepts and skills. Trainee is able to use the training in a manner and situation similar to the training setting (Royer, 1979). Trainee’s ability to apply learned capabilities exactly to the work situation (Noe, 2002).
**Far Transfer.** The extent to which trainees apply what was learned in training to situations that are different or new from those in which they were trained (Laker, 1990). Far transfer requires an approximate match between training and task content, an approximate match between the training and task outcomes, and emphasis on general concepts and skills. Trainee applies the training to situations in manners and situations unlike the training setting (Royer, 1979). Trainee’s ability to apply learned capabilities to the work environment even though work environment is not identical to the training session (equipment, problems, tasks) (Noe, 2002).

**Limitations**

Limitations are factors which cannot be adequately controlled in the design of the study and which cannot be accounted for when analyzing, interpreting, and generalizing the data. The following were considered limitations of this study:

1. The lack of control over selecting subjects from the population of employees to attend training.
2. This study was concerned with trainee’s confidence relative to task performance. It did not address other types of job behaviors.
3. The nature of the quantitative paradigm and the experimental design used in the study do not account for additional qualitative differences.
4. A purposive sample of front-line supervisors was used and caution should be exercised in generalizing these conclusions to different populations and to conditions different than those in the study.
5. The treatment was part of four training sessions conducted on two days.
6. The results of the study are limited by the instruments used.
Assumptions

For this study assumptions were statements that served to delineate the scope of the investigation with its prescribed boundaries. The following were assumptions of this study:

1. The study concerned supervisor training.
2. The study investigated the use of a near transfer of training approach and a far transfer of training approach.
3. Trainees in four training sessions of an organization were used as subjects for this study.

Organization of the Study

This study is organized in five chapters. The first chapter introduces the study, presents the statement of the problem and states the significance of the study. The second chapter reviews the literature related to the problem in the study. Specifically, the importance of HRD in training for performance, theory and empirical research in the areas of developing training transfer, near and far transfer of training, and self-efficacy and training transfer are discussed. The third chapter discusses the research design and methodology of the study. The fourth chapter presents the results of the study. The fifth chapter discusses conclusions and implications of the study, which are based on the results reported in Chapter IV. In addition, Chapter V presents suggestions for future research. References for sources used in this study and appendices of the materials used in this study are included at the end of the document.
CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

This chapter is divided into five sections. The first section provides a definition of human resource development (HRD), reviews the importance of moving from a training perspective to a performance perspective when considering transferring training to the job, and discusses the benefits of a system’s approach to training. The second section provides an overview of the transfer literature by defining transfer of training and discussing relevant theories, models, research, and issues related to transfer of training. The third section provides definitions of near and far transfer of training, describes learning requirements of near and far transfer of training and discusses performance implications of a near and far transfer of training approach. The fourth section defines self-efficacy and its relationship to training and transfer. The fifth section provides a conceptual framework for the information in the review of literature.

Human Resource Development

This section is divided into three parts. The first part presents a definition of HRD. The second part discusses the importance of moving from a training perspective to performance perspective when considering transferring training to the job. The third part discusses the benefits of a systems approach to training.
Human resource development (HRD) refers to the process of enabling individuals and groups to achieve desired accomplishments through training, organization development, and career development, for the purpose of improving an organization’s performance (Jacobs, 1998). HRD programs, which offer a variety of learning opportunities, enable employees to perform better on their jobs and should enable the organization as a whole to perform better (Torraco & Swanson, 1995). In addition, Gilley & Eggland (1989) specifically describe two major processes of HRD including organization development and training and development. They describe organization development as the process of systematically implementing organizational change for the purpose of improving performance. Likewise, they define training and development as the process of systematically developing expertise in employees for the purpose of improving performance.

Training to Performance

Organizations are increasingly recognizing the importance of moving from training to performance improvement in HRD. Robinson and Robinson (1996) describe this shift as moving away from what people need to learn (training) to what they must do (performance). Employee training continues to be an effective human resource development (HRD) process for developing employees. Still, there is strong consensus that acquisition of knowledge, skills, behaviors, and attitudes through training is of limited value if these skills are not transferred to the job setting (Baldwin and Ford, 1988; Goldstein & Ford, 2002; Kozlowski & Salas, 1997; Yamnill & McLean, 2001). Positive training transfer is defined as the extent to which what is learned in training is applied to
the job and improves job performance (Yamnill & McLean, 2001). Since HRD
emphasizes not only learning but also individual and organizational performance
considerable emphasis is placed on the transfer of training to job performance (Swanson

According to Swanson (1995), for HRD to become a core business, performance
is the key. It has been said that learning is of little value to organizations if it does not
transfer to performance (Holton, Bates, Seyler, & Carvalho, 1997). Since HRD is
concerned with helping employees perform their jobs effectively, employees must learn
trained material and use it on the job to improve performance. Thus, transfer of training
to the job is important to the success of HRD efforts (DeSimone, Werner, & Harris,
2002).

Since HRD has great potential for contributing to organization performance,
organizations are demanding more accountability for results of training programs and
other HRD interventions from providers of HRD programs (Robinson & Robinson, 1996;
Swanson & Holton, 1999). HRD researchers and practitioners are continually being
pressured to account for results of training programs and other HRD interventions.
According to Tziner, Haccoun, and Kadish (1991), the main purpose of any training
program is to foster the attainment of trainee skills and abilities in order to enhance their
job performance. Similarly, most would agree that the critical issue of any training
program is the successful transfer of the newly acquired skills back to the work
environment (Ford, Quinones, Sego & Sorra, 1992). Described as the behavioral
demonstration of learning, training transfer is typically recognized as the third dimension
in Kirkpatrick’s (1967) widely used evaluation model. However, the number of
organizations conducting Level 3 (behavior/transfer) is small in comparison to those assessing reaction (Level 1) and learning (Level 2) causing some to still argue that the transfer problem is not being adequately addressed (Holton, 1996; Russ-Eft, 2002). Thus, transfer of training is an important organizational issue, which supports the need for additional research on how to design training programs to enhance the transfer process.

**Systems Approach to Training**

The transfer of knowledge and skills from instructional programs continues to be an area of concern for both HRD researchers and practitioners. Training programs are often designed and delivered without connecting training back to the work environment. The majority of research on training transfer is descriptive and identifies or describes factors that may influence transfer without examining how these factors could be changed or managed (Holton & Baldwin, 2000). This is especially concerning when considering a system’s approach to training.

It is widely accepted among HRD scholars and practitioners that training programs influence and are influenced by elements of a larger organizational system (Goldstein, 1993; Rummler & Brache, 1995; Wexley & Latham, 1991). That is, training programs should be considered in terms of improving performance in a broader systemic context. Training is no longer viewed as a sub-system of the organization but rather it is viewed from a system’s perspective as an integral part of a business’s strategic direction (Salas, Cannon-Bowers, 2001). Jacobs (2003) suggested that training programs have a strategic role in organizations due to changes in the nature of work (such as the use of advanced technologies and more emphasis on responsiveness to customer’s needs),
which increasingly requires employees to solve problems and make complex decisions. Thus, having employees with high levels of expertise is of strategic importance to organizations.

Further, strategically transfer of training is a critical issue regarding linking individual change to the requirements of the organizational system (Holton & Baldwin, 2000). Thinking based on a systems perspective suggests that learning outcomes at the individual level will potentially influence higher-level organizational outcomes and effectiveness (Salas & Cannon-Bowers, 2001).

Transfer of Training

This section of the literature review is divided into five parts: (a) definition of transfer of training, (b) relevant theories of transfer of training, (c) relevant models of transfer of training, (d) relevant research regarding transfer of training, (e) issues related to transfer of training.

Definition of Transfer of Training

In order for organizations to benefit from their investments in training and development and remain competitive, trainees must apply, generalize, and maintain over time what they learn in training on the job (Salas & Cannon-Bowers, 2001). This is known as transfer of training and it involves the extent to which the knowledge, skills, and abilities acquired in training can be applied, generalized, and maintained over time (Baldwin & Ford, 1988). Similarly, Georgenson (1982) defines transfer as the degree to which an individual uses the skills and knowledge learned in training on the job in an effective and continuous manner. Positive training transfer is often defined as the extent to which what is learned in training is applied to the job and improves job performance.
(Yamnill & McLean, 2001). Others have expanded on these definitions noting that the transfer process may involve using what one has learned in one situation in other situations, which can differ in some ways from the training situation (Broad & Newstrom, 1992; Holton, Bates, Seyler, & Carvalho, 1997).

One issue with definitions of transfer of training is that these definitions view transfer from a unidimensional perspective (Laker, 1990). Laker suggests that even though definitions of transfer of training contain several identifiable components including applied to the job context, applied in new contexts or for new purposes, applied in an effective and continuous manner, generalized to the job, and maintained, these claim to describe the same transfer concept. Instead, he suggests that definitions of transfer of training should include two dimensions: a temporal dimension and a generalizability (or distance) dimension.

The temporal dimension includes transfer initiation and maintenance and the generalizability dimension includes near and far transfer. Laker (1990) defines transfer initiation as the degree to which trainees attempt to use the training they have received. Transfer maintenance is the extent to which trainees continue to apply the training they have received over time. Generalization is the extent to which knowledge, skills, and attitudes acquired in training are applied to different tasks or to settings beyond the training context (Adams, 1987). Generalizability is distinguished by near and far transfer of training. Laker defines near transfer as the extent to which trainees apply what is learned in training to situations that are similar to those in which they were trained. In contrast, he defines far transfer as the extent to which trainees apply what is learned in training to situations that are different or new from those in which they were trained.
These distinctions are important because according to Laker (1990) it can be hypothesized that the factors influencing transfer initiation, transfer maintenance, and near and far transfer are often very different. That is, these dimensions will have different implications for the identification of training objectives, the design and development of the training content, the needed strategies to support transfer, and the evaluation of training effectiveness. Consider that generalization is particularly important when considering how to design training to achieve far transfer while a supportive work environment may be critical to transfer maintenance.

*Theories of Transfer of Training*

Drawing from earlier research (Baldwin & Ford, 1988; Noe, 1986; Noe & Schmitt, 1986; Rouiller & Goldstein, 1993; Tannenbaum & Yukl, 1992; Tracey, Tannenbaum & Kavanaugh, 1995), Holton, Bates, and Ruona (2000) proposed viewing transfer from a system’s perspective. They define transfer system as all elements involving the person, the organization, and the training that influence transfer of learning to job performance. Combining the elements of transfer system along with the components of Baldwin & Ford’s model, three common themes emerge from the literature regarding theories of training transfer: 1) theories involving trainee characteristics, 2) theories regarding the work environment and 3) theories relating to training design.

*Trainee Characteristics*

Transfer of training theories related to trainee characteristics include theories involving motivation to transfer. Motivation to transfer is defined as the trainees’ desire to use the skills and knowledge acquired in a training program on the job (Noe, 1986). Thus,
motivation to transfer is hypothesized to link individual learning with individual performance change (Holton, 1996). Three conditions that contribute to a trainee’s motivation to transfer include: 1) trainees’ level of confidence in using the skills; 2) trainees’ awareness of work situations in which demonstration of the new skills is appropriate; and 3) trainees’ perceptions that job performance improvement is likely to occur if the new skills are used on the job (Noe, 1986).

Three theories of human behavior, which may help explain motivation to transfer including expectancy theory, equity theory, and goal-setting theory (Yamnill and McClean, 2001). First, expectancy theory suggests that individuals will be more motivated if they believe that their effort will lead to improved performance and therefore more motivated to transfer (Holton, 1996; Vroom, 1964). Second, Adams (1963) equity theory on job motivation states that various factors affect a person’s perception of their relationship with their work such as seeking a fair balance between inputs (what they put into their work) and outputs (what they get out of their work). Thus, if a person feels that by attending training he or she will gain equity in pay or some other award, there is a better chance that learning will occur, and that this learning will transfer to the job (Noe, 1986). Third, goal-setting is recognized as a powerful motivational technique to enhance behavioral change in many settings (Locke & Latham, 1984). Locke’s (1968) goal setting theory states that individuals make calculated decisions regarding their desired goals. Once individuals determine the goals they want to achieve, these goals direct and motivate their actions to achieve them. In terms of training transfer, goal-setting theory may help explain how and why certain behaviors result in increased
transfer. For example, if individuals perceive that what they learn is relevant to their goal, they may be more motivated to transfer what they have learned to the job.

Work Environment

It is generally accepted in the training literature that training motivation can be influenced by both individual and situational characteristics (Noe, 1986; Tannenbaum & Yukl, 1992). Wexley and Latham (1991) defined trainability (the degree to which trainees’ are able to learn and apply the material learned in a training program) as a function of the trainees’ ability and motivation. Noe and Schmitt (1986) added environmental favorability to this definition, which includes both trainees’ perceptions of social support for using new skills and task constraints. Research also suggests that situational factors play an important role in influencing individual behavior (Colquitt, LePine, and Noe, 2000). For example, Tracey, Tannenbaum, and Kavanagh (1995) defined an organization’s transfer climate as trainees’ perceptions about characteristics of the work environment that influence the use of training content on the job. Transfer climate is seen as a mediating variable in the relationship between an individual’s job attitudes and work behavior and the organizational context (Holton, Ruona, & Leimbach, 1998).

The distinguishing features of a positive climate include adequate resources, cues to remind trainees what they have learned, and opportunities to use new skills, timely feedback, and positive consequences for using new training (Rouiller & Goldstein, 1993; Tracey et al., 1995). Rouiller and Goldstein (1993) found that a positive climate was linked with transfer of managerial skills in the fast-food industry. Tracey et al. (1995) found that a positive organizational climate predicted the extent to which employees used
trained skills on the job. Holton, Bates, Seyler, and Carvalho (1997) found that people see transfer climate in terms of organizational referents such as supervisors or peers.

Organization theory supports aspects of the transfer climate variable. Organizational theory states that trained knowledge, skills, and attitudes at the individual level are embedded in unit level technology, coordination processes, and social system contexts with broader contextual constraints starting at higher at system (Kozlowski & Salas, 1997). Thus, organization theory is based on concepts drawn from systems theory to enhance training. These concepts include: 1) organizations are influenced by external environmental factors, 2) subsystem events are embedded within the larger systems context, and 3) complex systems cannot be understood based on their individual elements. The theory implies that preparing individuals to accept training and to transfer their new skills in the work environment requires training that is delivered at the appropriate level and is aligned with contextual supports. Thus, even when learning occurs in training, the transfer climate may either support or inhibit the application of learning to the job (Mathieu, Tannenbaum, & Salas, 1992).

Training Design

Training design has been described as one of the most important influences on training transfer (Brinkerhoff & Gill, 1992). In terms of training transfer, training design includes purposeful elements that are part of the training program to enhance the possibility of transfer. Holton (1996) states that one cause of failure to transfer is that training design does not provide for the ability to transfer the learning. Consider that even if cognitive learning occurs, trainees’ may not have the opportunity to practice the training on the job or may not be taught how to apply their new knowledge on the job.
That is, the training itself can have a direct influence on transfer of training. Two primary design theories that describe the conditions necessary for transfer are identical elements theory and principles theory.

First, the identical elements theory suggests that transfer of training occurs when the training material is identical to that which the trainee performs in an actual context (Kim & Lee, 2001). Thus, transfer is maximized according to the extent to which the tasks, tools, equipment, and environment in the training setting are similar to those in the work setting. Identical elements theory supports a near transfer of training approach where the training enables trainees to apply their knowledge and skills to known predictable conditions of their job (Kim & Lee, 2001). Based on this theory the training environment is identical to the work environment and the work environment features are predictable such as in training to use equipment (Noe, 2002). This theory is used in the development of many training programs, especially those involved with learning specific procedures or learning how to use equipment (Noe, 2002).

Originally proposed by Thorndike & Woodworth (1901), they hypothesized that transfer is maximized by the extent that there are identical stimulus and response elements in the training and transfer settings. Therefore, the amount of transfer between the familiar situation and the unfamiliar one is determined by the number of elements that the two situations have in common. This learning theory represents the original S-R (stimulus-response) framework of behavioral psychology where learning is the result of associations forming between stimuli and responses (Thorndike, 1913). Such associations become strengthened or weakened by the nature and frequency of the S-R
pairings. Therefore, transfer is always specific, never general and occurs because of previously encountered situations.

Baldwin and Ford (1988) describe identical elements as the necessary degree of similarity between components of the training program and the work environment that will facilitate learning, retention, and transfer. In summary, identical elements theory suggests the following:

The more the training content and program reflect the workplace, the greater the near transfer (Baldwin and Ford, 1988).

The greater the specificity about where and how the training is to be applied to the job, the greater the near transfer (Clark and Voogel, 1985).

The more overlearning of the task is encouraged, the greater the near transfer (Noe, 1986).

The more the procedural nature of the task is emphasized, the greater the near transfer (Clark and Voogel, 1985).

The more the application of the training is restricted to only those areas for which the trainee was prepared, the greater near transfer (Clark and Voogel, 1985).

Second, principles theory suggests that training should focus on the general principles or most important features needed to learn a task so that the leaner may use them to solve problems as part of the transfer task (Goldstein & Ford, 2002). That is, transfer is enhanced when trainees are taught, not only skills, but also the general rules and theoretical principles that underlie the training content. Principles theory emphasizes a far transfer of training approach where general principles are applicable to different work situations in a work environment that is typically unpredictable and characterized by a high degree of variability (Noe, 2002). Trainees are expected to learn concepts and principles to deal with situations that may not be encountered during training (Kim &
Lee, 2001). In contrast to the specific stimuli and response elements of identical elements, principles theory maintains a broader perspective focusing on the general principles in the original learning and transfer situations. An example of this type of training is interpersonal skills training.

In summary, general principles theory suggests the following:

The better trainees understand the underlying principles, concepts, and assumptions of the skills and behaviors they are learning, the greater the far transfer (Goldstein, 1986).

The more trainees practice in different contexts and use novelty in practice exercises, the greater the far transfer (Baldwin & Ford, 1988; Goldstein, 1986).

The more encouragement trainees receive during training to discuss and apply the training in situations they choose, the greater the far transfer (Noe, 1986).

The more encouragement trainees receive after training to apply the training to situations other than those for which they were trained, the greater the far transfer (Goldstein, 1986).

*Models of Transfer of Training*

Several researchers have developed models of transfer of training describing components of the transfer system that can be changed or managed to positively impact transfer. Baldwin & Ford’s (1988) classic model consists of training inputs (trainee characteristics, training design factors, and work environment factors); training outputs (learning and retention); and conditions of transfer (skill generalization and maintenance). The model suggests that transfer of training is a function of these variables being in alignment. That is, training inputs affect learning and retention, which directly influence generalization and maintenance (Yamnill & Mclean, 2001). So successful transfer of training is not determined by any one factor such as performance in
the training program (Machin, 2002). Rather, obstacles to training transfer can occur in any part of the transfer process if any of these variables are miss-aligned.

Subsequent transfer models show that new ways to consider transfer are being explored. Some of these models emphasize viewing transfer as a process rather than an outcome. For example, Broad and Newstrom (1992) developed a model that included strategies for managing the transfer process before, during, and after training, and the role responsibilities of managers, trainers, and trainees in the transfer process. Kozlowski and Salas (1997) designed a three-level model incorporating the individual level, the team level, and the organizational level. Further, Thayer and Teachout (1995) added transfer climate to their model including cues such as goal cues and social cues and consequences such as positive or negative reinforcement that may enhance or inhibit transfer. Similarly, Holton (1996) developed a model that emphasized transfer motivation meaning that individual learning is influenced by the trainees’ motivation to learn, reaction to the training climate, and ability and experience.

Other researchers have expanded on the original model developed by Baldwin & Ford (1988). Noe (2002) adapted the model to include issues of self-management strategies and concern for the learning environment as relative to training design and assessing transfer climate as being important in assessing the work environment. Gielen (1996) presented another model of transfer that separates work environment factors affecting training transfer into work system factors and people factors. Work system factors include items related to culture such as open communication and change resistance (Rainey, 1983), opportunity to use training (Ford, Quinones, Sego, & Sorra, 1992; Clarke, 2002), and match between training goals and organizational goals (Richey,
People related factors include support from supervisors and co-workers (Ford et al. 1992; Richman-Hirsch, 2001), and availability of a mentor (Richey, 1990). Also, other models have looked at motivation to transfer (Colquitt, Lepine, & Noe, 2000; Holton, 1996; Noe & Schmitt, 1986).

Transfer of Training Research

Since Baldwin and Ford’s (1988) review of the literature over a decade ago, a great deal of research has been conducted on factors influencing the transfer process. The majority of this research reflects the common themes previously mentioned regarding theories of transfer of training and components of models of transfer of training that have focused on trainee characteristics, work environment factors, and elements of training design.

Trainee Characteristics

As mentioned, Baldwin and Ford (1988) defined trainee characteristics as individual-level variables such as motivation, ability, and personality characteristics. Perhaps most relevant to this study is the research on motivational variables influencing transfer since self-efficacy and motivation have received considerable attention in the transfer research (Baldwin & Ford, 1988; Noe, 1986; Noe & Schmitt, 1986).

A review of the literature has identified four main categories that comprise research on motivational variables influencing transfer: 1) career and job attitudes/pre-training motivation, 2) organizational commitment, 3) decision and reaction to training, and 4) post-training interventions. First, Noe and Schmitt (1986) defined motivation to transfer as a trainees’ desire to use the knowledge and skills learned in the training program on the job. Based on Noe’s (1986) model of motivational influences on training
effectiveness (with participant’s behavior in training defined as a function of ability, 
motivation, and environment), they looked at the relationship between training 
effectiveness and trainees’ attitudes towards their jobs, careers, and participation in the 
training program. They found a significant relationship between job involvement and 
learning. Further, they concluded career planning is an important prerequisite to on-the-
job behavior after participating in a training program. They also concluded that these 
results demonstrated the importance of pre-training motivation for training effectiveness. 
Further, Mathieu, Tannenbaum, and Salas (1992) further replicated their results. They 
found that trainees who had both good career planning skills and a high level of job 
involvement were more likely to be motivated to learn. These results imply support for 
pre-training activities as well as pre-training motivation for impacting learning transfer. 

Second, motivational variables influencing transfer have been studied from an 
commitment as a psychological state (involving the strength of a person’s involvement 
and identification with an organization) that characterizes the employee's relationships 
with the organization, and that has implications for the decision to stay in the 
organization. For example, Tannenbaum, Mathieu, Salas and Cannon-Bowers (1991) 
found that the level of trainees’ organizational commitment affects their views on the 
usefulness of training and the expected outcome of early training experiences. Further, 
they concluded that commitment influenced pre-training motivation and was related to 
the development of post-training attitudes. Also, Tesluk, Farr, Mathieu, and Vance 
(1995) found that training can generalize from context to another and that trainees with a
higher level of organizational commitment were more likely to use training in performing core job activities.

Third, motivational variables influencing transfer have been studied based on decisions and reactions to training. Researchers have found that employees who have had the opportunity to provide input into the training decision were more likely to see the training as relevant to their jobs. This resulted in higher levels of pre-training motivation (Clark, Dobbins, & Ladd, 1993; Mathieu, Tannenbaum, & Salas, 1992). Further, pre-training motivation influenced learning in the training program (Baldwin et al; Mathieu et al.) and Mathieu et al. found pre-training motivation to be related to training performance. Additionally, Mathieu et al. found reactions to training influenced trainees’ learning and job performance and Clark et al. found that trainees who saw training as having high career and job utility were more motivated to learn. Finally, Axtell, and Maitlis (1996) reported that trainees who perceived training as relevant had higher levels of immediate transfer (one month after training).

Fourth, transfer motivational variables have been studied based on post-training interventions such as feedback and relapse prevention techniques that might influence trainees’ motivation to transfer new skills to the job. Martocchio and Webster (1992) concluded that trainees receiving negative feedback demonstrated less learning over time than those receiving positive feedback. Wexley and Baldwin (1986) found that participative goal setting brought about larger levels of maintenance behavior two months after training. Gist, Bavetta, and Stevens (1991) showed that goal setting could be used as a post-training intervention to improve skills learned in interpersonal communications. In another study, Stevens and Gist (1997) further showed that goal-setting instruction as
part of a post-training program could improve the maintenance of trained interpersonal skills. Further, Burke (1997) found that relapse prevention positively impacted both trainees’ ability and motivation to transfer. Finally, Richman-Hirsch (2001) concluded that goal-setting enhanced transfer if it occurred in a supportive environment.

Although the influence of trainee characteristics on transfer of training has received a great deal of research attention, few distinctions between near and far transfer and trainee characteristics are found in the literature. However, Kim & Lee (2001) suggest that a trainee, who is field dependent, may have more difficulty in identifying the critical features of concepts versus a field independent trainee who may ask more questions thus ensuring a deeper understanding of underlying concepts. This would support Laker’s (1990) suggestion that the more fully trainees’ understand the underlying concepts and assumptions of the skills and behaviors they are learning, the more efficient the far transfer.

Work Environment Factors

In their transfer model, Baldwin and Ford (1988) classified work environment factors as training inputs defined as peer and supervisory support and opportunities and constraints to perform learned behaviors on the job. Research suggests that situational factors play an important role in influencing individual behavior (Colquitt, LePine, and Noe, 2001). Situational characteristics have been examined from various perspectives in the training literature. For example, Tracey, Tannenbaum, and Kavanagh (1995) defined an organization’s climate for transfer as trainees’ perceptions about characteristics of the work environment that influence the use of training content on the job. The distinguishing features of a positive climate include adequate resources, cues to remind trainees what
they have learned, and opportunities to use new skills, timely feedback, and positive consequences for using new training (Rouiller & Goldstein, 1993; Tracey et al., 1995). Rouiller and Goldstein (1993) found that a positive climate was linked with transfer of managerial skills in the fast-food industry. Tracey et al. (1995) found that a positive organizational climate predicted the extent to which employees used trained skills on the job.

Holton’s (1996) transfer of training model includes ‘transfer climate’ defined as the mediating variable between organizational context and a person’s job attitudes and work behavior as a result of an individual’s perception of their work environment. Thus, even when learning occurs in training, the transfer climate may either support or inhibit the application of learning to the job or the extent to which a person can use learned skills on the job (Mathieu, Tannenbaum, and Salas, 1992). Holton, Bates, Seyler, and Carvalho (1997) found that people see transfer climate in terms of organizational referents such as supervisors or peers. Supervisor support has clearly been established in the literature as a critical work environment factor influencing the transfer process (Baldwin and Ford, 1988; Clark, Dobbins, and Ladd; 1993; Clarke, 2002; Gielen, 1996; Taylor, 1992; and Russ-Eft, 2002). Russ-Eft defined supervisor support as providing reinforcement for learning on the job including setting goals with trainees, modeling training behaviors, and providing positive reinforcement for the use of new skills. Baldwin, Ford, and Naquin (2000) define supervisor support as active participation meaning that supervisors need to do more than state the importance of learning. Rather, they should actively participate in and lead training. Examples of supervisor support include setting learning goals, helping, and offering positive feedback. Previous research supports management involvement in
learning. Cohen (1990) found that trainees with more supportive supervisors entered training with more positive attitudes towards the value of training. Baldwin and Magjuka (1991) found that trainees who were aware that their managers would be conducting follow up to the training reported stronger intentions to transfer. Birdi, Allan, and Warr (1997) linked manager support to increased job learning, increased planning, and increased development. Tracy, Hinkin, Tannenbaum, and Mathieu (2001) discuss managerial support as part of the organization’s social system. They claim that both professional and personal relationships between managers and employees can influence how training is perceived and valued. Supervisor’s who support training can positively influence a person’s confidence to learn new skills as well as their ability to transfer the new skills to the job. Xiao (1996) found supervisory behavior affected training transfer more than any other organizational variable. Additionally, Facteau, Dobbins, Russell, Ladd, and Kudisch, (1995) argued that both supervisors and peers can help trainees in transferring skills back to the job. Their study showed a positive link between supervisor support and motivation to learn and peer support and transfer.

Holton, Bates, Seyler, and Carvalho (1997) and Russ-Eft (2002) define peer support in transfer climate as the extent to which peers support the use of learning on the job. This support could include setting learning goals, giving assistance, or offering positive feedback. Hawley and Barnard (2005) found that peer support was important to transfer for training managers even across geographic distances. Although past research has focused more on the importance of supervisor support and training transfer, increases in the use of teamwork on the job are calling attention to the importance of peer support on training transfer. For example, Klink, Gielen, and Nauta (2001) discuss the importance
of peer support due to the increased use of self-directed teams in organizations. They suggest that because of this increase it is possible that team members in the workplace may influence trainee’s behavior more than supervisors. Rouiller and Goldstein (1993) concluded that the work environment including behavior of colleagues was a stronger predictor of training transfer than the trainee’s actual learning outcomes at the end of the training program. Bates, Holton, Seyler, and Carvalho (2000) found that peer support was a significant predictor of training transfer.

More recently Richman-Hirsch (2001) found that goal setting and self-management training as post-training interventions was more effective in supportive work environments. Clarke (2002) found that work environment factors such as a lack of supervisory support inhibited the use of training back on the job. Russ-Eft (2002) included supervisor support, supervisor sanctions, and peer support as factors that HRD researchers and practitioners should attempt to manipulate to enhance transfer. In a recent work on environment factors affecting transfer, Russ-Eft (2002) proposes factors from training design and the work environment that may influence training transfer. Her typology focuses on elements that can be manipulated by HRD researchers and practitioners. This gives the HRD field ways to move beyond simply describing or identifying factors that may influence transfer to examining how these factors could be changed or managed. Russ-Eft (2002) draws from earlier studies on work environment factors influencing transfer (Baldwin and Ford, 1988; Roullier and Goldstein, 1993) and more recent work such as Holton, Bates, Seyler, and Caravalho (1997) and Holton, Bates, and Ruona’s (2000) research on developing a transfer climate instrument for measuring work environment factors that may enhance or inhibit training transfer. Her typology
includes situational elements that may influence transfer such as supervisor support, supervisor sanctions, workload, opportunities to use, and peer support (Russ-Eft, 2002).

Although numerous work environment factors can influence training transfer, research increasingly emphasizes the important role that managers and peers play in the transfer process (Clark, Dobbins, and Ladd, 1993; Facteau et al. 1995). Therefore, effective transfer is dependent on the work environment factors of peer and supervisor support. Thus, even far transfer occurs within a general work environment where the training occurs (Richey, 1992). Laker (1990) supports this notion by stating that the more positive the reinforcement that trainees receive both during and after training to discuss and apply the training, the more effective the far transfer.

Yet, there continues to be gaps in the literature regarding the specific supervisory factors that influence transfer (Baldwin and Ford, 1988; Klink, Gielen, and Nauta, 2001) making it difficult to develop and implement supervisory interventions to improve transfer. Gielen and Van der Klink (1995) argued for stronger supervisory support interventions to improve transfer.

Training Design

In general, training design has been described as one of the most important influences on transfer of training (Brinkerhoff & Gill, 1992). That is, training design includes purposeful elements that are part of the training program to enhance the possibility of transfer. Training design variables can be categorized into two domains: instructional design and instructional method. Baldwin & Ford (1988) discuss two key instructional design issues that impact learning transfer: identical elements and general principles. First, learning transfer is maximized when there are identical stimulus and
response elements in the training and transfer settings. As stated, this refers to near transfer, which occurs when students apply their knowledge and skills in situations and contexts that are very similar to those in which the learning occurred (Clark & Voogel, 1985; Perkins & Salomon, 1988). Bates, Holton, and Seyler (1997) supported this finding by saying that content validity of training has a strong positive association with transfer. Thus, the relevance of the training content to the trainees’ job affects their motivation to transfer. Second, Ellis (1965) explains that positive transfer is facilitated when a variety of relevant training stimuli are included in the training content. Similarly, McGehee and Thayer (1961) suggest that transfer is enhanced when trainees are taught, not just an applicable skill, but also the general rules and theoretical principles that underlie the training content.

The influence of various types of instructional methods on learning transfer has also been studied. For example, McGehee and Thayer (1961) studied overlearning or learning beyond the required level of performance. According to Hagman and Rose (1983), overlearning supports retention of training. Also, post-training interventions such as goal setting (Wexley & Nemeroff, 1975) and feedback (Naylor & Briggs, 1963) have also been shown to increase the trainees’ motivation to transfer learned skills to the job.

Garavalia (1993) proposes the use of several instructional methods to promote effective transfer: 1) use of many different examples in various contexts, 2) use of analogies, 3) use of computer simulation, and 4) use of advance organizers. Kim and Lee (2001) suggest that providing multiple examples in various contexts is required to achieve far transfer when using structured OJT (Jacobs, 2003). Consider that an employee working in a distribution center might be trained to pack different products
such as books and clothing in different organizational function such as the shipping department and the gift wrap area. Similarly, Nitsch (1977) demonstrated that training in various contexts enhances far transfer and that context practice requires that a given task be varied. Finally, Foxon (1997) suggest the action planning method of training to increase transfer. An action plan is a set of written statements describing in measurable terms the specific actions the learner intends to apply on the job as a result of the training.

In summary, the literature shows that models of training transfer have focused on combinations of training inputs; (trainee characteristics, training design factors, and work environment factors); training outputs (learning and retention); and conditions of transfer (skill generalization and maintenance). The theories and research discussed show that these models suggest that transfer of training is a function of these variables being in alignment and that obstacles to transfer can occur at any point in the transfer process. However, although transfer of training has received much attention in the literature, most of this research has focused on the conditions for near transfer to occur (Barnett & Ceci, 2002; Clark, 1999; Clark & Voogel, 1985; Holton & Baldwin, 2000; Laker, 1990; Kim & Lee, 2001; Smith, Ford, & Kozlowski, 1997).

Transfer of Training Issues

According to Holton (1996) one cause of failure to transfer is that training design does not provide for the ability to transfer the learning. Consider that even if cognitive learning occurs, trainees’ may not have the opportunity to practice the training on the job or may not be taught how to apply their new knowledge on the job. That is, the training itself can have a direct influence on transfer of training. Yet, Holton’s evaluation model does not specify guidelines to explain what constitutes appropriate transfer design
(Yamnill & McLean, 2001). Instead, as stated most research concerning training design has focused on the two previously mentioned transfer theories: identical elements theory and principles theory.

However, Baldwin and Ford (1988) described training design as a training input consisting of principles of learning, sequencing, and training content. Regarding training content they discuss the work of instructional theorists such as Gagne and Briggs (1979) who have looked at learning outcomes (intellectual skills, motor skills, and cognitive strategies) to determine conditions of learning which best support each learning outcome. Baldwin and Ford suggest that a logical extension of this work is the inclusion of the transfer outcomes generalization and maintenance. Consider that there is little room for error in teaching someone how to safely operate a power tool. In this situation a near transfer of training approach is more appropriate for trainees to replicate the training behavior as closely as possible. Yet, Baldwin and Ford further explain that in the case of supervisory skills training, the objective is to have trainees generalize the rules and concepts (specifying a class of behaviors given a particular stimulus) making it unproductive to have the trainee reproduce only those behaviors specifically taught. Instead, a far transfer of training approach is more appropriate for supervisory skills training where the trainee needs to learn, generalize, and apply behaviors that may differ from those learned in training.

Subsequent research in the training and development literature and in the psychology literature demonstrates that new ways to consider transfer are being investigated. For example, Baldwin & Ford’s (1988) generalization condition of transfer is distinguished in the literature by near and far transfer of training (Laker, 1990). More
recently, Barnett and Ceci (2002) proposed a taxonomy for far transfer to occur. They argue that determining whether far transfer occurs has made little progress due to a failure to specify various dimensions along which transfer can occur. Thus, the focus of their taxonomy is on the extent to which transfer occurs by focusing on what is transferred and when and where the transfer occurs. Their taxonomy includes two broad dimensions. First, the content or what is transferred consists of the learned skill, the performance change and the memory demands. Second, the context or when and where transfer occurs consists of the knowledge domain, the physical context, the temporal context, the functional context, the social context and modality.

Barnett and Ceci (2002) identify two limitations of the framework. First, the framework does not address instructional elements that may influence transfer such as issues of variability of practice, feedback, and training instructions. Second, the framework does not include characteristics of the individual learner such as age, intelligence, and related knowledge that could also influence transfer. Instead, they focus on what they believe to be an important prerequisite of developing a framework to determine when far transfer occurs by focusing on two main questions: 1) How similar does the learning context have to be to the transfer context, and 2) Is this independent of the content which is applied?

As mentioned, in order to optimize the investment in training, the key factor is the transferability of skills. Yet, a number of scholars have criticized transfer studies for failing to document if or how training in one context or on one type of problem generalizes to related problems in different contexts (Barnett & Ceci, 2002). For example, Detterman (1993) states that although transfer is one of the most frequently
studied phenomenon in psychology, little transfer occurs. Barnett & Ceci maintain that
disagreement among transfer scholars and critics is due to the failure to specify various
dimensions along which transfer can occur.

Perhaps most relevant to the current study is research concerning transfer content
or the specificity-generality of the learned skill. The specificity or generality of the
learned skill is described as whether it is a specific fact or procedure such as a set of
particular steps, a form of representation or a more general problem solving principle
having a deeper or causal understanding (Barnett & Ceci, 2002). Lim and Johnson
(2002) suggest that studies have seldom examined the pattern of learning transfer
according to the type of content. Yet, Tesluk, Farr, Mathieu, and Vance (1995) found that
training can generalize from context to another and that trainees with a higher level of
organizational commitment were more likely to use training in performing core job
activities. Finally, Axtell, Maitlis, and Yearta (1997) reported that trainees who
perceived training as relevant had higher levels of immediate transfer (one month after
training).

As stated, obstacles to training transfer can occur in any part of the transfer
process. For example, trainees may lack motivation or cognitive ability or experience low
self-efficacy in relation to mastering the training content. The training design may be
poorly structured, include inadequate training materials or neglect basic adult learning
principles.

A common training output in transfer models is learning. That is, training inputs
are seen as affecting learning and retention, which directly influence generalization and
maintenance Baldwin & Ford, 1988). One exception to this is Holton’s (1996) model,
which emphasizes individual performance. His model proposes three outcomes of training: learning, individual performance, and organizational results. He defines learning as achievement of the desired outcome from the HRD intervention, individual performance as the change resulting from the learning being applied to the job, and organizational results as influences occurring at the organizational level as a result of change in individual performance. In turn, these outcomes are influenced by motivation to transfer, transfer climate, and training design. Providing further support for Holton’s (1996) model, Holton and Baldwin (2000) developed a conceptual framework for managing learning transfer systems. Interventions important to the transfer system include learner/team interventions, organization interventions such as precondition and support, the learning process and individual/team performance.

Of special interest to HRD is the performance aspect of the model, which represents the performance outcomes from learning. Two dimensions of performance are specified: near transfer or short-term results and far transfer or longer-term transfer and generalization of learning to new situations. Depending on the organizational goals and the expected performance outcomes of the HRD training program, training objectives and learning requirements may call for either a near or far transfer approach to training. Thus, it would be expected that performance outcomes from learning would provide an appropriate balance between near and far transfer (Holton & Baldwin, 2000). Yet, most research has focused on the conditions for near transfer to occur (Barnett & Ceci, 2002; Clark, 1999; Clark & Voogel, 1985; Holton & Baldwin, 2000; Laker, 1990; Kim & Lee, 2001; Smith, Ford, & Kozlowski, 1997). However, this may seem logical considering that the match between the training setting and the work setting is critical in determining
Near transfer of training (Baldwin & Ford, 1988). That is, the greater the similarity between the two settings (including physical attributes, work-related cues, and work environment factors) the greater the likelihood of transfer of training to occur (Kim & Lee, 2001).

Still, the extent to which a training program can achieve this match may be influenced by other factors such as the type of work or the expected training outcomes. Yamnill and McLean (2001) suggest that the appropriate near or far transfer training goals should guide the development of the training content and the training program design. In order for learning to lead to performance change one must consider what training design contributes to people’s ability to transfer skills successfully. Thus, the situations in which training is going to be applied should be decided in advance. This too suggests that research would provide a closer balance between near and far transfer (Holton & Baldwin, 2000).

Near and Far Transfer of Training

This section of the literature review is divided into three parts. The first part defines near and far transfer of training. The second part reviews learning requirements of a near and far transfer of training instructional approach. The third part reviews performance implications of near and far transfer of training.

Definitions

Near transfer of training is usually defined as a situation where the stimulus for the original learning event is similar to the stimulus for the transfer event (Royer, 1979). For example, if the original learning task involved adding two digit numbers, near transfer might be determined by adding three digit numbers. Likewise, far transfer refers
to a situation where the stimulus between the original learning event and the transfer event are somewhat different. An example of far transfer is originally learning number problems and substituting addition word problems for the transfer task. Laker (1990) defined near transfer as the extent to which the trainee applies what was learned in training to situations that are similar to those in which he or she was trained.

In contrast, far transfer is defined as the extent to which the trainee applies what was learned in training to situations that are different or new from those in which he or she was trained. Generalization is the extent to which knowledge, skills, and attitudes acquired in training are applied to different tasks or to settings beyond the training context (Adams, 1987). Thus, generalization is particularly important when considering how to design training to achieve far transfer.

**Learning Requirements**

The literature suggests that near and far transfer requires different learning requirements. The requirements for near transfer depend mostly on the similarity between the training and the task (Kim & Lee, 2001). However, achieving far transfer requires additional considerations. As stated, Laker (1990) proposes that far transfer depends on whether the training includes information regarding the underlying the underlying principles and assumptions regarding the skills and behaviors being trained. Thus, the better trainees understand the underlying principles, concepts, and assumptions of the skills and behaviors they are learning, the greater the far transfer (Goldstein, 1986). The more trainees practice in different contexts and use novelty in practice exercises, the greater the far transfer (Baldwin & Ford, 1988; Goldstein, 1986). The more encouragement trainees receive during training to discuss and apply the training in
situations they choose, the greater the far transfer (Noe, 1986). Additionally, the more encouragement trainees receive after training to apply the training to situations other than those for which they were trained, the greater the far transfer (Goldstein, 1986).

Performance Implications

How to achieve optimal levels of transfer of training becomes increasingly complex when organizations emphasize performance improvement over training. As stated, the majority of transfer of training research has focused on the conditions for near transfer to occur as opposed to far transfer. However, a review of the literature on performance improvement processes shows several potential areas for improving organizational effectiveness by looking at performance in terms of both near and far transfer of training. These include: 1) Developing employee expertise, 2) Training employees on both job specific and non-job specific tasks, and 3) Teaching more general behavioral skills.

First, it is widely accepted among HRD scholars and practitioners that training is no longer viewed as a sub-system of the organization but rather it is viewed from a system’s perspective as an integral part of a business’s strategic direction (Salas, Cannon-Bowers, 2001). Jacobs (2003) suggested that training programs have a strategic role in organizations due to changes in the nature of work (such as the use of advanced technologies and more emphasis responsiveness to customer’s needs), which increasingly requires employees to solve problems and make complex decisions. Thus, having employees with high levels of expertise is of strategic importance to organizations. Jacobs (2001) describes an expert as one who can deal with both routine and non-routine tasks. Since far transfer focuses on trainees learning more general concepts which may
be applied to a wider set of contexts than those presented in the training setting (Kim & Lee; 2002; Smith, Ford, & Kozlowski, 1997), it may be useful in developing experts who can perform both routine and non-routine tasks.

Second, Campbell’s (1990) individual performance model from industrial psychology discusses looking at both specific (the extent to which a person can perform the core tasks central to his or her job) and non-specific (the extent to which a person can perform the tasks or execute the behaviors not specific to his or her job) job performance tasks.

Consider that far transfer, which focuses on trainees learning more general concepts and principles, might be applied to a wider set of contexts than those presented in the training setting (Kim & Lee; 2002; Smith, Ford, & Kozlowski, 1997). Although a significant portion of the investment in workplace training is focused on specific job needs, it’s logical to assume that the intention is usually not just to have trainees learn only specifics of the training course. Rather, it seems more productive to build skills in training that will transfer to various job situations (Barnett & Ceci, 2002).

It seems logical that training for specific task performance would require a near transfer approach since near transfer requires a close match between training and task content, a close match between the training and task outcomes, and emphasis on specific concepts and skills (Royer, 1979). In contrast, non-specific task proficiency is defined as the extent to which a person can perform the tasks or execute the behaviors not specific to his or her job. Thus, training required for non-specific task proficiency suggests a far transfer of training approach since far transfer requires an approximate match between training content and the unit of work, an approximate match between the training and
task outcomes, and an emphasis on general concepts and skills. Further, non-specific
task transfer seems to make better use of the generalization concept since it emphasizes
the extent to which knowledge, skills, and attitudes acquired in training are applied to
different tasks or to settings beyond the training context (Adams, 1987).

Third, in order to optimize the investment in training, a key factor is the
transferability of skills. Far transfer may have the potential to reduce the amount of
training conducted if one training program can apply to more than one situation (Jacobs,
2003). In addition, by focusing on the human ability to generalize concepts, far transfer
principles could be applied in designing training for more varying units of work (Jacobs;
Lee, Kim, & Jacobs, 2002). This could potentially increase productivity by assisting in
the development of more flexible, multi-skilled employees (Jacobs, 2003; Smith, Ford, &
Kozlowski, 1997).

In addition, organizations are increasingly interested in how to build learning
organizations (Watkins & Marsick, 1993). The literature on learning organizations often
states that these organizations strongly emphasize the training and skill development of
explain that learning organizations spend less time on individual job focused skills
training and place more emphasis on training that focuses on development of a common
experience, framework or theory of action for the entire team or work unit (Mohrman &
Mohrman, Jr., 1995). They found the ability to transfer knowledge across organizational
boundaries to be a strategic performance component of learning organizations.
Additionally, Goh and Lussier argue that in order for the concept of a learning
organization to gain organizational support, it must have an impact on organizational
performance. Jacobs (2003) supports this claim by acknowledging that learning is important, but what can actually be done with the learning in terms of enhanced performance or profitability is probably more important.

These claims suggest support for an emphasis on strategic performance components of learning organizations that focus on teaching more general behavioral skills to ensure that knowledge is transferred to other parts of the organization (Goh & Lussier, 1997) rather than emphasizing technical skills training that has a short shelf-life (Kiernan, 1993). Although they agree that to be useful skills and knowledge need to be transferred to the job, they also emphasize the importance of knowledge being transferred to other parts of the organization to solve problems and to build creative new ideas. Also, skill competencies need to match some of the behavioral skill sets required in a learning organization such as shared leadership, coaching behaviors and providing feedback. Thus, learning organizations emphasize behavioral skills employee training and less towards technical skills that have a short shelf-life (Kiernan, 1993).

Self-Efficacy

This section of the chapter is divided into three parts. The first part defines self-efficacy. Respectively, the second and third parts discuss self-efficacy and training and self-efficacy and transfer.

Self-Efficacy

According to social cognitive theory, achievement depends on interactions between one’s behavior, thoughts and beliefs, environmental conditions, and a learner’s self-efficacy is influenced by their performance, their experiences, influences from others, and their psychological reactions (Bandura, 1986). Learning is an ongoing
process in which behavior is motivated and regulated by one’s cognitions (Bandura, 1986). Self-efficacy, or beliefs about one’s capacity to perform at designated levels is one important set of cognitions. Self-efficacy assumes that individuals are capable of human agency or intentional directed behavior based on a series of determinants: previous behavior or performance, internal personal factors, and the external environment (Bandura, 1986).

Bandura (1982) suggested that the interplay of these factors may influence a person’s perception of task capability on performance and, thus direct future action. That is, efficacy judgments are task-specific and regulate behavior by determining task choices, effort, and persistence in task achievement (Gist & Mitchell, 1992). These judgments are also linked with self-aiding or self-hindering thought patterns that may influence performance particularly early in the learning process (Wood & Bandura, 1989). According to Bandura (1977) there are three dimensions of self-efficacy: magnitude, strength, and generality. Magnitude is the level at which a person believes he or she can perform whereas strength refers to a person’s confidence that he or she can perform at that level. Generality is the extent to which self-efficacy in one situation extends to other situations.

A person’s estimate of his or her ability to perform on a specific task has proven to be relevant to many aspects of human resource development and organizational behavior including training, goal-setting, and performance appraisals (Gist, 1987). For example empirical studies have shown self-efficacy to be related to work-related performance (Barling & Beattie, 1983), coping with career related tasks (Stumpf, Brief & Hartman, 1987), learning and achievement (Campbell & Hackett, 1986; Wood & Locke, 1989).
1987), and learning new technology (Hill, Smith, & Mann, 1987). In addition, some studies have shown that certain training methods can increase self-efficacy in areas such as self-management (Frayne & Latham, 1987), cognitive modeling (Gist, 1989), and behavioral modeling (Gist, Schwoerer, & Rosen, 1989).

**Self-Efficacy and Training**

Over the last decade, self-efficacy has been found to be a critical variable in training research. From a training perspective, self-efficacy refers to a trainee’s belief that he or she can master training tasks and behaviors and perform them on the job (Gaudine & Saks, 2004). Noe’s (1986) model of motivational influences on training effectiveness defined a person’s behavior in training as a function of ability, motivation, and environment. Research has consistently shown that training increases trainees’ self-efficacy and that self-efficacy predicts trainee learning and performance (Gist, 1986; Mathieu, Martineau, & Tannenbaum, 1993; Morin & Latham, 2000; Salas & Cannon-Bowers, 2001; Tannenbaum, Mathieu, Salas, & Cannon-Bowers, 1991). Self-efficacy has also been shown to be important when determining a person’s level of readiness for training (Noe, 1986). In addition, self-efficacy mediates the effect of training on training outcomes such as job attitudes, absenteeism, turnover, and performance (Gist, Stevens, & Bavetta, 1991; Latham & Frayne, 1989; Mathieu, Martineau, & Tannenbaum, 1993; Saks, 1995). Finally, self-efficacy has been shown to be an effective predictor of coping with uncertain and changing situations (Jones, 1986). Thus, it is widely accepted that self-efficacy strongly contributes to understanding training and improving training effectiveness (Mathieu et al; 1993).
Certainly, in a training environment, task choice, task effort, and persistence in task achievement are likely to translate into a positive relationship between self-efficacy and training outcomes (Colquitt, LePine, & Noe, 2000). As previously mentioned, research indicates that trainee self-efficacy may be important when looking at training method and outcome relationships (Frayne & Latham, 1987; Gist, 1989; Gist, Schwoerer & Rosen, 1989; Martochio & Webster, 1991). However, Gist, Stevens, and Bavetta (1991) claim that typically self-efficacy studies concerning performance relationships have focused on individual cognitive tasks such as adaptability to new technology (Hill, Smith, & Mann, 1987) and managerial decision making (Wood & Bandura, 1989) rather than on more complex tasks such as interpersonal skills. They claim that since self-efficacy has been shown to influence coping and perseverance when faced with obstacles, then it may contribute to performance on complex interpersonal skills. Their study showed that initial self-efficacy was related to interpersonal skills training and was significantly related to initial performance levels and to skill maintenance after seven weeks.

As stated, far transfer based on principles theory, which focuses on trainees learning more general concepts and principles, might be applied to a wider set of contexts than those presented in the training setting (Kim & Lee; 2002; Smith, Ford, & Kozlowski, 1997). An example of this interpersonal skills training. Achieving far transfer requires additional considerations such as whether the training includes information regarding the underlying principles regarding the skills and behaviors being trained (Laker, 1990). Also, people with high self-efficacy are considered to demonstrate high effort in situations that may require new types of behavior or increased performance
levels (Bandura, 1977 in Noe, 1986). This may support Baldwin and Ford’s (1988) two conditions required for transfer of training: 1) generalizing training back to the work environment and 2) maintaining skills over time. Generalization is the extent to which knowledge, skills, and attitudes acquired in training are applied to different tasks or to settings beyond the training context (Adams, 1987). Thus, self-efficacy may be important to consider when looking at a far transfer of training approach which focuses on more complex skills applicable to various contexts such as those required with interpersonal skills training.

_Self-Efficacy and Transfer_

Self-efficacy has also been found to be an important variable in other aspects of the transfer research such as transfer motivation. As mentioned, Baldwin and Ford (1988) included motivation as an individual-level variable influencing transfer. Noe and Schmitt (1986) defined motivation to transfer as a trainees’ desire to use the knowledge and skills learned in the training program on the job. Noe (1986) identified three conditions that contribute to a trainees’ motivation to transfer include: 1) trainees’ level of confidence in using the skills; 2) trainees’ awareness of work situations in which demonstration of the new skills is appropriate; and 3) trainees’ perceptions that job performance improvement is likely to occur if the new skills are used on the job (Noe, 1986). Logically, the chances of skill use after training are likely to be reduced if motivation is low.

Several models of transfer incorporate self-efficacy. In their transfer model, Thayer & Teachout (1995) include pre-training and post-training self-efficacy as individual variables that enhance transfer activities. Similarly, Holton (1996) developed
a model that emphasized transfer motivation meaning that individual learning is influenced by the trainees’ motivation to learn, reaction to the training, climate, ability, and experience. Thus, motivation to transfer is hypothesized to link individual learning with individual performance change (Holton, 1996).

In additional research involving self-efficacy and transfer, Gaudine & Saks (2004) found that a positive transfer climate increased trainee’s self-efficacy, behavior, and performance. Also, Machin & Fogarty (2003) found that post-training self-efficacy and transfer enhancing activities both predicted transfer implementation intentions. They found that pre-training self-efficacy predicted post-training self-efficacy and trainee’s level of learning during training. Marx (1982) suggested that self-efficacy may be important to skill maintenance because individuals who leave training with the belief that they can successfully perform tasks they have been trained to do, should be more resilient when they encounter obstacles in the work environment.

Perhaps most relevant to the current study is Holladay and Quinones’s (2003) discussion of self-efficacy and near and far transfer. They propose that different dimensions of self-efficacy are needed to explain near and far transfer. That is, self-efficacy level and strength are associated with the perceived difficulty of the task and the confidence for performing the task and thus represent an identical or near transfer task. Furthermore, generality focuses on tasks that are different from the original learning and represent far transfer. They hypothesized that people with higher generality would have higher self-efficacy for a broader range of tasks and perform better on far transfer tasks or variations of tasks not taught in training. Although they found that self-efficacy intensity
was not related to near transfer, both intensity and generality had effects on far transfer. However, they did conclude that having higher self-efficacy allowed trainees to attempt and succeed at variations of tasks that had not been previously taught in training. This supports the importance of generality for far transfer.
Conceptual Framework

This final section of the literature review provides a conceptual framework of the relationships between training content, attribute variables, and the training outcomes transfer coaching and learning.

Figure 2.1: Conceptual framework of the relationships between training content, demographic variables, and training outcomes
CHAPTER 3
METHODOLOGY

This chapter is divided into four sections. The first section will describe the design of the study. The second section will describe the sample selection process. The third section describes the measurements used including the operationalization of variables, instrument design and development, and instrument validity and reliability. The fourth section describes data collection procedures and data analysis techniques.

Research Design

A post-test only comparison group design for the main independent variable was used in this study (Campbell & Stanley, 1963). Campbell and Stanley state that randomization is the most adequate assurance of lack of initial biases between groups meaning that a pre-test is not necessarily essential to experimental designs. Further, this design is recommended for situations in which pretest reactivity is likely to occur (Ary, Jacobs, & Razavieh, 1996).
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*Design Configuration*

In this design, subjects scheduled to attend a supervisor training program on coaching were randomly assigned to one of the two levels of the independent variable for
the instructional units of the training program. The treatment was administered and posttest measures were taken immediately following the training. This design is considered one of the most powerful experimental designs and one of the strongest designs in social science research (Ary, Jacobs, & Razavieh, 1996; Kerlinger, 1964). It enables the researcher to compare two randomly assigned groups, each assigned to a different condition.

Additionally, randomization controls for all possible extraneous variables and assures that any initial differences between the groups that might be related to the dependent variable(s) are based on chance. Since randomization assures statistical equivalence of the groups prior to the introduction of the independent variable, differences observed in the dependent variable(s) can be attributed to the treatment rather than to other causes. Further, correlation coefficients were examined between each of the dependent variables and the demographic variables.

**Internal Validity**

In general, the internal validity of this design is considered to be quite strong (Kerlinger, 1964). This design controls for most internal validity concerns including history, maturation, regression, and pre-testing (Ary, Jacobs, & Razavieh, 1996). However, one area in which the design is weaker than other experimental designs is mortality. Mortality exists when for one reason or another (such as illness, relocation or time restraints) subjects drop out of a study.
The researcher attempted to minimize this concern by using several techniques. First, subjects were notified by e-mail of the dates and times of the training sessions. Second, subjects were notified by written communication of the dates and times of the training sessions. Letters were hand delivered to the subject’s immediate manager. Third, follow up phone calls were made to all potential subjects to confirm participation in one of the training sessions. Fourth, follow up phone calls were made to the subject’s managers to remind them of the dates and times of the training.

*External Validity*

Two common external validity concerns are population validity and ecological validity.

*Population validity.* The first concern was the population validity of the study (Campbell & Stanley, 1963). The target population in this study was supervisors in organizations. The experimentally accessible population was supervisors that were employed by the organization under study. The sample was two groups of supervisors who attended a supervisor training program on July 14th and July 20th. From the experimentally accessible population, a list of all supervisors employed by the organization in the study (approximately 600), a sub-population of 96 front-line supervisors were selected based on having direct reports (employees the supervisor is directly responsible for regarding performance, development, and disciplinary actions). Thus, the sample was a purposive sample and the results of the study cannot be generalized beyond the specific sample.

*Ecological validity.* The second concern was the ecological validity of the study
The following identifies specific external validity concerns that were identified and the actions taken to minimize these effects.

The first ecological validity concern was the Hawthorne effect, which refers to a situation where participants score highly on the post-test instrument regardless of their participation in the treatment. The Hawthorne effect implies that simple selection into the study population has an impact on participants (Campbell & Stanley, 1963). Informing participants that the study was being conducted along with the Educational Development and Resources Department of their organization may minimize this effect. Since this department is highly involved with training and development and conducts training and assessment on a regular basis, participants may not have found it unusual for the department to be looking at different approaches to training. Thus, the tendency for participant’s behavior to be influenced by knowledge of participating in a research project may have been minimized. Additionally, coaching is a training topic that the department offers on a regular and continuous basis.

A second ecological validity concern was the experimenter effect. This effect may occur if different experimenters working on the same experiment administer different treatments. It was minimized by having experienced trainers administer both levels of the treatment and posttest measures. Also, a train the trainer session was conducted for the trainers.

A third potential ecological validity concern was related to novelty and disruption effects. Typically, managerial training focuses on teaching new concepts with participants engaged in different learning activities. In addition, this organization conducts managerial training away from the job site so trainees work with different
people outside their typical work group. Consequently, the training experiences seem new or different to trainees. Since most training experiences away from the job setting involve some degree of novelty and disruption this reduced the potential for an effect on participants simply because the treatment was different.

Sample Selection

The study was conducted in a comprehensive university medical center in a large mid-west city in the United States. The medical center employs approximately 6,800 employees in both health and non-health related positions. The study was conducted as part of four front line supervisory training sessions offered by the Educational Development and Resources Department. Two sessions were conducted on July 14th, 2005 and two sessions were conducted on July 20th, 2005 with each group receiving different levels of the independent variable.

From the list of 96 supervisors six were eliminated because they no longer worked for the organization and eight were eliminated because they worked the night shift. The remaining 82 front-line supervisors were contacted and invited to the training by the Director of Educational Development and Resources. See Appendix A for a copy of the letter inviting supervisors to the training. Out of the 82 supervisors invited to training, 35 agreed to attend training on July 14th and an additional 23 agreed to attend training on the 20th. Out of the 35 supervisors who signed up for the first training class, 33 actually attended. The 33 supervisors were randomly assigned to one of two groups of training, 16 to the near group and 17 to the far group. Two supervisors in the far group had to leave training early due to a work emergency leaving 31 supervisors completing
training on the first day, 16 in the near group and 15 in the far group. Out of the 23 supervisors who signed up for the second training class, 14 actually attended. These 14 supervisors were randomly assigned to one of two groups of training, 7 to the near group and 7 to the far group. Thus, in total 45 supervisors attended training, 22 in the near group and 23 in the far group.

As subjects arrived for training they were randomly assigned to one of two groups of training for two modules of a supervisory training program: training using a near transfer module, or training using a far transfer module. The content of the instructional units was “Coaching for Improved Team Meeting Performance” (near) and “Coaching for Improved Job Performance” (far). One location was used for administering the treatment. Classrooms in a facility away from the job site served as the training location.

Immediately before training the researcher collected the following demographic information on trainees from a participant information sheet. See Appendix B items 1-9 for a copy of the participant information sheet.

First, the number of years as a supervisor was categorized as ordinal data with four levels: less than three years, three to six years, seven to ten years, and greater than ten years. Second, the number of years with the present employer was categorized ordinal data with three levels: less than five years, five to ten years, and more than ten years. Third, the number of employees supervised was categorized as ordinal data with three levels: less than five employees, five to ten employees, and more than ten employees. Fourth, the functional area supervised was categorized as nominal data with two categories: clinical (direct patient care) and non-clinical (no direct patient care). Fifth, gender was categorized as nominal data with two levels: male and female. Sixth,
educational level was categorized as ordinal data with three levels: twelve years (high/school diploma/GED), thirteen to fifteen years (some college), and sixteen years or more (college graduate or higher). Seventh, age will be categorized as interval data. Eighth, the level of experience working one-on-one with employees was categorized as ordinal data with three levels: very experienced, somewhat experienced, and little experience. Ninth, the amount of time spent weekly working with employees one-on-one was categorized as nominal data with four levels: less than one hour, one to three hours, four to six hours, seven to nine hours, and more than nine hours.

Instruments

This section describes the instruments that were used to measure the variables in the study. Two dependent variables were measured in this study: transfer coaching and learning. This study had one active independent variable with two levels; near and far, and one moderating variable; general self-efficacy.

Transfer Coaching Scale

Transfer coaching was the first dependent variable. Transfer coaching was operationally defined as trainees’ perceived level of confidence in being able to generalize their new skills to tasks that are both related and unrelated to those emphasized in training. Transfer coaching was measured based on a questionnaire developed by the researcher consisting of fourteen measure items that consist of tasks that are either related or unrelated to each of the coaching training sessions. Subjects were asked to rate their level of confidence to provide coaching in the situations provided based on the training they had just received. See Appendix C for a copy of the transfer performance questionnaire and the instructions given to the subjects.
The instructions for the transfer coaching questionnaire asked subjects to rate their level of confidence on a four point scale with one as the low point and four as the high point, to provide coaching on fourteen measure items that consisted of tasks either related or unrelated to each of the coaching training sessions.

Validity and Reliability Plan

A panel of experts and a pilot test were used to assess the face and content validity and reliability of the instrument. Two experienced trainers and one practitioner served as the subject matter experts. The panel was given definitions of “Coaching for Improved Job Performance” and “Coaching for Improved Team Meeting Performance.” Then, the panel was asked to indicate for each scenario whether they believed it represented “Coaching for Improved Job Performance” or “Coaching for Improved Team Meeting Performance” or neither. See Appendix D for a copy of the instructions given to the panel for the field test for the transfer coaching scale.

In addition, to further assess the reliability of the instrument a measure of internal consistency was conducted across the 14 measure items and a Cronbach’s alpha of .68 was obtained.

Behavior Learning Rating Scale

Learning was the second dependent variable. Learning was operationally defined as the trainee’s achievement of the learning objectives stated in the training modules. Specifically, learning was measured by trainee’s generating an example from their own experience when they observed an employee being ineffective at their job. Then, trainees were asked to write down in their own words how they would coach this person based on
the training they just received. The researcher developed a behavior learning rating scale that was used by independent raters to rate the trainee’s learning. See Appendix E for a copy of the behavior learning rating scale and instructions given to raters.

Validity and reliability plan. A panel of experts and two pilot tests were used to assess the face and content validity and reliability of the instrument. First, two experienced trainers served as the subject matter experts and participated in a pilot test of the instructional modules. After completing the training, the panel reviewed the behavior rating scale for content validity. They were asked to review the instrument for the clarity of the wording, the appropriateness of the items, and the format. Next, they were asked to independently rate two scenarios previously generated. Second, two additional trainers were asked to generate scenarios after completing the training.

In addition, to further assess the reliability of the instrument a measure of internal consistency was conducted across the three rater’s scores and a Cronbach’s alpha of .98 was obtained.

Independent Variable

This study had one active independent variable with two levels and one moderating variable.

Training modules. The training modules based on the topic coaching served as the active independent variable in this study. This variable was categorized as nominal data with two levels, near and far. Several factors distinguish near and far transfer. First, near transfer requires a close match between training content and the unit of work, whereas far transfer requires an approximate match between training content and the unit of work (Jacobs, 2003; Kim & Lee, 2001). Second, near transfer requires a close match
between the training and task outcomes, whereas far transfer requires an approximate match between the training and task outcomes (Kim & Lee, 2001). Third, near transfer emphasizes specific concepts, skills, facts, or procedures whereas far transfer emphasizes more general concepts, skills, principles, or strategies (Kim & Lee, 2001). Listed in Appendix F are the components of the near and far transfer of training modules.

Preparation of the training modules. The researcher developed the near and far training modules. See Appendix G for a copy of the instructional modules. The content of the training modules was adapted from current modules used by the organization selected for this study. The near transfer module was adapted from the training module “Meeting Management”. The far transfer module was adapted from the training module “Coaching 101: The Leader’s Role”. The content in both of the training modules was validated by a panel of subject matter experts and the instructional method of each module was validated by an instructional design expert. Based on feedback from the subject matter experts trainees were given an additional opportunity to provide a coaching example from their own experience to practice what they had learned. See Appendix H for a copy of the checklist given to reviewers and the instructions. Each module involved teaching a concept and a process so both training modules followed the same process: 1) Present the concepts, 2) Show the model, 3) Practice activity, and 4) Evaluation. A concept analysis was completed for each module showing the common and varying attributes for each. See Appendix I for a copy of the concept analysis.
Two experienced trainers with business and industry and higher education backgrounds delivered the training. A train the trainer session was conducted for the trainers. The session lasted approximately two hours and covered the following topics:

1. Underlying theory guiding the development of each training module;
2. Strengths and limitations of each approach;
3. Objectives for each training module;
4. Instructions for implementing the module;
5. Appropriate learning activities for delivering the modules;
6. Instructions for evaluating transfer performance after delivering the instructional module.

In addition a facilitation checklist was provided to each trainer to ensure that each training session followed the same format. See Appendix J for a copy of the facilitation checklist given to the trainers.

*Administration of the training modules.* The treatment was administered during four training sessions on two separate days. On each day one trainer facilitated training for a near group and the other trainer facilitated training for a far group. The same trainer facilitated the near group on both days. However, the facilitator for the far group was unable to teach the second far training session and so the researcher facilitated that session. Each training session lasted approximately two hours and followed the same sequence of training events.

*General Self-Efficacy Scale*

Information on general self-efficacy was also collected along with the demographic information on subjects to further assess that the two groups were equal prior to the training. The General Self-Efficacy Scale (GSES) was used to measure trainees’ self-efficacy. This information was collected from a participant information sheet immediately before implementation of the treatment. The scale was originally
developed by Sherer and colleagues (1982) and later modified by Bosscher and Smit (1998). The three subscales consisting of 12 items include: 1) initiative; items 1-3, and 2) effort; items 4-8, and 3) persistence; items 9-12. The reliability reported for the 12 item scale is as follows: Cronbach alpha (whole scale) = 0.69, Cronbach alpha (initiative) = 0.64, Cronbach alpha (effort) = 0.63, and Cronbach alpha (persistence) = 0.64 (Bosscher and Smit, 1998). Examples of the scale items include: 1) Initiative: If something looks too complicated, I will not even bother to try it, 2) Effort: I can't do a job the first time, I keep trying until I can, and 3) Persistence: When unexpected problems occur, I don't handle them very well. See Appendix B items 10-21 for a copy of the general self-efficacy scale.

In addition, to further assess the reliability of the instrument a measure of internal consistency was conducted across the 12 measure items for general self-efficacy and a Cronbach’s alpha of .87 was obtained.

Data Collection

Data was collected over a period of two days during four training sessions at two collection points either immediately before or immediately after the training sessions. Trainers asked all subjects to complete the participant information sheet at the beginning of the training sessions to collect data on the demographic variables and to collect data from the general self-efficacy scale. The second data collection point occurred immediately following the training sessions. First, trainers had the trainee’s complete the learning activity by generating an example from their own experience when they observed an employee being ineffective at their job. Then, trainees were asked to write down in their own words how they would coach this person based on the training they
just received. Second, transfer performance was measured based on a questionnaire developed by the researcher consisting of fourteen measure items that consisted of tasks that were either related or unrelated to each of the coaching training sessions. Subjects were asked to rate their level of confidence to provide coaching in the situations provided based on the training they had just received.

Data Analysis

This study investigated differences in confidence and learning to perform specific and related tasks for employees who were trained using either a near or a far transfer of training approach. Six research questions were investigated in this study:

1. Do trainees who are trained using a far training transfer approach have equal confidence to coach both related and unrelated tasks?
2. Do trainees who are trained using a near training transfer approach have greater confidence to coach related tasks?
3. Do trainees who are trained using a near training transfer approach have lower confidence to coach unrelated tasks?
4. Do trainees who are trained using a far and near training transfer approach differ in their assessment of learning outcomes?
5. Do trainees who are trained using a far and near training transfer approach differ in their self-assessment of general self-efficacy?
6. Do trainees who are trained using a near and far training transfer approach differ on the demographic variables how long a supervisor, how long working with present employer, how many direct reports, educational level, experience working one-one-
one with employees, and time spent weekly working one-on-one with employees and
transfer coaching and learning.

The first research question asked do trainees who are trained using a far
training transfer approach have equal confidence to coach both related and unrelated
tasks? To answer this question a t-test for paired samples was used to test the
difference between the means of the transfer performance scores for subjects in each
of the two groups (near and far). The second research question asked, do trainees
who are trained using a near training transfer approach have greater confidence to
couch related tasks? A t-test for paired samples was also used to test the difference
between the means of the transfer performance scores for subjects in the near group.
The third research question asked, do trainees who are trained using a near training
transfer approach have lower confidence to coach unrelated tasks? Again, a t-test for
paired samples was used to test the difference between the means of the transfer
performance scores for subjects in the near group. The fourth research question
asked, do trainees who are trained using a far and near training transfer approach
differ in their assessment of learning outcomes? An independent sample t test was
used to assess the difference between the means of learning scores. The fifth research
question asked, do trainees who are trained using a far and near training transfer
approach differ in their self-assessment of general self-efficacy? Again, an
independent sample t test was used to assess the difference between the means of the
self-efficacy scores. Finally, the sixth research question asked, do trainees who are
trained using a near and far training transfer approach differ on the demographic
variables how long a supervisor, how long working with present employer, how many
direct reports, educational level, experience working one-one-one with employees, and time spent weekly working one-on-one with employees and transfer coaching and learning. Correlation coefficients were examined between the demographic information collected and the dependent variables to assess any differences between the two groups.
CHAPTER 4
RESULTS

This chapter is divided into three sections. The first section presents the sample demographics. The second section presents the descriptive statistics for the dependent variables. The third section reports the results for each research question.

Demographics

The demographic information collected for all sample subjects and sample subjects by group (near and far) includes: number of years as a supervisor (all jobs), number of years with present employer, number of direct reports, functional area supervised, gender, educational level, age, experience working one-on-one with employees, and time spent working on-one-on with employees. The frequencies and percentages for all sample subjects and for the near and far groups are presented in table 4.1.

Table 4.1 shows that the average number of years as a supervisor (all jobs) for all sample subjects (n = 47) ranges from three to six years. Ten subjects (21.3%) reported having 3 to 6 years experience working in a supervisory capacity, 18 subjects (38.3%) reported having more than ten year’s supervisory experience, 15 subjects (31.9%) reported having less than three years, and only 4 subjects (8.5%) reported having 7 to 10 years supervisory experience. Also, the average number of years as a supervisor (all jobs) for the near group (n = 22) was higher than for all sample subjects (3 to 6 years)
ranging from seven to ten years. Three subjects (13.6%) reported having 7 to 10 years experience working as a supervisor, 11 subjects (50%) reported having more than 10 years experience as a supervisor, 7 subjects (31.8%) reported having less than 3 years supervisory experience, and only one subject (4.5%) reported having 3 to 6 years supervisory experience. Similar to all sample subjects, the average number of years as a supervisor (all jobs) for the far group (n = 25) also ranges from 3 to 6 years. Nine subjects (36%) reported having three to six years supervisory experience, 8 subjects (32%) reported having less than 3 years supervisory experience, 7 subjects (28%) reported having more than 10 years supervisory experience and only 1 subject (4%) reported having 7 to 10 years working as a supervisor.

In addition, Table 4.1 shows that the average number of years with the present employer for all sample subjects ranges from 5 to 10 years. Eighteen subjects (38.3%) reported working with their employer 5 to 10 years, 15 subjects (31.9%) reported working with their employer for less than 5 years, and 14 subjects (29.8%) reported having more than 10 years service. Similar to all sample subjects, the average number of years with the present employer for the near group also ranges from 5 to 10. Nine subjects (40.9%) reported working 5 to 10 years with their employer, 8 subjects (36.4%) reported working more than 10 years with their employer, and 5 subjects reported less than 5 years service. In contrast to both all sample subjects and the near group, the far group reported working with their present employer on average less than 5 years. Ten subjects (40%) reported working with their present employer less than 5 years, 9 subjects (36%) reported working 5 to 10 years with their employer, and 6 subjects (24%) reported having more than 10 years service with their employer.
In addition, Table 4.1 shows that the average number of employees supervised for all sample subjects is more than 10 with 35 subjects (74.5%) reporting supervising over 10 direct reports. Six subjects (12.8%) reported having less than 5 direct reports, and 6 subjects (12.8%) reported supervising 5 to 10 employees. In the near group 16 subjects (72.7%) reported having more than 10 direct reports. Only 2 subjects (9.1%) reported supervising 5 to 10 employees while 4 subjects (18.2%) supervise less than 5 employees. Similarly, the far group also supervises on average more than 10 employees with 19 subjects (76%) reporting having more than 10 direct reports. Only 2 subjects (8%) reported supervising less than 5 employees while 4 subjects (16%) supervise 5 to 10 employees.

Regarding the functional area supervised (clinical or non-clinical), Table 4.1 shows that for all sample subjects 32 subjects (68.1%) supervise non-clinical employees who do not have direct patient care. Fewer subjects (15 or 31.9%) supervise clinical employees who have direct patient care. In contrast the near group is more evenly divided regarding the functional area supervised with 12 subjects (54.5 %) supervising non-clinical employees and 10 subjects (45.5%) supervising clinical employees. However, compared to the near group, the far group reports a much higher percentage supervising non-clinical employees with 20 subjects (80%) reporting their employees having no direct patient care. Only 5 subjects (20%) have employees who have direct patient care.

Regarding gender, Table 4.1 shows that for all sample subjects 26 subjects (55.3%) were male and 21subjects (44.7%) were female. For the near group 13 subjects (59.1%) were male and 9 subjects were female (40.9%) versus the far which was more
evenly divided regarding gender with 13 male subjects (52.0%) and 12 female subjects (48.0%).

Next, Table 4.1 shows that for all sample subjects the average educational level ranges from 13 to 15 years (some college) with 16 subjects (34%) reporting 13 to 15 years of education. However, 19 subjects (40.4%) reported an educational level of college graduate or higher (16 years or more) and an additional 12 subjects (25.5%) reported having 12 years education or a high school diploma or GED equivalency. The near and far groups reported similar percentages. For example, the near group’s average educational level also ranges from 13 to 15 years with 6 subjects (27.3%) having 13 to 15 years education and 6 subjects (27.3%) having 12 years high school or a GED. However, similar to the total sample a higher percentage (10 subjects or 45.5%) reported having 16 years education or more. Likewise, the far group’s (n = 25) average educational level ranges from 13 to 15 years with 10 subjects (40.0%) having 13 to 15 years education and 6 subjects (24.0%) having 12 years high school or a GED. Compared to the total sample and the near group, the far group had fewer subjects reporting 16 years education or more (9 subjects or 36%).

Furthermore, regarding age Table 4.1 shows that the average age for all sample subjects was 42.9 with ages ranging from 22 to 68. The average age for the near group was higher at 46.0 with ages ranging from 30 to 68. However, the average age for the far group was lower than both the total sample and the near group at 40.2 with ages ranging from 22 to 58.

In addition, Table 4.1 shows that the average level of experience working on-on-one with employees for all sample subjects is very experienced. Twenty-four subjects
(51.1%) reported their level of experience working one-on-one with employees as very experienced, 19 subjects (40.4%) reported being somewhat experienced, and only 4 subjects (8.5%) reported having little experience working one-on-one with employees. Similarly, subjects in both the near and far groups reported their average level of experience working one-on-one with employees as very experienced. Thirteen subjects (59.1%) in the near group and 11 subjects (44%) in the far group reported being very experienced working on-one-on. Eight subjects (36.4%) in the near group and 11 subjects (44%) in the far group reported being somewhat experienced working one-on-one. In contrast, only one subject (4.5%) in the near group reported little experience working one-on-one and 3 subjects (12.0) in the far group reported little experience.

Lastly, Table 4.1 shows the average amount of time spent weekly working one-on-one with employees for all sample subjects ranges from 4-6 hours per week. Nine subjects (19.1%) reported spending 4 to 6 hours one-on-one with employees, nine subjects (19.1%) reported working 7 to 9 hours per week, seven subjects (14.9%) reported spending less than an hour per week one-on-one, 10 subjects (21.3%) reported working 1 to 3 hours with employees and twelve subjects (25.5%) reported spending more than 9 hours per week working one-on-one with employees. As with all sample subjects, the average amount of time spent weekly for the near group working one-on-one with employees ranges from 4-6 hours per week. Five subjects (22.7) work 4 to 6 hours weekly with employees, six subjects (27.3%) work 1 to 3 hours per week with employees, 4 subjects (18.2%) work seven to nine hours one-on-one with employees, one subject (4.5%) reported working less than one hour with employees, and 6 subjects (27.3%) reported working more than nine hours weekly one-on-one. Similar to all
sample subjects and the near group, the far group’s average time spent one-on-one also ranges from 4 to 6 hours weekly. Four subjects (16.0%) reported spending 4 to 6 hours one-on-one with employees, 4 subjects (16.0%) work 1 to 3 hours per week with employees, 5 subjects (20.0%) work seven to nine hours one-on-one with employees, 6 subjects (24.0%) reported working more than nine hours one-on-one. However, in contrast to the near group (4.5%), six subjects (24%) reported working less than one hour weekly with employees.

In summary, the demographic information collected from sample subjects showed the following differences and similarities between the near and far groups on average: 1) the near group had more years experience as a supervisor than the far group, 2) the far group worked fewer years with their present employer than the near group, 3) both groups supervised on average more than 10 employees, 4) the far group supervised more non-clinical employees, 5) the near group had more male subjects than the far group, 6) both groups averaged 13 to 15 years education but the near group had more subjects with 16 years education or more, 7) subjects in the far group were younger, 8) both groups were very experienced working one-on-one with employees, yet the far group had more subjects with little experience, 9) both groups spend 4 to 6 hours per week working one-on-one with employees, yet the far group had more subjects who worked less than one hour with employees.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Sample</th>
<th>Near Group</th>
<th>Far Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Years as a Supervisor</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 3 years</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 – 6 years</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 – 10 years</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 10 years</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Number of years with Present Employer** |    |      |    |      |    |      |
| Less than 5 years                | 15 | 31.9 | 5  | 22.7 | 10 | 40.0 |
| 5 – 10 years                     | 18 | 38.3 | 9  | 40.9 | 9  | 36.0 |
| More than 10 years               | 14 | 29.8 | 8  | 36.4 | 6  | 24.0 |

| **Number of Employees Supervised** |    |      |    |      |    |      |
| Less than five employees          | 6  | 12.8 | 4  | 18.2 | 2  | 8.0  |
| 5 – 10 employees                  | 6  | 12.8 | 2  | 9.1  | 4  | 16.0 |
| More than 10 employees            | 35 | 74.5 | 16 | 72.7 | 19 | 76.0 |

| **Functional Area Supervised**    |    |      |    |      |    |      |
| Clinical                         | 15 | 31.9 | 10 | 45.5 | 5  | 20.0 |
| Non-Clinical                     | 32 | 68.1 | 12 | 54.5 | 20 | 80.0 |

| **Gender**                       |    |      |    |      |    |      |
| Male                            | 26 | 55.3 | 13 | 59.1 | 13 | 52.0 |
| Female                          | 21 | 44.7 | 9  | 40.9 | 12 | 48.0 |

| **Educational Level**            |    |      |    |      |    |      |
| 12 years: HS Diploma/GED         | 12 | 25.5 | 6  | 27.3 | 6  | 24.0 |
| 13 – 15 years/some college       | 16 | 34.0 | 6  | 27.3 | 10 | 40.0 |
| 16 years or more college         | 19 | 40.4 | 10 | 45.5 | 9  | 36.0 |

Table 4.1: Frequencies and Percentages for Demographic Information, Total Sample (n = 47), Near Group (n = 22) and Far Group (n = 25).
Table 4.1 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Total Sample</th>
<th>Near Group</th>
<th>Far Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 – 30 years</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 - 39 years</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 - 49 years</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 – 59 years</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 60 years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Experience working one-on-one with employees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>Total Sample</th>
<th>Near Group</th>
<th>Far Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little experience</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat experienced</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>40.4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very experienced</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>51.1</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hours Spent Weekly Working One-on-One with Employees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hours Spent Weekly</th>
<th>Total Sample</th>
<th>Near Group</th>
<th>Far Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than one hour</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 – 3 hours</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 – 6 hours</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 – 9 hours</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 9 hours</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Descriptive Statistics

Two dependent variables were investigated to determine the effects of the treatment in this study: transfer coaching and learning. Ratings of confidence levels by forty-five supervisors in the study and ratings of supervisor generated scenarios by three independent raters provided the data for analyzing the dependent variables.
For transfer coaching, immediately following training, the supervisors were asked to rate their level of confidence to provide coaching on fourteen measure items that consisted of tasks either related or unrelated to each of the coaching training sessions. On a four point scale with one as the low point and four as the high point, Table 4.2 shows the mean score for all subjects was 3.12 with a standard deviation of .654. The mean score for the near group was 3.16 with a standard deviation of .670. The mean score for the far group was 3.08 with a standard deviation of .651.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transfer Coaching: Subject’s Confidence Level Scores for Coaching Scenarios</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Near</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>.670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Far</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>.651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Sample</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>.654</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2 Mean Scores and SD for Transfer Coaching, Total Sample (n = 45), Near group (n = 22) and Far Group (n = 23)

The dependent variable, “transfer coaching” is composed of 14 separate items. Table 4.3 shows the range of means and standard deviations for all items measured for the total sample, near group, and far group. For the total sample the means ranged from 2.84 to 3.86. The standard deviations ranged from .719 to .998. For the near group, the means of all measure items ranged from 2.68 to 3.36. The standard deviations ranged from .492 to .990. Six of the seven lowest item means were for unrelated (far) tasks with confidence level scores ranging from 2.68 to 2.95. Conversely, six of the seven highest item means were for related (near) tasks with confidence level scores ranging from 3.00 to 3.45. For the far group, the means of all measure items ranged from 2.82 to 3.30. The
standard deviations ranged from .634 to 1.04. The seven lowest item means consisted of four related (near) tasks (2.82, 2.95, 3.00 and 3.04) and three unrelated (far) tasks (2.91, 3.00 and 3.00). The seven highest item means also represented a combination of related and unrelated tasks with four of the highest item means representing unrelated (far) tasks (3.30, 3.30, 3.36, and 3.17) and three of the highest mean items representing related (near) tasks (3.17, 3.13, and 3.08).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transfer Coaching Measure Items</th>
<th>Total Sample Mean</th>
<th>Total Sample SD</th>
<th>Near Group Mean</th>
<th>Near Group SD</th>
<th>Far Group Mean</th>
<th>Far Group SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Julie stops meeting to make copies (near)</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>.824</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>.726</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>.877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Barb yells across the floor calls waiting (far)</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>.998</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>.972</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Jill can’t complete weekly tasks (far)</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>.780</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>.838</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>.650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Josh answers phone while meeting with employees (far)</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>.962</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>.990</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>.877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. People had to stand during team meeting (near)</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>.926</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>.800</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Sara judges value of suggestions (near)</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>.733</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>.492</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>.834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Cindy works before scheduled start time (far)</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>.860</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>.898</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>.822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Sam talks about football during meeting (near)</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>.928</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>.843</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Items missing from meeting minutes (near)</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>.719</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>.755</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>.694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Stacey asks Ben to facilitate at start of the meeting (near)</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>.752</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>.723</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>.716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. George not in position long enough to apply for new one (far)</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>.814</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>.950</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>.634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Jason not writing measurable performance objectives (far)</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>.891</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>.843</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>.953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. John discusses items not on agenda (near)</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>.794</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>.789</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>.792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Employees concerned about upcoming change (far)</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>.750</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>.774</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>.688</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.3: Means and SD of Transfer Coaching Measure Items, Total Sample (n = 45), Near Group (n = 22) and Far Group (n = 23).
For learning, immediately following the training supervisors were asked to generate a scenario from their own experience when they observed an employee being ineffective at their job. Next, trainees were asked to write down in their own words how they would coach this person based on the training they just received. Using a behavior learning rating scale three independent raters scored the trainee’s learning based on the steps in the coaching process. Out of a total possible score of 44 points, Table 4.4 shows the mean rater score for all subjects was 25.30 with a standard deviation of 8.02. For individual raters Table 4.4 shows the mean score for rater one all subjects was 24.12 with a standard deviation of 7.75. The mean score for rater two all subjects was 24.87 with a standard deviation of 8.44. The mean score for rater three all subjects was higher, 26.31 with a standard deviation of 9.02.

For the near group, Table 4.8 shows the mean rater score was 24.10 with a standard deviation of 7.90. Individually, rater one’s mean score for the near group was 23.85 with a standard deviation of 7.49. Rater two’s mean score was 23.27 with a standard deviation of 8.07. Rater three’s mean score for the near group was 24.68 with a standard deviation of 9.35.

For the far group, Table 4.4 shows the mean score for all raters was 26.45 with a standard deviation of 8.13. Individually, rater one’s mean score for the far was 24.40 with a standard deviation of 8.21. Rater two’s mean score was 26.18 with a standard deviation of 8.71 and rater three’s scores means core was 27.95 with a standard deviation of 8.58.
Learning:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Sample (n = 45)</th>
<th>Near Group (n = 22)</th>
<th>Far Group (n = 23)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rater’s scores of Subject’s Coaching Scenarios</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Raters</td>
<td>25.30</td>
<td>8.02</td>
<td>24.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rater One</td>
<td>24.12</td>
<td>7.75</td>
<td>23.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rater Two</td>
<td>24.87</td>
<td>8.44</td>
<td>23.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rater Three</td>
<td>26.31</td>
<td>9.02</td>
<td>24.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.4: Rater’s Mean Scores and SD for Learning, Total Sample (n = 45), Near group (n = 22) and Far Group (n = 23)

Results for Each Research Question

Research Question One: Do trainees who are trained using a far training transfer approach have equal confidence to coach both related and unrelated tasks?

A t-test for paired samples was used to test the difference between the means of the transfer coaching scores for subjects in each of the two groups (near and far). Regarding research question one, Table 4.5 shows that trainees who were trained using a far training transfer approach had a mean confidence level score of 3.13 on unrelated tasks (far) tasks with a standard deviation of .636 and a mean confidence level score of 3.03 on related tasks (near) with a standard deviation of .683. Table 4.6 shows that the confidence level score on unrelated (far) tasks was only .11 higher than on related (near) tasks and that the t value in terms of related and unrelated tasks was 2.341 and was not statistically significant at the .05 alpha level. Since there was no significant difference in confidence
levels for coaching either related or unrelated tasks, it appears that trainees who were trained using a far training transfer approach have equal confidence to coach both related and unrelated tasks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paired Sample Statistics</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group: Far</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL Far Measure Item Scores</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>.636</td>
<td>.13275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL Near Measure Item Scores</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>.683</td>
<td>.14256</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.5: Mean, Standard Deviation and Standard Error for Far Group on Confidence levels for Both Related and Unrelated Tasks (n = 23)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paired Samples Test</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paired Differences</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.216</td>
<td>.04510</td>
<td>2.341</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL Far – CL Near</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.6: Paired sample t test for Far Group (n = 23) on Confidence Levels for both Related and Unrelated Tasks

Research Question Two: Do trainees who are trained using a near training transfer approach have greater confidence to coach related tasks.

A t-test for paired samples was also used to test the difference between the means of the transfer coaching scores for subjects in the near group. Table 4.7 shows that trainees who trained using a near training transfer approach had a mean confidence level
score of 3.45 on related tasks (near) with a standard deviation of 1.12. Table 4.8 shows that the confidence level score on related (near) tasks was .58 higher than on unrelated (far) tasks and that the t value in terms of related and unrelated tasks was -2.292 and was statistically significant at the .05 alpha level. Thus, trainees who were trained using a near training transfer approach have greater confidence to coach related tasks.

*Research Question Three: Do trainees who are trained using a near training transfer approach have lower confidence to coach unrelated tasks.*

A t-test for paired samples was also used to test the difference between the means of the transfer coaching scores for subjects in the near group. Table 4.7 shows that trainees who were trained using a near training transfer approach had a mean confidence level score of 2.87 on unrelated tasks (far) tasks with a standard deviation of .570. Table 4.8 shows that the confidence level score on related (near) tasks was .58 higher than on unrelated (far) tasks and that the t value in terms of related and unrelated tasks is -2.292 and is statistically significant at the .05 alpha level. Thus, trainees who were trained using a near training transfer approach have lower confidence to coach unrelated tasks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paired Sample Statistics</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>SE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CL Far Measure Item Scores</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>.570</td>
<td>.12157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL Near Measure Item Scores</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>.24067</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.7: Mean, Standard Deviation and Standard Error for Near Group on Confidence levels for Both Related and Unrelated Tasks (n = 22)
Paired Samples Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group: Near</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paired Differences</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>.25212</td>
<td>-2.292</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL Far – CL Near</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.8: Paired sample t test for Near Group (n = 22) on Confidence Levels for both Related and Unrelated Tasks

Research Question Four: Do trainees who are trained using a far and near training transfer approach differ in their assessment of learning outcomes?

An independent t-test was used to test the difference between the mean rater scores for learning for the near and far groups. Levene’s test for equality of variances was conducted to ensure equal variances. An F ratio of 1.882 with a probability of .177 supported the assumption of homogeneity so results of the t test for equal variances were examined. Table 4.9 shows that trainees who were trained using a near training transfer approach had a mean rater score for learning of 24.10 with a standard deviation of 7.90. Also, Table 4.9 shows that trainees who were trained using a far training transfer approach had a mean rater score of 26.45 with a standard deviation of 8.13. Table 4.10 shows that there was no significant difference in the assessment of learning outcomes for the near and far groups. The t value is -.983 and is not significant at the .05 alpha level. Thus, trainees who were trained using a near and far transfer of training approach did not differ in their assessment of learning outcomes.
Independent Sample Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rater’s Scores</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>SE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Near Group</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24.10</td>
<td>7.90</td>
<td>1.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Far Group</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>26.45</td>
<td>8.13</td>
<td>1.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.9: Mean, Standard Deviation and Standard Error for Rater’s Scores for Near Group and Far Group

Table 4.10: Independent Sample t Test for Near Group (n = 22) and Far Group (n = 23) for Rater’s scores of learning.

Research Question Five: Do trainees who are trained using a far and near training transfer approach differ in their self-assessment of general self-efficacy?

An independent t-test was used to test the difference between the mean self-efficacy scores for the near and far groups. Levene’s test for equality of variances was conducted to ensure equal variances. An F ratio of .073 with a probability of .788 supported the assumption of homogeneity so results of the t test for equal variances were examined. Table 4.11 shows the mean self-efficacy score for all subjects (n = 47) was 3.34 with a standard deviation of .405. The mean score for the near group was 3.40 with a standard deviation of .342. The mean score for the far group was 3.28 with a standard
deviation of .405. Table 4.12 shows that there was no significant difference in the self-assessment of general self-efficacy for the near and far groups. The t value is .985 and is not significant at the .05 alpha level. Thus, trainees who were trained using a near and far transfer of training approach did not differ in their self-assessment of general self-efficacy or their judgments about task capability based on initiative, effort, and persistence prior to the training.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Self-Efficacy</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Near</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>.342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Far</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>.454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Sample</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>.405</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.11: Self-Efficacy Mean Scores for Total Sample (n = 45), Near group (n = 22) and Far Group (n = 23)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-efficacy scores</td>
<td>.967</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>.339</td>
<td>.1148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Near and Far Groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.12: Independent Sample t Test for Near Group (n = 22) and Far Group (n = 23) for self-efficacy scores.
Research Question Six: Do trainees who are trained using a near and far training transfer approach show different relationships between demographic factors and transfer coaching and learning?

Correlation coefficients were examined to look at the nature of the relationships between trainees’ demographic information and the dependent variables: transfer coaching and learning. Regarding near transfer, there are moderate positive correlations between education level and hours spent one on one and total learning (Table 4.13). There are positive correlations between years as a supervisor and years with present employer, experience working one on one, age, and total learning. Age was moderately correlated with number of employees supervised. Age was negatively correlated with education level and negatively correlated with the learning score.

Fewer significant correlations were found with the far transfer group. Similar to the near group, age was negatively correlated with education level (Table 4.14). There was a strong positive correlation between age and years as a supervisor. There was also a strong positive correlation between education level and total confidence. However, there was a moderate negative correlation between years with present employer and total confidence. Finally, the learning score and the confidence score were moderately correlated, suggesting that the more confident the participants were, the higher their learning.

When the two groups were combined, only two correlations were significant with both the near and far groups: age and years as a supervisor and age and years with present employer (Table 4.15).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>X1</th>
<th>X2</th>
<th>X3</th>
<th>X4</th>
<th>X5</th>
<th>X6</th>
<th>X7</th>
<th>Y1</th>
<th>Y2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Educ. level (X₁)</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years as supvr (X₂)</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years with present employer (X₃)</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.47*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number employees supervised (X₄)</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exp. working one-on-one (X₅)</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>-.32</td>
<td>.70**</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours spent one-on-one (X₆)</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>.40*</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>-.28</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (X₇)</td>
<td>45.6</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>-.43*</td>
<td>.55**</td>
<td>.46*</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>-.36</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total learning score (Y₁)</td>
<td>74.1</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>.43*</td>
<td>-.61**</td>
<td>-.37</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.41*</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>-.513**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total confidence level (Y₂)</td>
<td>42.1</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.32</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n=26
*Correlation is significant at the .05 level. ** Correlation is significant at the .01 level.

Table 4.13: Correlations Between Transfer Coaching and Learning and Demographic Variables (Near Group)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>X_1</th>
<th>X_2</th>
<th>X_3</th>
<th>X_4</th>
<th>X_5</th>
<th>X_6</th>
<th>X_7</th>
<th>Y_1</th>
<th>Y_2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Educ. level (X_1)</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years as supervsr (X_2)</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>-.43</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years with present employer (X_3)</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number employees supervised (X_4)</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exp. working one-on-one (X_5)</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours spent one-on-one (X_6)</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (X_7)</td>
<td>39.6</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>-.54*</td>
<td>.80**</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total learning score (Y_1)</td>
<td>78.4</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total confidence level (Y_2)</td>
<td>43.7</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>.70**</td>
<td>-.29</td>
<td>-.47*</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>-.44</td>
<td>.55*</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n=21
*Correlation is significant at the .05 level. **Correlation is significant at the .01 level.

Table 4.14: Correlations Between Transfer Coaching and Learning and Demographic Variables (Far Group)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>X₁</th>
<th>X₂</th>
<th>X₃</th>
<th>X₄</th>
<th>X₅</th>
<th>X₆</th>
<th>Y₁</th>
<th>Y₂</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Educ. level (X₁)</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years as suprvsr (X₂)</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>-.32*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years with present employer (X₃)</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.34*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number employees supervised (X₄)</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exp. working one-on-one (X₅)</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>-.28*</td>
<td>.49**</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours spent one-on-one (X₆)</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (X₇)</td>
<td>42.94</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>-.44**</td>
<td>.64**</td>
<td>.31*</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total learning score (Y₁)</td>
<td>75.97</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>.45**</td>
<td>-.38**</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.39**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total confidence level (Y₂)</td>
<td>42.86</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>.45**</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>-.39**</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.36*</td>
<td>-.29</td>
<td>.36*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n=47
*Correlation is significant at the .05 level. **Correlation is significant at the .01 level.

Table 4.15: Correlations Between Transfer Coaching and Learning and Demographic Variables (Near and Far Groups Combined)
CHAPTER 5
SUMMARY, DISCUSSION, AND IMPLICATIONS

This chapter is divided into three sections. The first section summarizes the results of the data analysis and findings of the five research questions. The second section provides further discussion based on the findings. The last section discusses implications for HRD researchers and practitioners and presents a revised theoretical framework based on the findings of the study and future research implications.

Summary of Findings

This study was designed to determine the effects of a near versus far transfer of training approach on trainee’s confidence to coach related or unrelated tasks. Forty-five supervisors who attended a training program on coaching were randomly assigned to one of two groups of training for two modules of a supervisory training program: training using a near transfer module and training using a far transfer module. The effects of the two instructional approaches were assessed on two dependent variables: transfer performance and learning. Analysis of the data revealed the following results:

Research Question One: Do trainees who are trained using a far training transfer approach have equal confidence to coach both related and unrelated tasks?

Supervisors who were trained using a far training transfer approach had equal confidence to coach both related and unrelated tasks. Specifically, trainees who were trained according to the far module “Coaching for Improved Job Performance” had equal
scores on the transfer coaching scale for those measure items more closely associated
with team meetings and for those measure items more closely associated with general
concepts of coaching for improving performance in a variety of work contexts.

Research Question Two: Do trainees who are trained using a near training transfer
approach have greater confidence to coach related tasks.

Supervisors who were trained using a near training transfer approach had greater
confidence to coach related tasks. Specifically, trainees who were trained according to
the near module “Coaching for Improved Team Meeting Effectiveness” had higher scores
on the transfer coaching scale for those measure items more closely associated with team
meetings.

Research Question Three: Do trainees who are trained using a near training transfer
approach have lower confidence to coach unrelated tasks.

Supervisors who were trained using a near training transfer approach had lower
confidence to coach unrelated tasks. Specifically, trainees who were trained according to
the near module “Coaching for Improved Team Meeting Effectiveness” had lower scores
on the transfer coaching scale for those measure items unrelated to team meetings that
emphasized general concepts of coaching for improving performance in a variety of work
contexts.

Research Question Four: Do trainees who are trained using a far and near training
transfer approach differ in their assessment of learning outcomes?

Supervisors who were trained using a far training transfer approach and those who
were trained using a near training transfer approach acquired similar levels of knowledge
as a result of participating in the training. Specifically, trainees who were trained
according to the far module “Coaching for Improved Job Performance” and trainees who were trained according to the near module “Coaching for Improved Team Meeting Performance” had similar scores on their written coaching scenarios.

**Research Question Five: Do trainees who are trained using a far and near training transfer approach differ in their self-assessment of general self-efficacy?**

Supervisors who were trained using a far training transfer approach and those who were trained using a near training transfer approach had similar levels of general self-efficacy prior to the training.

**Research Question Six: Do trainees who are trained using a near and far training transfer approach show different relationships between demographic factors and transfer coaching and learning?**

For the most part, the relationship between the demographic factors and transfer coaching and learning differed for trainees in the near group and those in the far group. Only two correlations were similar in their significance when both groups were combined: age and years as a supervisor, and age and years with present employer.

**Discussion**

Transfer of training has received much attention in the literature. Yet, most of this research has focused on the conditions for near transfer to occur, even though far transfer is an emerging area of interest. This study attempted to fill that gap by trying to better understand the differences between near and far transfer. This section provides some possible interpretations of the results and further discusses the findings.
Far Transfer of Training Approach

The results showed that trainees who were trained using a far transfer of training approach had equal confidence to coach related and unrelated tasks. This finding can be interpreted in several ways. First, this finding means that the training design of the instructional modules used in the study supported how far transfer is distinguished in the literature. This finding is important because even proposed frameworks that have attempted to distinguish between dimensions of transfer such as content and context do not identify the instructional elements that may influence transfer (Barnett & Ceci, 2002).

Also, transfer models have been criticized for not explaining what constitutes appropriate transfer design. Even though it has been suggested that the appropriate near or far transfer training goals should guide the development of the training content, transfer models do not differentiate between near and far design elements (McLean, 2001). Since far transfer involves having trainees learn more general concepts and principles, which might be applied to broader contexts than those originally taught in the training (Kim & Lee, 2001), one would expect that a person who could apply training to a broader context could also apply training to a more specific context that required a close match between the training and task outcome. This further supports the literature that describes transfer as existing on a continuum with near at one end and far at the other (Barnett & Ceci, 2002). Thus, trainees who were trained according to the far module “Coaching for Improved Job Performance” had equal confidence to apply their learning to both near tasks related to a specific type of coaching and far tasks related to coaching in general.
Second, this finding means that additional ways to design training for teaching skills need to be considered. Researchers have suggested that the instructional design literature has not kept up with how to design programs for far transfer (Smith, Ford, & Kozlowski, 1997). The majority of training design literature has focused on identical elements emphasizing overlearning, reinforcement schedules, and conditions of practice (Ford, Weissbein, Smith & Gully, 1998). Although this is consistent with a near approach to training transfer emphasizing (Ellis, 1965; Goldstein, 1986, Noe, 1986) short-term learning, it may not support far transfer (Ford, et al. 1998). Rather, this finding is important because it supports designing training based on competencies or clusters of knowledge, skills, abilities (KSA’s) and behaviors that are needed for successful performance rather than on specific skills or one area of expertise.

Third, having knowledge that training can be designed to support far transfer and knowing that competency based training may have potential for developing employees who can make better use of general KSA’s and behaviors, this finding means that additional consideration should be given to developing employee expertise. Jacobs (2001) describes an expert as one who can deal with both routine and non-routine tasks. He suggested that training programs have a strategic role in organizations due to changes in the nature of work (such as the use of advanced technologies and more emphasis on responsiveness to customer’s needs), which increasingly requires employees to solve problems and make complex decisions (Jacobs, 2003). Since far transfer focuses on trainees learning more general concepts which may be applied to a wider set of contexts than those presented in the training setting (Kim & Lee; 2002; Smith, Ford, &
Kozlowski, 1997), it may be useful in developing experts who can perform both routine and non-routine tasks.

**Near Transfer of Training Approach**

The results also showed that supervisors who were trained using a near training transfer approach had greater confidence to coach related tasks and lower confidence to coach unrelated tasks. First, as mentioned with the far approach to training this finding means that the training design of the instructional modules used in the study supported how near transfer is distinguished in the literature. Also, it further adds to our understanding of transfer design and the appropriate training goals that should guide the development of content. Since near transfer emphasizes a high degree of similarity between the training and the task and does not focus on underlying principles, trainees who were trained according to the near module “Coaching for Improved Team Meeting Effectiveness” had higher scores on the transfer coaching scale for those items most closely associated with team meetings and lower scores on items that were unrelated to team meetings and emphasized more general concepts related to other work contexts.

Second, this finding also means that additional ways to design training for teaching skills needs to be considered especially when considering that the transferability of skills is important for optimizing investments in training. Since the near transfer training approach resulted in lower transfer of unrelated tasks, it seems more appropriate for emphasizing specific, routine skills that have a narrower application rather than more general behavioral skills that can potentially extend to other aspects of a job or even beyond the job. Although a significant portion of the investment in workplace training is focused on specific job needs, it’s logical to assume that the intention is usually not just
to have trainees learn only specifics of the training course. Rather, it seems more productive to build skills in training that will transfer to various job situations (Barnett & Ceci, 2002).

Third, practitioners interested in how to build learning organizations realize that less time should be spent on individual job focused skills training and more time should be spent on training that develops common experiences for an entire team or work unit (Goh and Lussier 1997; Mohrman & Mohrman, Jr., 1995). Since far transfer may have the potential to reduce the amount of training conducted by focusing on the human ability to generalize concepts and designing training for varying units of work (Jacobs, 2003; Lee, Kim, & Jacobs, 2002), it could potentially increase the investment in training by enhancing productivity through the development of more flexible, multi-skilled workers (Jacobs, 2003; Smith, Ford, & Kozlowski, 1997).

Learning

The results showed that supervisors who were trained using a far training transfer approach and those who were trained using a near training transfer approach acquired similar levels of knowledge as a result of participating in the training. That is, trainees who were trained according to the near module “Coaching for Improved Team Meeting Effectiveness” and trainees who were trained according to the module “Coaching for Improved Job Performance” had similar scores on their written coaching scenarios based on the training they received.

This finding has several possible interpretations. First, this finding means that learning may not be negatively impacted as a result of far transfer. This is important
considering that previous transfer models and frameworks have not focused on instruction and learning. Yet, it has been suggested that by achieving far transfer, you may give up near transfer due to less repetition and overlearning (Laker, 1990). This could be concerning especially when training employees how to do their jobs. However, since the far group acquired similar levels of knowledge when compared to the near group it seems possible to achieve equal leaning with both approaches.

Second, this finding means that the learning requirements suggested in the literature for a near versus far transfer of training approach were supported. This finding is important since little is known about designing transfer to achieve far transfer. As mentioned, the learning requirements for near transfer depend mostly on the similarity between the training and the task and the learning requirements for achieving far transfer depend on whether the training includes information regarding the underlying principles and assumptions regarding the skills and behaviors being trained (Kim & Lee, 2001).

Consider that each module was designed according to the learning requirements for a near and far transfer approach. For example, the near module’s rationale statement emphasized the need to learn the training content to meet a specific work expectation and the training objective was related directly to the task statement, conducting team meetings, which is a work expectation of supervisors. Likewise, the far module’s rationale statement emphasized the need to learn the training content to use in a variety of work contexts and the training objective focused on the general work expectation that supervisors are required to conduct coaching in various work related contexts. Also, the training content for the near module focused on a specific process designed to help supervisors conduct team meetings; whereas the content for the far module focused on a
more general process designed to help supervisors provide coaching in a variety of coaching situations.

Also, the training events followed the same sequence varying only in the content provided. The near module focused on a specific concept and model of coaching to conduct team meetings and the far module focused on a general concept and model of coaching focused on examples from varied contexts. Thus, it would seem likely that subjects in both groups would achieve their training objective.

Finally, for the far group, learning was not negatively influenced by far transfer. There was a positive correlation between educational level and total confidence and learning score and confidence score. Thus, the more confident participants were, the higher their learning scores.

**General Self-Efficacy**

The findings showed that supervisors who were trained using a far training transfer approach and those who were trained using a near training transfer approach had similar levels of general self-efficacy. This finding means that the two groups were similar prior to the training on their beliefs regarding effort, initiative, and persistence. Also, both groups reported high scores on general self-efficacy.

Since a person’s self-efficacy may be influenced by the interaction of factors such as beliefs, experience, motivation, learning, and performance this finding has several possible interpretations when comparing the results of the study. First, in comparing the results of self-efficacy and learning both groups acquired similar levels of learning and had similar levels of self-efficacy. This finding is consistent with studies that have shown pre-training self-efficacy to predict a trainee’s level of learning during training.
(Machin & Fogarty, 2003). However, a limitation of this study is that it did measure post-training self-efficacy. This would have added further insight to the transfer performance results for the near group. Since the near group had equally high levels of self-efficacy and similar learning outcomes compared to the far group but lower confidence on unrelated tasks it would have been helpful to assess their post-training self-efficacy. However, conclusions cannot be made as to whether either groups self-efficacy changed as a result of the training.

Second, when comparing self-efficacy, and transfer coaching the results are consistent for the far group but inconsistent for the near group. The far group had high self-efficacy levels and equal confidence to perform both related and unrelated tasks. However, the near group had equally high self-efficacy scores but lower confidence to perform unrelated tasks. This means that high levels of self-efficacy may not mediate the relationship between a near transfer approach and the ability to coach unrelated tasks even though research has shown that trainees with high self-efficacy demonstrate high effort in situations that may require new types of behavior or increased performance levels (Bandura, 1977 in Noe, 1986).

Third, when comparing experience, self-efficacy, and transfer coaching on average subjects in both the near and far groups reported being very experienced working one-on-one with employees. Also, subjects in both groups reported spending equal time in both groups (4 to 6 hours per week) working one-on-one with employees. This means that the topic of the training program may have influenced self-efficacy scores since subjects knew that the topic of the training was coaching. Even though there were positive correlations between education level, hours spent one on one, and total learning,
the near group had lower confidence on unrelated tasks. This means that certain types of experience may actually negatively impact transfer and especially far transfer. Consider that one of the main differences between the groups was the type of employee supervised. The far group supervised more non-clinical employees and the near group supervised more clinical employees. Thus, the far group may have more opportunities to coach different types of employees resulting in coaching across various contexts.

The findings regarding the relationships between self-efficacy and learning, self-efficacy and transfer coaching, and self-efficacy and experience mean that motivation to transfer may be an important variable to consider when distinguishing between near and far transfer since motivation to transfer has been hypothesized to link individual learning with individual performance change. Also, models of transfer motivation suggest that individual learning is influenced by the trainees’ motivation to learn, reaction to the training, climate, ability, and experience (Holton, 1996). Perhaps even more important is recent research suggesting that intention to transfer may be general and not specific. Yelon, Sheppard, and Sleight (2004) fund that autonomous workers were more likely to apply new ideas from training in general without necessarily specifying the application, rather than specifically. A limitation of this study is that did not look at motivation to transfer.

Implications

The first part of this section discusses implications of the study for HRD researchers and presents a revised conceptual framework based on the results of the study and future research implications. The second section discusses implications for HRD practitioners.
Implications for HRD Researchers

This study challenges HRD researchers to reexamine relationships between learning, training, and performance. From an organizational perspective it’s important to consider the strategic potential of far transfer to link individual changes from training to the larger organizational system. Thinking based on a systems perspective suggests that learning outcomes at the individual level will potentially influence higher-level organizational outcomes and effectiveness (Salas & Cannon-Bowers, 2001).

To keep pace with rapid changes in work, organizations may benefit by designing training based on a far approach. This study shows that it is possible to design training that allows trainees to generalize concepts to other job tasks and contexts. Thus, additional research is needed to better understand how to design training to achieve far transfer. To understand this, more needs to be known about designing training to achieve employee expertise by teaching general behavioral skills that transfer to non-specific job tasks. This research should include how to effectively design competency based training needed rather than specific job skills. For example, at the individual level this research might focus on problem solving skills and critical thinking skills. This could result in employees who are multi-skilled and can make better use of problem solving skills and complex decision making abilities (Jacobs, 2003). Further, this study should be replicated for other types of employees such as technical staff and different types of training such as awareness to better understand employee expertise and far transfer.

Future research should also try to identify variables that influence work experience and learning. For example, since there was a negative correlation between years with present employer and total confidence for the far group, more needs to be
known about experience and confidence and their relationship to transfer. The literature suggests that experience is one basis for workplace learning and that learning may occur through reflection, on-the-job experience, and work processes (Collin, 2004). Still, how and where workplace learning is acquired is still highly debated. Qualitative research using a critical incident technique could be used to identify the specific work experiences and behaviors that may inhibit or enhance far transfer. For example, more needs to be known about long term experience and learning and how it influences far transfer. Also, work experiences that may serve as barriers to transfer need to be identified.

Since supervisors who were trained using a near training transfer approach had greater confidence to perform related tasks and lower confidence to perform unrelated tasks even though subjects in both groups acquired similar levels of knowledge, future research should look more closely at job performance. Specifically, future research should examine both learning and performance over time. Although a significant portion of the investment in workplace training is focused on specific job needs, it’s logical to assume that the intention is usually not just to have trainees learn only specifics of the training course. Rather, it seems more productive to build skills in training that will transfer to various job situations (Barnett & Ceci, 2002). This research may also contribute to a better understanding of vertical transfer, which suggests that transfer should be linked to larger strategic goals at the organizational level, and to horizontal transfer that may support transfer across jobs.

In addition, since subjects in both training groups were similar in their self-assessments of general self-efficacy, future research should look at self-efficacy both pre-training and post-training. This would provide useful information regarding whether self-
efficacy changes as a result of the near and far training transfer approaches. Looking at post-training self-efficacy could investigate further why high scores on initiative, persistence, and effort for the near subjects did not impact their confidence to perform unrelated tasks.

Finally, since this study is the first known attempt to operationalize far transfer, there are limitations of a research project like this which imposed a fairly limited set of questions on a very complex psychological topic of training transfer. As mentioned two of these limitations are that the study did not measure post-training self-efficacy or motivation to transfer. Thus, it would be beneficial for future research to look at these areas. Again, qualitative research would help in these areas to see if motivation to transfer is job-specific and to identify if and why self-efficacy changes based on a far transfer approach.

Based on the findings from the data analysis, discussion, and future research implications, a revised conceptual framework is presented in figure 5.1.
Implications for HRD Practitioners

As HRD has moved from an emphasis on training to performance improvement, training and development is more often referred to as a process of systematically developing expertise in employees for the purpose of improving performance. Thus, HRD practitioners need new insights from research as well as ways to implement training ideas that can strategically improve performance at both the organizational level and the work process level.

An important implication of this of this study for HRD practitioners is that far transfer may have the potential to optimize investments in training. Far transfer may be able to reduce the amount of training conducted if one training program can apply to
more than one situation (Jacobs, 2003). In addition, by focusing on the human ability to generalize concepts, far transfer principles could be applied in designing training for more varying units of work (Jacobs; Lee, Kim, & Jacobs, 2002). This could potentially increase productivity by assisting in the development of more flexible, multi-skilled employees (Jacobs, 2003; Smith, Ford, & Kozlowski, 1997).

Also, far transfer may provide a more practical way to support the strategic performance components of learning organizations. For example, by focusing on teaching more general behavioral skills to ensure that knowledge is transferred to other parts of the organization (Goh & Lussier, 1997), rather than job specific skills that may quickly change or become obsolete, there is greater potential for developing more flexible and adaptable employees. In addition, by focusing on skill competencies that need to match shared behavioral skill sets such as leadership, coaching, and providing feedback, there could potentially be more opportunities to influence organizational goals through vertical transfer and horizontal goals through cross-training and job sharing.

Further, this study provides HRD practitioners with training design strategies for both near and far transfer of training as well as the appropriate learning requirements needed to support for both approaches. Thus, HRD practitioners can experiment with these approaches for various types of training and different types of employees to determine behavioral skills that may be useful for developing multi-skilled employees.

Finally, many important ideas for future research have been generated by this study. These include examining the role confidence, learning, and experience play in near and far transfer. These questions present opportunities for HRD researchers and practitioners to engage in partnership research.
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APPENDIX A

LETTER INVITING SUPERVISORS TO TRAINING
June 25th, 2005

Dear Ohio State University Medical Center Employee:

The Educational Development and Resources Department is pleased to invite you to participate in a training program on coaching. This program is being offered as part of a research study being conducted at Ohio State University, in the College of Education, Workforce Development and Education. Your participation in this program will provide useful information on coaching and help with your supervisory skill development.

Your involvement in this study consists of participating in one training session on coaching and completing two training activities immediately following the program. Your participation in this program is strictly voluntary; however, you will receive attendance credit for your time. Also, all employee identification information will remain confidential both during and after the study and your participation in the study will not impact any subsequent job performance evaluations.

To show our appreciation for your participation in the program, we will have a drawing at the end of each session for a $25.00 Gift Certificate to Target. Also, refreshments will be served.

The training session will last approximately two hours and will be offered on Thursday July 14th from 10:00am to 12:00 noon and on Wednesday July 20th from 1:00pm to 3:00 pm. Training will be held at the University Medical Center, Battelle Building 13 at 1375 Perry Street in Rooms 042 and 043.

Please call Educational Development and Resources to register 3-8929.

Sincerely,

Natalie Wittmann
Director of Educational Development and Resources
The Ohio State University Medical Center
APPENDIX B

PARTICIPANT INFORMATION SHEET
Participant Information Sheet

Please take a moment to answer the following questions. Return your sheet to the trainer when you are finished.

1. How long have you been a supervisor?
   _____ Less than three years   _____ Three to six years
   _____ Seven to ten years     _____ More than ten years

2. How long have you worked with your present employer?
   _____ Less than five years   _____ Five to ten years   _____ More than ten years

3. How many employees report directly to you?
   _____ Less than five       _____ Five to ten      _____ More than ten

4. What kind of employees do you supervise?
   _____ Clinical (direct patient contact)   _____ Non-Clinical (no patient contact)

5. What is your gender?
   _____ Male        _____ Female

6. What is your educational level?
   _____ Twelve years (High school diploma/GED)
   _____ Thirteen to fifteen years (some college)
   _____ Sixteen years or more (college graduate or higher)
7. How would you describe your experience working with employees one-on-one?

_______ Very experienced _______ Somewhat experienced

_______ Little experience _______ No Experience

8. How much time do you spend working one-on-one with employees on a weekly basis?

_______ Less than one hour _______ 1-3 hours _______ 4-6 hours

_______ 7-9 hours ________ More than nine hours

9. What year and month were you born? _____ (year) _____ (month)

10. If something looks too complicated, I will not even bother to try it.

____ Strongly Disagree ____ Disagree _____ Agree _____ Strongly Agree

11. I avoid trying to learn new things when they look to difficult.

____ Strongly Disagree ____ Disagree _____ Agree _____ Strongly Agree

12. When trying something new, I soon give up if I am not initially successful.

____ Strongly Disagree ____ Disagree _____ Agree _____ Strongly Agree

13. When I make plans, I am certain I can make them work.

____ Strongly Disagree ____ Disagree _____ Agree _____ Strongly Agree

14. If I can't do a job the first time, I keep trying until I can.

____ Strongly Disagree ____ Disagree _____ Agree _____ Strongly Agree
15. When I have something unpleasant to do, I stick to it until I finish it.

____ Strongly Disagree    ____ Disagree    _____ Agree    _____ Strongly Agree

16. When I decide to do something, I go right to work on it.

____ Strongly Disagree    ____ Disagree    _____ Agree    _____ Strongly Agree

17. Failure just makes me try harder.

____ Strongly Disagree    ____ Disagree    _____ Agree    _____ Strongly Agree

18. When I set important goals for myself, I rarely achieve them.

____ Strongly Disagree    ____ Disagree    _____ Agree    _____ Strongly Agree

19. I do not seem to be capable of dealing with most problems that come up in my life.

____ Strongly Disagree    ____ Disagree    _____ Agree    _____ Strongly Agree

20. When unexpected problems occur, I don't handle them very well.

____ Strongly Disagree    ____ Disagree    _____ Agree    _____ Strongly Agree

21. I feel insecure about my ability to do things.

____ Strongly Disagree    ____ Disagree    _____ Agree    _____ Strongly Agree

Code ______
APPENDIX C

TRANSFER COACHING SCALE
Based on the training you have just received, please rate your level of confidence to provide coaching in the following situations.

1. While facilitating the Monday morning team meeting, Julie stops the meeting to leave and make copies of the handouts.

   1                            2        3       4
   No Confidence               Low Confidence Confident High Confidence

2. Josh answers his telephone whenever it rings while meeting with his employees.

   1                            2                      3       4
   No Confidence               Low Confidence Confident High Confidence

3. While walking through the customer service area Sheila hears Barb yell across the floor that there are seventeen calls waiting in queue.

   1                                      2                 3                     4
   No Confidence               Low Confidence Confident High Confidence

4. Sue notices that three people had to stand during the weekly team meeting because there were chairs missing.

   1                                      2                 3                     4
   No Confidence               Low Confidence Confident High Confidence

5. Sharon notices that Jill is having difficulty completing her weekly tasks.

   1                                      2                 3                     4
   No Confidence               Low Confidence Confident High Confidence

6. Steve notices that several items are missing from Diane’s meeting minutes.

   1                                      2                 3                     4
   No Confidence               Low Confidence Confident High Confidence
7. During the weekly new product team meeting, Sara quickly judges the value of suggestions as they are being brainstormed.

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
1 & 2 & 3 & 4 \\
\text{No Confidence} & \text{Low Confidence} & \text{Confident} & \text{High Confidence}
\end{array}
\]

8. Heather observes Cindy working on the patient report before her scheduled start time.

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
1 & 2 & 3 & 4 \\
\text{No Confidence} & \text{Low Confidence} & \text{Confident} & \text{High Confidence}
\end{array}
\]

9. During a weekly team meeting to discuss employee absenteeism, Sam insisted on talking about yesterday’s football game as others shared ideas.

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
1 & 2 & 3 & 4 \\
\text{No Confidence} & \text{Low Confidence} & \text{Confident} & \text{High Confidence}
\end{array}
\]

10. Kevin observes that immediately before the start of the team meeting, Stacey asks Ben to facilitate the meeting.

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
1 & 2 & 3 & 4 \\
\text{No Confidence} & \text{Low Confidence} & \text{Confident} & \text{High Confidence}
\end{array}
\]

11. Scott notices that George has not been in his current position long enough to apply for a new position in a different department.

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
1 & 2 & 3 & 4 \\
\text{No Confidence} & \text{Low Confidence} & \text{Confident} & \text{High Confidence}
\end{array}
\]
12. Brenda notices that Jason is not writing measurable performance objectives in his employee’s work reviews.

1 2 3 4
No Confidence Low Confidence Confident High Confidence

13. During the weekly team meeting, John discusses several items that are not on the agenda.

1 2 3 4
No Confidence Low Confidence Confident High Confidence

14. Brian’s supervisors inform him that employees are concerned about the upcoming changes to the patient records system.

1 2 3 4
No Confidence Low Confidence Confident High Confidence
APPENDIX D

INSTRUCTIONS GIVEN TO PANEL FOR FIELD TEST

OF TRANSFER COACHING SCALE
Field Test for Transfer Coaching Scale

Procedures

A field test was conducted to assess the content validity of the transfer performance scale. Instructions were verbally provided to participants and they reviewed each coaching scenario individually.

Instruction Provided to Participants

Thanks for participating in this field test activity. The purpose of this review is to determine whether the scenarios look like they will measure what they are suppose to measure and will in fact measure what they are suppose to measure. Listed below are definitions for the concepts “Coaching for Improved Job Performance” and “Coaching for Improved Team Meeting Performance.”

Definitions

Coaching for Improved Job Performance:

Coaching is the planned process used by managers to help subordinate employees improve their job performance.

Coaching for Improved Team Meeting Performance:

Coaching is the planned process used by managers to help subordinate employees improve their team meeting performance.

Based on these definitions, please indicate for each scenario whether you believe it represents “Coaching for Improved Job Performance” or “Coaching for Improved Team Meeting Performance” or Neither.
APPENDIX E

BEHAVIOR LEARNING RATING SCALE
Behavior Learning Rating Scale
“Coaching for Improved Team Meeting Performance”

Role of the Behavior Rating Scale

This instrument has been designed to assess a participant’s mastery of the coaching for improved team meeting performance process as depicted in the training module “Coaching for Improved Team Meeting Performance.” Participants complete a short-answer written essay that requires them to generate an example from their own experience when they observed a subordinate employee being ineffective at conducting a meeting. Next, they must write down in their own words how they would coach this person based on the training they have just received. An expert rater then uses the performance rating scale to evaluate the written responses.

How to Use the Rating Instrument

The performance learning rating scale is used to evaluate responses to the following short essay: “write down in your own words how you would coach this person based on the training you just received.” After reading the response, a rater evaluates the quality of the response in relation to each of the components identified in the four steps in the coaching to improve team meeting performance.

The behavior learning rating scale uses a four point scale with 1 being the lowest rating and 4 being the highest point of the scale. The points and corresponding ratings are:

1  2  3  4
No evidence of key skill   Little evidence of key skill Some evidence of key skill Strong evidence of key skill

The criteria for rating each of the steps are listed in the table below. After reading the written response the rater will score each component of the step and add the numbers to arrive at a total score for each step. Next, the rater will add the scores for each step to arrive at a total final score for the written essay located at the end of the last table.
Behavior Response Rating Scale for the “Coaching for Improved Team Meeting Performance”

Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Steps for Coaching for Improved Team Meeting Performance</th>
<th>No evidence of key skill 1</th>
<th>Little evidence of key skill 2</th>
<th>Some evidence of key skill 3</th>
<th>Strong evidence of key skill 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. State the behavior observed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Gain the employee’s attention</td>
<td>Did not make any attempt to gain the employee’s attention before the coaching session started</td>
<td>Gained the employee’s attention, but used inappropriate words</td>
<td>Gained the employee’s attention to some extent</td>
<td>Gained the employee’s attention in a convincing way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Focus on the behavior</td>
<td>Did not state what behaviors were observed</td>
<td>Stated what was observed, but in an incomplete or accusatorily manner</td>
<td>Stated what was observed in an acceptable way</td>
<td>Stated what was observed in a complete and unambiguous way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Probe for a response</td>
<td>Did not ask why the person did the behavior</td>
<td>Asked why the person did the behavior, but it was in a disrespectful or accusatory manner</td>
<td>Asked why the person did the behavior in an acceptable way</td>
<td>Asked why the person did the behavior in a complete and unambiguous way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Participant Code __________

Rater Code __________

Total Score Step One ____
Behavior Response Rating Scale for the “Coaching for Improved Team Meeting Performance” Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Steps for Coaching for Improved Team Meeting Performance</th>
<th>No evidence of key skill 1</th>
<th>Little evidence of key skill 2</th>
<th>Some evidence of key skill 3</th>
<th>Strong evidence of key skill 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Wait for a complete response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Listen for a reason for the behavior</td>
<td>Did not identify a reason for the behavior</td>
<td>Identified a reason for the behavior, but in an incomplete manner</td>
<td>Identified a reason for the behavior in an acceptable way</td>
<td>Identified a reason for the behavior in a complete and acceptable way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Give the employee time to answer</td>
<td>Did not allow the employee time to answer</td>
<td>Gave the employee time to answer, but in an incomplete manner</td>
<td>Gave the employee time to answer in an acceptable way</td>
<td>Gave the employee time to answer in a complete and acceptable way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant Code</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rater Code</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Score Step Two ______
### Behavior Response Rating Scale for the “Coaching for Improved Team Meeting Performance” Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Steps for Coaching for Improved Team Meeting Performance</th>
<th>No evidence of key skill 1</th>
<th>Little evidence of key skill 2</th>
<th>Some evidence of key skill 3</th>
<th>Strong evidence of key skill 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. Explain what needs to be done</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Describe the importance of the correct behavior</td>
<td>Did not explain the benefits of the change</td>
<td>Explained the benefits of the change, but in an incomplete manner</td>
<td>Explained the benefits of the change in an acceptable way</td>
<td>Explained the benefits of the change in a complete and unambiguous way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Describe the consequences of the current behavior</td>
<td>Did not explain what will happen if the current behavior continues</td>
<td>Explained what will happen if the current behavior continues, but in an incomplete manner</td>
<td>Explained what will happen if the current behavior continues in an acceptable way</td>
<td>Explained what will happen if the current behavior continues in a complete and unambiguous way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Offer help and support</td>
<td>Did not offer help and support</td>
<td>Offered help and support, but in an incomplete manner</td>
<td>Offered help and support in an acceptable way</td>
<td>Offered help and support in a complete and unambiguous way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Participant Code __________  
Rater Code __________  
Total Score Step Three ______
### Behavior Response Rating Scale for the “Coaching for Improved Team Meeting Performance” Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Steps for Coaching for Improved Team Meeting Performance</th>
<th>No evidence of key skill</th>
<th>Little evidence of key skill</th>
<th>Some evidence of key skill</th>
<th>Strong evidence of key skill</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. Agree on the change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Remind the employee of the needed behavior change</td>
<td>Did not restate what the employee needs to do</td>
<td>Restated what the employee needs to do, but in an incomplete manner</td>
<td>Restated what the employee needs to do in an acceptable way</td>
<td>Restated what the employee needs to do in a complete and unambiguous way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Obtain a commitment from the employee to make the change</td>
<td>Did not obtain a commitment from the employee to make the change</td>
<td>Obtained a commitment from the employee to make the change, but in an incomplete or disrespectful manner</td>
<td>Obtained a commitment from the employee to make the change in an acceptable way</td>
<td>Obtained a commitment from the employee to make the change in a complete and unambiguous way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Show your appreciation</td>
<td>Did not show appreciation</td>
<td>Showed appreciation, but in an incomplete manner.</td>
<td>Showed appreciation in an acceptable way</td>
<td>Offered help and support in a complete and acceptable manner</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participant Code</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rater Code</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Score Step Four</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Final Score:  

Step one _____ +  Step two _____ +  Step three _____ +  Step four = _________ = Total: ______
APPENDIX F

COMPARISON OF NEAR AND FAR TRANSFER OF TRAINING DESIGN SPECIFICATIONS
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Near Transfer</th>
<th>Far Transfer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Title</strong></td>
<td>Coaching Supervisors to Conduct Team Meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rationale Statement</strong></td>
<td>The rationale statement will refer to the need to learn the training content to meet a specific work expectation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Training Objectives</strong></td>
<td>The training objectives will be related directly to the task statement – Conducting team meetings, which is a work expectation of supervisors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Training Content</strong></td>
<td>The training content will include a process that is specifically designed to help supervisors conduct team meetings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Training Events</strong></td>
<td>The training events will be the following: 1) Present the specific concept of coaching supervisors to conduct team meetings 2) Show the specific coaching model 3) Practice activity focusing on examples having a specific coaching context. 4) Evaluation of trainees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Performance Evaluation</strong></td>
<td>Trainees will be asked to demonstrate their ability to coach in specific situations related to conducting team meetings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX G

TRAINING MODULES

COACHING FOR IMPROVED TEAM MEETING PERFORMANCE AND
COACHING FOR IMPROVED JOB PERFORMANCE
Coaching for Improved Team Meeting Performance

B. Coaching Process

1. State the behavior observed during the team meeting

“Scott, I saw that you delayed the start of the team meeting. Can you tell me why you did not start on time?”

- **Attention** was gained by addressing the employee by his name, “Scott.”
- **The supervisor focused on the behavior** by stating, “you delayed the start of the team meeting.”
- **The supervisor probed for a response by asking, “why?”**
- **A neutral approach** was maintained by not yelling or using angry words.
Your Experience

Think about a time when you observed an employee being ineffective at conducting a team meeting. Describe in your words how you addressed this by responding to the following:

Describe the situation:

What did you say to the employee?

What was the outcome?

Rationale

Good managers conduct effective team meetings. Managers use coaching to help their subordinate employees improve their team meeting performance.

Much of your effectiveness as a coach depends on your understanding of coaching and ability to use the Coaching Process.
**Objectives**

By the conclusion of this program, you will

A. Describe what is coaching to improve team meeting performance

B. Describe the steps of the Coaching Process

C. Demonstrate the Coaching Process to improve team meeting performance

**Example**

While attending the weekly supervisor team meeting, Sally observes that Joan does not have an agenda prepared for the meeting. Sally interrupts the meeting and yells out to Joan asking why she does not have an agenda. Joan begins to respond, but Sally immediately says, “Don’t ever start another meeting without an agenda. How can you think of doing that?”

- Is this an example of good coaching?
- What is the likely effect on Joan as a person?
- What is the likely effect on Joan’s performance?
A. What is coaching?

Coaching comes in many different forms. One might coach a sports team. One might coach someone in making a speech.

We have a specific use of coaching. That is, to help others perform better. Our definition of coaching is:

*Coaching is the planned process used by managers to help subordinate employees improve their team meeting performance.*

A. What is coaching?

Let's summarize the four key parts:

1. Coaching is a planned process
2. Used by managers
3. To help subordinate employees
4. Improve their team meeting performance

*Is this definition similar to or different from your idea of coaching?*
B. Coaching Process

There are four steps in the Coaching Process:

1. **State** the behavior observed during the team meeting
2. **Wait** for a complete response
3. **Explain** what needs to be done to improve the team meeting
4. **Agree** on the team meeting change

Which of these coaching steps have you used? *Not used?*

---

B. Coaching Process

1. **State the behavior observed during the team meeting**

To do this, you would need to consider the following:

- Gain the employee’s attention
- Focus on the team meeting behavior
- Probe for a response
- Maintain a neutral approach
B. Coaching Process

1. State the behavior observed during the team meeting

   • Gain the employee's attention by... using his/her name.

   • Focus on the team meeting behavior by... stating what you observed during the meeting

   • Probe for a response by... asking why

   • Maintain a neutral approach by... using a calm voice tone

B. Coaching Process

1. State the behavior observed during the team meeting

   Examples of what you might say...

   “Scott, I saw that you delayed the start of the team meeting. Can you tell me why you did not start on time?”

   “Angie, I noticed that you did not follow the agenda for the team meeting. Can you tell why you did not follow the agenda?”

   “Maria, I noticed that you did not encourage participation from all team members during the weekly meeting. Can you tell why you did not encourage participation from everyone?”
Wrap Up

Using your handouts:

1. Generate an example from your own experience when you observed an employee being ineffective when conducting a meeting.

2. Write down in your own words how you would coach this person based on the training you just received.

B. Coaching Process

1. State the behavior observed during the team meeting

   "Angie, I noticed that you did not follow the agenda for the team meeting. Can you tell me why you did not follow the agenda?"

   **Attention** was gained by addressing the employee by her name, "Angie."

   The supervisor focused on the behavior by stating "you did not follow the agenda for the team meeting."

   The supervisor probed for a response by asking, "why?"

   A neutral approach was maintained by not yelling or using angry words."
B. Coaching Process

1. State the behavior observed during the team meeting

"Maria, I noticed that you did not encourage participation from all team members during the weekly meeting. Can you tell me why you did not encourage participation from everyone?"

Initial statement identify what we said to:

Gain attention:

Focus on the team meeting behavior:

Probe for a response:

Maintain a neutral approach:

What might you suggest state the behavior observed?

B. Coaching Process

Let's summarize the first step ....

1. State the behavior observed during the team meeting

- Gain the employee's attention:
- Focus on the behavior observed during the team meeting
- Probe for a response
- Maintain a neutral approach

By probing for a response in step one, you are ready to move to step two.
B. Coaching Process

2. Wait for a complete response

To do this, you would need to consider the following:

- Listen for a reason for the team meeting behavior
- Allow enough time for the employee to answer
- Remain calm *

* There may be situations when you should not remain calm. For example, if there is a safety issue, you may need to react quickly to prevent your employee from being harmed.

B. Coaching Process

2. Wait for a complete response

To do this, you would need to consider the following:

- Listen for a reason for the team meeting behavior observed during the meeting ... such as lack of knowledge or skills
- Give the employee time to answer: ... do not interrupt
- Remain calm ... ignore emotions
B. Coaching Process

2. Wait for a complete response

Examples of what you might hear...

“Two people were late and I didn’t want them to miss important information.”

“People kept bringing up items we had already finished discussing. I didn’t know what to do so I just let them continue talking.”

“I thought if they didn’t say anything they probably didn’t have anything important to add to our discussion.”
B. Coaching Process

2. Wait for a complete response

2. "Two people were late and I didn’t want them to miss important information."

What did the supervisor learn by waiting for a complete response?

B. Coaching Process

2. Wait for a complete response

1. “Angie, I noticed that you did not follow the agenda for the team meeting. Can you tell me why you did not follow the agenda?”

2. “People kept bringing up items we had already finished discussing. I didn’t know what to do so I just let them continue talking.”
B. Coaching Process

2. Wait for a complete response

2. "People kept bringing up items we had already finished discussing. I didn’t know what to do so I just let them continue talking."

The supervisor listened for a reason to explain why she did not follow the agenda. By doing this she identified lack of knowledge and skills. "I didn’t know what to do."

The supervisor gave ample time to answer and did not interrupt.

The supervisor remained calm and ignored emotions.

What did the supervisor learn by waiting for a complete response?

B. Coaching Process

2. Wait for a complete response

1. "Mania, I noticed that you did not encourage participation from all team members during the weekly team meeting. Can you tell me why you did not encourage participation from everyone?"

2. "I thought if they didn’t say anything, they probably didn’t have anything important to add to our discussion."

145
2. Wait for a complete response

"I thought if they didn’t say anything they probably didn’t have anything important to add to our discussion."

In this statement identify how the supervisor:

Listened for a reason for the team meeting behavior

Allowed time for Maria to answer

Remained calm:

---

B. Coaching Process

Let's summarize the second step .....  

2. Wait for a complete response

- Listen for a reason for the team meeting behavior
- Give the employee time to answer
- Remain calm

*By listening to the employee’s response in step two, you are ready to move to step three.*
B. Coaching Process

3. Explain what needs to be done to improve the team meeting

To do this, you would need to consider the following:

- Describe the importance of the correct team meeting behavior
- Describe the consequences of the current team meeting behavior
- Offer help and support
B. Coaching Process

3. Explain what needs to be done to improve the team meeting

Examples of what you might say...

“Scott, it’s important to start the team meeting promptly so that you can complete the agenda in a timely manner. If you don’t start on time you may not be able to cover all the agenda items. Do you have the ‘Effective Team Meeting’ module? I would be happy to review it with you.”

“John, you used to follow the agenda in a timely manner. The agenda should include time to be spent on each item. By following the agenda you can keep the process moving along. I’m facilitating a team meeting tomorrow, would you like to attend to observe the team meeting process?”

“Maria, it’s important to encourage participation from everyone. You need to be aware of non-participants and encourage them to speak by using phrases such as ‘haven’t heard from you today, what do you think about it’. Refer to the ‘Effective Team Meeting’ module for other examples of what you can say to encourage participation.”

B. Coaching Process

3. Explain what needs to be done to improve the team meeting

1. “Scott, I saw that delayed the start of the team meeting. Can you tell me why you didn’t start on time?”

2. “Two people were late and I didn’t want them to miss important information.”

3. “Scott, it’s important to start the team meeting promptly so you can complete the agenda in a timely manner. If you don’t start on time you may not be able to cover all the agenda items. Do you have the ‘Effective Team Meeting’ module? I would be happy to review it with you.”
B. Coaching Process

3. Explain what needs to be done to improve the team meeting

3. "Scott, it's important to start the team meeting promptly so you can complete the agenda in a timely manner. If you don't start on time you may not be able to cover all the agenda items. Do you have the 'Effective Team Meeting' module? I would be happy to review it with you."

The supervisor described the importance of the correct team meeting behavior by stating: "It's important to start the meeting promptly so you can complete the agenda in a timely manner."

The supervisor described the consequences of the current team meeting behavior by saying: "If you don't start on time you may not be able to cover all the agenda items."

The supervisor offered help and support by asking: "Have you the 'Effective Team Meeting' module? I would be happy to review it with you."

B. Coaching Process

3. Explain what needs to be done to improve the team meeting

1. "Angie, I noticed that you did not follow the agenda for the team meeting. Can you tell me why you did not follow the agenda?"

2. "People kept bringing up items we had already finished discussing; I didn't know what to do so I just let them continue talking."

3. Angie, you need to follow the agenda in a timely manner. The agenda should include the time to be spent on each item. By following the agenda you can keep the process moving along. I'm facilitating a team meeting tomorrow, would you like to attend to observe the meeting process?"
B. Coaching Process

3. Explain what needs to be done to improve the team meeting

3. Angie, you need to follow the agenda in a timely manner. The agenda should include the time to be spent on each item. By following the agenda, you can keep the process moving along. I'm facilitating a meeting tomorrow, would you like to attend to observe the meeting process?

The supervisor described the importance of the correct team meeting behavior by saying, "By following the agenda, you can keep the process moving along."

The supervisor explained the consequences of the current team meeting behavior by saying, "You need to follow the agenda in a timely manner. The agenda should include the time to be spent on each item."

The supervisor offered help and support by asking, "Would you like to attend to observe the meeting process?"

B. Coaching Process

3. Explain what needs to be done to improve the team meeting

1. "Maria, I noticed that you did not encourage participation from all team members during the weekly team meeting. Can you tell me why you did not encourage participation from everyone?"

2. "I thought if they didn't say anything, they probably didn't have anything important to add to our discussion."

3. "Maria, it's important to encourage participation from everyone. You need to be aware of non-participation and encourage them to speak by using phrases such as "We haven't heard from you today, what do you think about it?" Review the 'Effective Meeting Module' for other examples of what you can say to encourage participation."
B. Coaching Process

3. Explain what needs to be done to improve the team meeting

"Maria, it's important to encourage participation from everyone. You need to be aware of new participants and encourage them to speak by using phrases such as 'We haven't heard from you today, what do you think about?' Review the 'Effective Meeting Mingle' for other examples of what you can say to encourage participation."

In this statement, identify what was said to:

Describe the importance of the current team meeting behavior:

Describe the consequences of the current team meeting behavior:

Offer help and support:

What else might you say to explain what needs to be done to improve the team meeting?

B. Coaching Process

Let's summarize the third step ...

3. Explain what needs to be done to improve the team meeting

- Describe the importance of the corrected team meeting behavior
- Describe the consequences of the current team meeting behavior
- Offer help and support

By explaining what needs to be done in step three, you are ready to move to step four.
B. Coaching Process

4. Agree on the team meeting change

To do this you would need to consider the following:

- Remind the employee of the needed team meeting behavior change
- Obtain a commitment from the employee to make the team meeting change
- Show your appreciation

---

B. Coaching Process

4. Agree on the team meeting change

To do this you would need to consider the following:

- Remind the employee of the needed team meeting behavior change by... *restating what the employee needs to do*
- Obtain a commitment from the employee to make the team meeting change by... *asking for agreement*
- Show your appreciation by... *thanking the employee*
B. Coaching Process

4. Agree on the team meeting change

Examples of what you might say...

"Scott, it's my understanding that you will start the team meetings promptly so that the agenda can be covered in a timely manner. Is that correct? I appreciate your understanding the importance of starting on time."

"Angie, we agree that you will follow the agenda in a timely manner. Is that correct? Thanks for your help with this."

"Maria, encouraging participation from everyone is important. Do you agree? Thanks for your flexibility with this."

---

B. Coaching Process

4. Agree on the team meeting change

1. "Scott, I see that you delayed the start of the team meeting. Can you tell me why you did not start on time?"

2. "Two people were late and I didn't want them to miss important information."

3. "Scott, it's important to start the team meetings promptly so that you can complete the agenda in a timely manner. If you don't start on time you may not be able to cover all the agenda items. Do you have the 'Effective Team Meeting' module? I would be happy to review it with you."

4. "Scott, it's my understanding that you will start the team meetings promptly so that the agenda can be covered in a timely manner. Is that correct? I appreciate your understanding the importance of starting on time."

---
B. Coaching Process

4. Agree on the team meeting change

4. "Scott, it’s my understanding that you will start the team meetings promptly so that the agenda can be covered in a timely manner. Is that correct? I appreciate your understanding the importance of starting on time.”

The supervisor reminded Scott of the needed team meeting behavior change by asking, "Is my understanding that you will start the team meeting promptly?"

The supervisor obtained a commitment from Scott to make the team meeting change by asking, "Is that correct?"

The supervisor expressed appreciation by saying, "I appreciate your understanding.”

---

B. Coaching Process

4. Agree on the team meeting change

1. "Annie, I noticed that you did not follow the agenda for the team meeting. Can you tell me why you did not follow the agenda?”

2. “People kept bringing up items we had already finished discussing. I didn’t know what to do so I just let them continue talking.”

3. "Annie, you need to follow the agenda in a timely manner. Rite your monthly report. The agenda should include the time to be spent on each item. By following the agenda you can keep the process moving along. I’m facilitating a meeting tomorrow, would you like to attend to observe the meeting process?”

4. "Annie, so we agree that you will follow the agenda in a timely manner. Is that correct? Thanks for your help with this.”
B. Coaching Process

4. Agree on the team meeting change

4. "Anna, so we agree that you will follow the agenda in a timely manner. Is that correct? Thanks for your help with this."

The supervisor obtained a commitment from Anna to make the team meeting change by saying, "We agree... is that correct?"

The supervisor expressed appreciation by saying, "thanks for your help with that."

The supervisor reminded Anna of the needed team meeting behavior change by stating, "you will follow the agenda in a timely manner."

B. Coaching Process

4. Agree on the change

1. "Anna, I noticed that you did not encourage participation from all team members during the weekly team meeting. Can you tell me why you did not encourage participation from everyone?"

2. "I thought if they didn't say anything, they probably didn't have anything important to add to our discussion."

3. "Anna, it's important to encourage participation from everyone. You need to be aware of non-participants and encourage them to speak by using phrases such as, "We haven't heard from you today, what do you think about it?" Review the "Effective Meeting Module" for other examples of what you can say to encourage participation."

4. "Anna, encouraging participation from everyone is important. Do you agree? Thanks for your flexibility with this."
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B. Coaching Process

4. Agree on the change

4.“Maria, encouraging participation from everyone is important. Do you agree? Thanks for your flexibility with this.”

In this statement identify what was said to:

Describe the importance of the correct team meeting behavior:

Describe the consequence of the current team meeting behavior:

Offer help and support:

B. Coaching Process

Let’s summarize the fourth step...

4. Agree on the team meeting change

• Remind the employee of the needed team meeting behavior change
• Obtain a commitment from the employee to make the team meeting behavior change
• Show your appreciation
B. Coaching Process

Let’s summarize the four steps…

1. **State** the behavior observed during the team meeting
2. **Wait** for a complete response
3. **Explain** what needs to be done to improve the team meeting
4. **Agree** on the team meeting change

C. Demonstrate using the Coaching Process

Let’s see if you can demonstrate the steps of the Coaching Process.

Review the example from your own experience on page 2. Write down in your words how you would coach this person based on the training you just received.
Wrap Up

Using your handouts:

1. Generate an example from your own experience when you observed an employee being ineffective at his/her job.

2. Write down in your own words how you would coach this person based on the training you just received.

Coaching for Improved Job Performance
Your Experience

Think about a time when you observed an employee being ineffective at his/her job. Please describe in your words how you addressed this by responding to the following:

Describe the situation:

What did you say to the employee?

What was the outcome?

Rationale

Good managers are also good coaches. Managers use coaching to help their subordinate employees improve how they do their jobs.

Much of your effectiveness as a coach depends on your understanding of coaching and ability to use the Coaching Process.
Objectives

By the conclusion of this program, you will

A. Describe what is coaching to improve job performance

B. Describe the steps of the Coaching Process

C. Demonstrate the Coaching Process to improve job performance.

Example

Sally supervises the testing lab. One morning, she observes Joan adding liquid to a test sample without measuring the exact amount. Sally immediately yells out to Joan to stop what she is doing. Joan begins to respond, but Sally immediately says, “Don’t ever pour anything into a test sample without measuring it first. How can you think of doing that?”

• Is this an example of good coaching?
• What is the likely effect on Joan as a person?
• What is the likely effect on Joan’s performance?
A. What is coaching?

Coaching comes in many different forms. One might coach a sports team. One might coach someone in making a speech.

We have a specific use of coaching. That is, to help others perform better. Our definition of coaching is:

**Coaching is the planned process used by managers to help subordinate employees improve their job performance.**

A. What is coaching?

Let’s summarize the four key parts:

1. Coaching is a planned process
2. Used by managers
3. To help subordinate employees
4. Improve how people perform their jobs

*Is this definition similar to or different from your idea of coaching?*
B. Coaching Process

There are four steps in the Coaching Process:

1. **State** the behavior observed
2. **Wait** for a complete response
3. **Explain** what needs to be done
4. **Agree** on the change

*Which of these coaching steps have you used? Not used?*

---

B. Coaching Process

1. **State the behavior observed**

To do this, you would need to consider the following:

- Gain the employee’s attention
- Focus on the behavior
- Probe for a response
- Maintain a neutral approach

---
B. Coaching Process

1. State the behavior observed

   • Gain the employee's attention by ... using his/her name.

   • Focus on the behavior by ... stating what you observed

   • Probe for a response by ... asking why

   • Maintain a neutral approach by ... using a calm voice tone

B. Coaching Process

1. State the behavior observed

   Examples of what you might say . . .

   “Scott, I saw that you were not using the on-line help desk. Can you tell me why you were not using the on-line help desk?”

   “Angie, I noticed that you did not complete your weekly report. Can you tell me why you did not complete the report?”

   “Marla, I noticed that you had ten keying errors on the data entry report. Can you tell me why there were so many errors?”
B. Coaching Process

1. State the behavior observed

"Scott, I saw that you were not using the online help desk. Can you tell me why you were not using the online help desk?"

- **Attention** was gained by addressing the employee by his name, "Scott."
- The supervisor **focused on the behavior** by stating, "I saw that you were not using the online help desk."
- The supervisor **probed for a response** by asking, "why?"
- A neutral approach was maintained by not yelling or using angry words.

---

B. Coaching Process

1. State the behavior observed

"Angie, I noticed that you did not complete your weekly report. Can you tell me why you did not complete the report?"

- **Attention** was gained by addressing the employee by her name, "Angie."
- The supervisor **focused on the behavior** by stating "you did not complete the weekly report."
- The supervisor **probed for a response** by asking, "why?"
- A neutral approach was maintained by not yelling or using angry words."
B. Coaching Process

1. State the behavior observed

"Maria, I noticed that you had ten keying errors on the data entry report. Can you tell me why there were so many errors?"

In this statement identify what was said to:

- Gain attention:
- Focus on the behavior:
- Probe for a response:
- Maintain a neutral approach:

What else might you say to state the behavior observed?

---

B. Coaching Process

Let's summarize the first step....

1. State the behavior observed

- Gain the employee's attention
- Focus on the behavior
- Probe for a response
- Maintain a neutral approach

By probing for a response in step one, you are ready to move to step two.
2. Wait for a complete response

To do this, you would need to consider the following:

- Listen for a reason for the behavior
- Allow enough time for the employee to answer
- Remain calm *

* There may be situations when you should not remain calm. For example, if there is a safety issue, you may need to react quickly to prevent your employee from being harmed.
B. Coaching Process

2. Wait for a complete response

Examples of what you might hear...

“I feel like the on-line help desk slows me down. I have never been comfortable with it.”

“I didn’t realize that I had to complete the report weekly. I thought you only wanted the written report monthly.”

“Susan never finished training me on keying techniques.”
B. Coaching Process

2. Wait for a complete response

2. “I feel like the on-line help desk slows me down. I have never been comfortable with it.”

The supervisor listened for a reason for the behavior by allowing Scott time to explain why he was not using the on-line help desk. By doing this the supervisor identified a lack of knowledge or skills.

The supervisor gave Scott time to answer and did not interrupt.

The supervisor remained calm and ignored emotions.

What did the supervisor learn by waiting for a complete response?

B. Coaching Process

2. Wait for a complete response

1. “Angie, I noticed that you did not complete your weekly report. Can you tell me why you did not complete the report?”

2. “I didn’t realize that I had to complete the report weekly. I thought you only wanted the report monthly.”
B. Coaching Process

2. Wait for a complete response

2. "I didn’t realize that I had to complete the report weekly. I thought you only wanted the report monthly."

What did the supervisor learn by waiting for a complete response?

B. Coaching Process

2. Wait for a complete response

1. "Maria, I noticed that you had ten keying errors on the data entry report. Why?"

2. "Susan, never finished training on keying techniques."

In this statement, identify how the supervisor:

Listened for a reason for the behavior:

Allowed time for Maria to answer:

Remained calm:

What did the supervisor learn by waiting for a complete response?
B. Coaching Process

Let’s summarize the second step ..... 

2. Wait for a complete response
   - Listen for a reason for the behavior
   - Give the employee time to answer
   - Remain calm

By listening to the employee’s response in step two, you are ready to move to step three.

B. Coaching Process

3. Explain what needs to be done

To do this, you would need to consider the following:

- Describe the importance of the correct behavior
- Describe the consequences of the current behavior
- Offer help and support
B. Coaching Process

3. **Explain what needs to be done**

To do this, you would need to consider the following:

- Describe the importance of the correct behavior by... **explaining how the change will benefit the employee**

- Describe the consequences of the current behavior by... **explaining what will happen if the current behavior continues**

- Offer help and support by... **asking what the employee needs**

---

B. Coaching Process

3. **Explain what needs to be done**

Examples of what you might say...

“Scott, by using the online help desk your productivity will increase. If you don’t use it, your productivity will decrease. Would some additional training be useful?”

“Augie, writing your weekly reports will save you time when writing your monthly report. Also, human resources needs the staffing update from your report to fill your open positions. I would be happy to review the report with you.”

“Maria, reducing your keying errors will increase your productivity. Having to correct ten errors will slow down your daily work. I will talk to Susan about finishing your training.”

---
B. Coaching Process

3. Explain what needs to be done

1. “Scott, I saw that you were not using the on-line help desk. Can you me why you were not using the on-line help desk?”

2. “I feel like the on-line help desk slows me down. I have never been comfortable with it.”

3. “Scott, by using the on-line help desk your productivity will increase. If you don’t use it your productivity will decrease. Would some additional training be useful?”

The supervisor described the importance of the current behavior by stating: “You don’t use the on-line help desk; your productivity will increase.”

The supervisor described the consequences of the current behavior by saying: “You don’t use the on-line help desk; your productivity will decrease.”

The supervisor offered help and support by adding: “Would some additional training be useful?”

The supervisor described the importance of the current behavior by stating: “You don’t use the on-line help desk; your productivity will increase.”

The supervisor described the consequences of the current behavior by saying: “You don’t use the on-line help desk; your productivity will decrease.”

The supervisor offered help and support by adding: “Would some additional training be useful?”

The supervisor described the importance of the current behavior by stating: “You don’t use the on-line help desk; your productivity will increase.”

The supervisor described the consequences of the current behavior by saying: “You don’t use the on-line help desk; your productivity will decrease.”

The supervisor offered help and support by adding: “Would some additional training be useful?”
B. Coaching Process

3. Explain what needs to be done

1. "Angie, I noticed that you did not complete your weekly report. Can you tell me why you did not complete the report?"

2. "I didn’t realize that I had to complete the report weekly. I thought you only wanted the report monthly."

3. "Angie, writing your weekly reports will save you time when you write your monthly report. Also, human resources needs the staffing update from your report. Without this information, there could be delays in filling your open positions. Are you comfortable with the format of the weekly report? I would be happy to review it with you."

B. Coaching Process

3. Explain what needs to be done

3. "Angie, writing your weekly reports will save you time when you write your monthly report. Also, human resources needs the staffing update from your report. Without this information, there could be delays in filling your open positions. Are you comfortable with the format of the weekly report? I would be happy to review it with you."

The supervisor described the importance of the current behavior by saying: "Writing your weekly reports will save you time when you write your monthly report."

The supervisor described the consequences of the current behavior by saying: "Without the staffing information, there could be delays in filling your open positions."

The supervisor offered help and support by saying: "Are you comfortable with the format of the weekly report? I would be happy to review it with you."
B. Coaching Process

3. Explain what needs to be done

1. "María, I noticed that you had tenkeying errors on the data entry report. Why?"

2. "Susan never finished training me on keying techniques."

3. "María, reducing your keying errors will reduce your re-works. This will save
time and increase your productivity. Having to correct ten errors will slow down
your daily work. It's important that you finish the training. Would you like me to
talk to Susan about finishing your training?"

In this statement identify what was said to:

Describe the importance of the correct behavior:

Describe the consequences of the current behavior:

Offer help and support

What else might you say to explain what needs to be done?
B. Coaching Process

Let's summarize the third step ...

3. Explain what needs to be done

- Describe the importance of the corrected behavior
- Describe the consequences of the current behavior
- Offer help and support

By explaining what needs to be done in step three, you are ready to move to step four.

B. Coaching Process

4. Agree on the change

To do this you would need to consider the following:

- Remind the employee of the needed behavior change
- Obtain a commitment from the employee to make the change
- Show your appreciation
B. Coaching Process

4. Agree on the change

To do this you would need to consider the following:

- Remind the employee of the needed behavior change by... *restating what the employee needs to do*
- Obtain a commitment from the employee to make the change by... *asking for agreement*
- Show your appreciation by... *thanking the employee*

B. Coaching Process

4. Agree on the change

Examples of what you might say...

“Scott, it’s my understanding that you will use the on-line help desk whenever it’s available. Is that correct? Thank you for your willingness to use the on-line desk.”

“Angie, do we agree that your weekly reports will be turned in Friday’s by 3:00. Is that correct? Thanks for your help with this.”

“Maria, finishing the training will help reduce your errors. Do you agree? Thanks for your flexibility to complete the training.”
B. Coaching Process

4. Agree on the change

1. “Scott, I see that you were not using the on-line help desk. Why?”

2. “I feel like it slows me down. I have never been comfortable with it.”

3. “Scott, you need to use the on-line help desk. By using the on-line help desk your productivity will increase. If you don’t use it your productivity will decrease over time. Also, you will need to teach new employees how to use it. Would some additional on-line help desk training be useful? If so, I can schedule you in the next class.”

4. “Scott, it’s my understanding that you will use the on-line help desk whenever it’s available. Is that correct? Thank you for your willingness to use the on-line help desk.”
B. Coaching Process

4. Agree on the change

1. "Angie, I noticed that you did not complete your weekly report. Why?"

2. "I didn’t realize that I had to complete the report weekly. I thought you only wanted the report monthly."

3. "Angie, writing your weekly reports will save you time when you write your monthly report. Also, if you don’t write your weekly report human resources will not have your staffing update. This could cause a delay in filling your open positions. Are you comfortable with the format of the weekly report? I would be happy to review it with you."

4. "Angie, so we agree that your weekly reports will be turned in Friday’s by 3:00. Is that correct? Thanks for your help with this."
B. Coaching Process

4. Agree on the change

1. “Maria, I noticed that you had ten keying errors on the data entry report. Why?”

2. “Susan never finished training me on keying techniques.”

3. “Maria, reducing your keying errors will reduce your reworks. This will save time and increase your productivity. Having to correct ten errors will slow down your daily work. It’s important that you finish the training. Would you like me to talk to Susan about finishing your training?”

4. “Maria, finishing the training will help reduce your errors. Do you agree? Thanks for your flexibility to complete the training.”

B. Coaching Process

4. Agree on the change

4. “Maria, finishing the training will help reduce your errors. Do you agree? Thanks for your flexibility to complete the training.”

In this statement, identify what was said to:

- Restate Maria of the desired behavior change:

- Obtain a commitment from Maria to make the change:

- Show appreciation:

What else might you say to obtain agreement to the change?
B. Coaching Process

Let's summarize the fourth step...

4. Agree on the change
   - Remind the employee of the needed behavior change
   - Obtain a commitment from the employee to make the change
   - Show your appreciation
C. Demonstrate using the Coaching Process

Let's see if you can demonstrate the steps of the Coaching Process.

Review the example from your own experience on page 2. Write down in your words how you would coach this person based on the training you just received.
APPENDIX H

CHECKLIST FOR REVIEWERS OF TRAINING MODULES
Checklist for Reviewers

Directions for Reviewers: Please use this checklist to review the training module “Coaching to Improve Job Performance.” For each question appearing in the left column below, you will (✓) yes or no in the right column. By completing this checklist, you will help identify the means by which the module can be improved prior to delivery of the training. Thank you for your assistance.

Response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The objectives of the training module are clearly stated.</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The training materials are clearly based on the instructional objectives.</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Is the sequence understandable?</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Are the training materials clear?</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Do the training activities match the objectives?</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Are trainees given adequate examples of content?</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Are trainees given adequate opportunities to practice what they learn?</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Are trainees given adequate opportunities to receive feedback on how well they practiced?</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Are trainees given an opportunity to demonstrate the task to the level defined by the training objective?</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Are there any other issues you noticed that should be considered during revision? If yes, describe below.</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Concepts:

1. Coaching for Improved Job Performance

2. Coaching for Improved Team Meeting Performance

Common Attributes:

1. Important behavior of supervisors
2. Occurs in the context of the workday and workplace
3. Scenarios follow the same steps; setting of the situation and content of the action

Varying Attributes:

1. Differ in degree of focus
   a. Coaching for Improved Job Performance focuses on improving performance in a variety of work contexts
   b. Coaching for Improved Team Meeting Performance is directly linked to the training objective of meetings as the context

2. Differ in content
   a. The training content will include a process that can be used in a variety of coaching situations.
   b. The training content will include a process that is specifically designed to help supervisors conduct team meetings.

3. Definitions
   a. Coaching for Improved Job Performance
   Coaching is the planned process used by managers to help subordinate employees improve their job performance.
   b. Coaching for Improved Team Meeting Performance
   Coaching is the planned process used by managers to help subordinate employees improve their team meeting performance.
APPENDIX J

FACILITATION CHECKLIST FOR TRAINERS
Facilitation Checklist

1. Introduce yourself: Welcome to the training program on coaching, my name is…
2. Have trainees fill out name cards
3. Have trainees introduce themselves: Name, Department
4. State: As mentioned in your invitation letter this program is being offered as part of a research study being conducted at Ohio State University, in the College of Education, Workforce Development and Education. Your participation in this program will provide useful information on coaching and help with your supervisory skill development.
5. Have them sign consent form: Top line right hand column (participant)
6. Have them fill out participant information sheet
7. Proceed with training module exactly as written
8. Complete Activity One: Wrap up: Using your handout generate an example from your own experience when you observed an employee being ineffective at his /her job. Write down in your own words how you would coach this person based on the training you just received.
9. Complete Activity Two: Coaching scenarios
10. Drawing for Gift Certificate (collect name cards and have someone draw)
11. Collect: Participant Information sheets, trainee generated scenario using the four steps, and the coaching scenario activity.