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Many HRD professionals have pointed out that one of the most important elements for transfer of training to the workplace is management support. However, there is little discussion concerning management characteristics that support the transfer of training to the workplace. The purpose of this study was to investigate management characteristics that inhibit or promote the transfer of training to the workplace and to provide information regarding those characteristics to companies.

This study focused on one main question: Do management characteristics have an effect on management support of the transfer of training to the workplace? To answer this question, a study was conducted in which 153 middle and lower health managers responded to a survey. Data were collected from five health districts in Saudi Arabia.

Two management characteristics were chosen for this study: the managers' level of education, and management training experience (the number of training courses that managers attended in their work experience). The study tested three dependent variables: (1) management's commitment, (2) management's reinforcement, and (3) management's satisfaction concerning the transfer of training to the workplace.
Differences between the two groups were measured and tested for significance using the \( t \) test for the independent sampling.

The results of this study showed a statistical difference between the managers' level-of-education mean and the management's commitment mean, indicating that the level of education has an effect on management's commitment to the transfer of training in the workplace.

No evidence was found to support that management's level of education has an effect on management's reinforcement or management's satisfaction regarding the transfer of training to the workplace.

No evidence was found that management training experiences have an effect on management's commitment, reinforcement, or satisfaction toward the transfer of training to the workplace.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Saudi leaders realize the importance of training and development of workers in the workplace. They know that the training and development of their workers will raise the level of employee competency and, thus, enable employees to bridge the gap between their actual performance and the organization standard (needed) performance levels.

Every 5 years the Saudi government establishes a new 5-year plan for development. During the third 5-year plan (1980–1985), the Saudi government spent $33.15 billion for training and development. Of the total 1984–1985 budget, 11.7% was allocated to human resource development (Embassy, 1985). During the fourth 5-year plan (1985–1990), the government expenditure for human resource development increased to $36.32 billion, about 20% of the total planned civilian expenditure (Ministry of Planning, 1985). The government enacted a law requiring every agency to provide specific training for at least 5% of its employees annually (Alseneady, 1992). As a result, Saudi government agencies send hundreds of thousands of their employees for training and development each year.

Most employees are trained at the Institute of Public Administration; the remainder are trained at other governmental training centers or are sent abroad. In 1986, 2,127 employees successfully completed training at the Institute of Public Administration. Ten years later, in 1996, 12,782 employees successfully completed training at the Institute (Institute of Public Administration Report, 1996). This
dramatic increase in the number of trainees resulted in an increase in cost
effectiveness for training in government agencies. In other words, the trainee rate of
increase was approximately 83% during the 10-year span of 1986–1996.

Government employee training is one of the most important tasks that must
be carried out by the CEO of any government agency. Consequently, most
government agencies have established a training department, which is responsible for
designing and delivering the training activities for their organization. This also means
each training department creates its own budget to meet the increased demand.

Although not addressed in this study, several possible questions warrant
investigation in future studies. Do government agencies receive benefits from the
money spent on training? Do trained employees share with management their
increased knowledge, improved skills, and positive attitude acquired at the Institute
of Public Administration or other training centers? Does their training really add
value to the organizations? Do the agencies get their “money’s worth”? (Brinkerhoff,
1987).

Newstrom (1986) wrote:

It has been estimated that over $100 billion is spent annually on all types of
training in the United States, making it a huge economic undertaking;
unfortunately, according to some observers, as little as 10 percent of the
expenditure pays off in actual behavior change on the job, resulting in an
astoundingly high 90 percent relapse rate. (p. 34)

Although studies of training impact have been done in the United States, no
similar investigation of the benefit of training efforts transferred to the workplace by
employees has been conducted in Saudi Arabia.

This research study investigates the extent to which characteristics of public
sector management support the transfer of learning to the public sector workplace in
Saudi Arabia. The focus is to what extent the characteristics of health managers in Saudi Arabia support the transfer of training to the workplace.

Broad and Newstrom (1992) believe that lack of support from management is one of the biggest barriers facing trainees in the transfer of knowledge, skills, and attitudes to their workplace. Georgenson (1982) believes that of all the potential influences, the immediate supervisor has the greatest impact on the transfer of learning. On the other hand, Phillips (1991) mentioned that the management of the organization is ultimately responsible for development through their commitment, support, reinforcement, and involvement; the extent of their influence ultimately determines the success of any human resource development (HRD) effort (p. 301). He added that managers are responsible for allocating resources for human resource programs and allowing their employees to attend training programs. But first and foremost, they reinforce new knowledge, skills, and attitudes in the workplace.

Statement of the Problem

The purpose of human resource development is to change the work environment, specifically in improved employee knowledge, skills, and attitude, or in the culture of the organization. Furthermore, HRD can be used to move individuals from a current performance status to the organization's desired, or standard, outcomes. The ultimate measure of training success is the transfer of the new knowledge, skills, and attitude to the workplace (Brinkerhoff, 1994).

Human resource development helps an organization to enhance workforce effectiveness and productivity through learning and other performance improvement activities (Broad & Newstrom, 1992, p. 4). If the impact of HRD is not realized, the
result will be a waste of money and time (Brethower, 1995; Brinkerhoff, 1987) and the organization's ultimate goal will never be reached (Kelly, 1982).

HRD impact may not be realized for a variety of reasons. If trainees perform extremely well by the end of the training session but their productivity remains the same after returning to work, then the organization should determine why productivity has not increased before investing additional time and money in training. Feldman (1981) raised the question: How often have human resource professionals observed a group of employees who successfully completed their training program, only to discover later that they were not using the knowledge, skills, and attitude on the job?

Robinson (1996) theorized that only 30% of what people learn in training actually is used on the job. Baldwin and Ford's (1988) study concluded that American industries annually spend up to $100 billion on training and development, yet only 10% of these expenditures actually result in transfer of new knowledge, skills, and attitude to the workplace.

The problem of training transfer is a critical one for the human resource development profession (Georgenson, 1982). Robinson (1985) stated that too often employees attend a training session but only a low percentage of the skill transfers to the job. When this happens, everyone—including the trainer, the trainee, and the manager—loses and, overall, so does the organization.

Newstrom (1986), in his research, identified nine barriers to transfer of training: (1) lack of reinforcement on the job, (2) interference from the immediate environment, (3) nonsupportive organizational climates, (4) lack of training program practicality, (5) irrelevant training content, (6) the feeling that change would be uncomfortable, (7) separation from the trainer, (8) poor delivery of training
programs, and (9) negative peer pressure (p. 36). Barriers 1, 2, 3, 6, and 9 are outside the control of human resource development and the responsibility of the trainee manager and the organization. Human resource development and the organization manager share responsibility for barriers 4, 5, and 7. Only barrier 8 is the responsibility of human resource development. In other words, management is really more responsible for transferring training to the workplace than human resource development.

Newstrom (1986) suggested that most efforts are spent on the training design and delivery. As a result, there are low payoffs for those who sponsor training programs. However, if more effort is expended on the support of these training programs, the result will be a huge payoff in the impact of such training. In other words, if the management is supportive of such training, the likelihood for transfer of training will increase, and if it does not, then the training payoff will be low.

The fifth 5-year development plan in Saudi Arabia (1990–1995), stated:

There is evidence to suggest that the extent of effectiveness of training institutions is weak in terms of their output matching the market need for high quality trained labor. This requires greater emphasis on guidance and orientation programs, intensive activities in various areas, and increased effectiveness of technical and administrative training programs, but within and outside the Kingdom. (p. 277)

Broad and Newstrom (1992) asked, Where are the most critical transfer barriers? Is it the trainee, the training center, the management, the subordinate, the peers, or the culture that inhibits the transfer of knowledge and skills? Broad (1982) suggested that the human resource development profession has concentrated only on developing effective training design to increase the rate of transfer of learning. As a result, we have “nonsupportive” transfer of training in the workplace (Broad & Newstrom, 1992). Broad (1982) believes the problem of transfer is in lack of
management support to the newly educated. Robinson (1985) stated that in a survey of more than 250 training managers involved in supervisory development, more than 80% reported that the trainee manager is the barrier to learning transfer.

Broad and Newstrom (1992) also found that management is the most critical factor controlling transfer of learning in an organization. With manager support, the transfer of knowledge and skills can increase the potential for organizational productivity improvement; without manager support, no changes can occur.

Some research suggests that the higher the management or supervisory involvement in the training program, the higher the transfer of learning. Similarly, if support from management is low, a lack of transfer of learning will result (Brinkerhoff, 1987; Trammell, 1987).

Therefore, the major focus of this study is the middle and the lower manager. According to the literature reviewed, the most support/nonsupport behaviors come from the immediate supervisor or the line manager (Robinson & Robinson, 1985). Do management characteristics (i.e., the level of education and training experience) have any effect on management support of the transfer of training to the workplace? The questions to be answered are:

1.0. Do management characteristics affect the management support of the transfer of training (learning) to the workplace?

1.1. Do the education levels of managers have an effect on their commitment toward the transfer of training to the workplace?

1.2. Does the managers' level of education affect their satisfaction toward the transfer of training to the workplace?

1.3. Does the managers' level of education affect their reinforcement of transfer of training to the workplace?
1.4. Do the managers' training experiences affect the management’s commitment toward the transfer of training to the workplace?

1.5. Do the managers' training experiences affect their satisfaction toward the transfer of training to the workplace?

1.6. Do managers' training experiences affect their reinforcement of the transfer of training to the workplace?

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to investigate the relationship between Saudi health managers' characteristics and the transfer of learning to the workplace. Do certain management characteristics inhibit the managers' support of the transfer of training to the workplace? This study also points out transfer barriers from the managerial perspective and offers some suggestions to overcome these barriers. In addition, this study provides the HRD professional and decision-makers in Saudi Arabia with ways and means for dealing with transfer of training beyond the classroom.

Importance of the Study

Human resource development does not end with a well developed program, nor does it end with well-trained employees, unless the knowledge, skills, and attitude they gain are transferred and applied to the workplace (Brinkerhoff, 1994; Robinson, 1989). The transfer of training is a key criterion for evaluating the effectiveness of any formal training program (Kirkpatrick, 1994; Pray, 1990).

King (1996) stated that human resource development cannot do the job of transferring learning, except in providing the tools and giving support during the
process. It is up to the management and the employees to ensure the transfer of learning.

This study investigates the relationship between health district managers' characteristics and their support of the transfer of learning to the workplace in Saudi Arabia.

The results of this study will help Saudi Arabian professionals to redesign their HRD activities, policies and procedures, and programs to go beyond the classroom context in order to maximize the transfer of learning to the workplace. The study results will help top management revisit their HRD strategies and goals and further encourage the middle manager to support transfer of learning.

Limitations of the Study

This study was limited to the middle management in the health districts of the public sector employees in Saudi Arabia—those individuals who work within the civil bureau governmental jobs in Saudi Arabia. Thus, the ability to generalize the results of the study is limited.

Overview of the Study

This study is organized into five chapters. Chapter I presents the introduction and the background of the study. It includes the problem statement, the purpose of the study, questions to be answered, the importance of the study, and the limitations of the study.

Chapter II is a review of the research and literature related to the topic of the study. Within this chapter is a brief review of the background of learning concepts and learning organization; Human Resource Development (HRD) training, cost of
training, transfer of training, training barriers that overall inhibit the transfer of 
learning to the workplace; management and the transfer of training, management 
characteristics and the transfer of learning. In addition, the study includes a general 
background of the workforce in Saudi Arabia the training policy in Saudi Arabia, the 
public sector training centers, and the training cost in Saudi Arabia. The chapter 
concludes with definitions of terms.

Chapter III presents the design of the study. This chapter includes the setting 
of the study, sample procedure, population, target sample, research variables, study 
hypotheses, survey instrument, construction of the instrument, testing the instrument, 
pilot study of the instrument, and measuring and scaling. Lastly, the chapter discusses 
data collection and procedure.

Chapter IV contains four sections: (1) the respondents’ characteristics, (2) the 
statement responses, (3) testing the hypotheses, and (4) summarization of the 
findings. These sections include the analysis of collected data. The statistical methods 
are described and the findings are presented and explained.

Chapter V has three main sections: (1) discussion of the study, (2) 
recommendations and implications, and (3) suggestions for future study.
CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

The Need for Learning

Because the world has become more interconnected and the work environment more elaborate and complicated, learning has become the most important element in an organization’s effectiveness. The workplace is constantly changing; therefore, continual learning is a vital ingredient in any organization. For an organization to survive and be effective, it must strive to keep up to date (Senge, 1990). Senge states that organizations must be “learningful.”

According to Senge (1990), the more we create a learning atmosphere in the organization, the more we can produce extraordinary results. Burns (1978) stated that learning in the organization is the essential capacity for self-actualization and is necessary for transformational leadership.

To transform the transactional organization from rigorous policies and procedures into a learning organization, all managers and employees in the organization must be given time and opportunity to learn and must be motivated to learn and use new knowledge and ideas (Brandon, 1993; Senge, 1990). Furthermore, an organization learns through its employees. The organization will benefit a great deal from individuals who pass along their knowledge to the rest of the group (Mills, 1992). To build a learning organization, leaders and management must commit to the
knowledge and have a mechanism to renew knowledge so learning can continue (Mills, 1992).

Leaders and followers, managers and employees, must work together to remove the roadblocks that hinder learning and to embrace a new practice (McGill, 1993). Leaders and managers must work as teachers, designers, and stewards (Senge, 1990). The entire organization must provide a supportive environment for newly learned skills and ideas. In other words, every organization must continuously possess the skills and knowledge that distinguish it from traditional organizations (Senge, 1990). To be a learning organization, it must adopt the following assumptions:

1. Everybody can be a source of knowledge and skill.
2. Learning must come from the top management as well as from employees below and from all directions.
3. New ideas are welcome.
4. Mistakes are regarded as opportunities (Kramlinger, 1992).

Further, the organization must create a learning environment to continue to learn and explore new experimentation, establishing a network between the knowledge resource and members of the organization. Managers must have a good information system, and the organization must establish a reward with benefits to help reinforce the new learning. Human resource development must select the right people for the right program. Finally, the organization's leadership must support the new learning or the human resource development activities (McGill, 1993).
Human Resource Development

Nadler (1984) defined *human resource development* as “an organized learning experience in a definite time period to increase the possibility of improving job performance growth” (p. 1). Human resource development can take many different forms. Nadler (1982) maintained that HRD is education if the purpose is to help individuals with future jobs or a different job. It can be considered development if the purpose is to strengthen the organization through individual performance improvement. HRD may be regarded as training if the purpose is to improve current jobs, or it may be a combination or variant of all these types (Brinkerhoff, 1987).

Training

Training is a planned learning experience formulated to cause ultimate change in personnel knowledge, skill, and attitude (Campbell, Dunnette, Lawler, & Weick, 1970). The purpose of training is to help individuals develop knowledge, skills, and attitude that will increase their performance when applied to the workplace (Brinkerhoff, 1987).

Brinkerhoff (1994) stated that highly effective training has four subprocesses: (1) formulating training goals, (2) planning training strategies, (3) producing learning outcomes, and (4) supporting performance improvement (p. 1). Brinkerhoff added that effective training needs support performance improvement, which means that training requires all people within an organization to work as partners in the training process. As a partner in the training intervention, the supervisor must be both trainer and trainee. Kelly (1992) defined *partnership* as people united to work as a team, to work toward the same purpose and goals to overcome barriers. All must support
(a) training goals and strategies; (b) retraining by motivating trainees to acquire knowledge, skills, and a new attitude in the training center; (c) training during the training session by following the trainees’ progress; and (d) training after trainees return to the workplace by encouraging the new knowledge, skills, and attitudes in the workplace. In other words, if learning is not enforced on the job, the training will fail (Brinkerhoff, 1994).

The Cost of Training

If not transferred to the workplace, training can be very costly. Training requires the trainee to leave the job site, which may cause a problem for the supervisor when skilled managers are scarce, and for the trainees’ colleagues who must carry the extra workload. The problem is further complicated when the trainee does not accomplish the organization’s goal. In other words, if the employee does not use the new knowledge and skills on the job, resources are wasted. Training is often provided for the wrong people at the wrong time (Brethower, 1995) or the wrong program is presented to the wrong people in the wrong way. Employees are sometimes given training to get them out of the way, as a reward for mistakes, or to escape heavy responsibility, as some HRD researchers indicated. The impact of training must transfer to the workplace.

Transfer of Training

Broad and Newstrom (1992) defined transfer of learning as “the effective and continuing application by trainees to their jobs of the knowledge and skills gained in training—both on and off the job” (p. 6). The transfer of training is one of the key
criteria for evaluating the effectiveness of any formal training program (Kirkpatrick, 1994).

King (1996) describes the lack of transfer of learning as someone who attends a training session and then drops the learning between the classroom and the workplace. She added that bridging the gap is commonly called *transfer of learning*. If learners apply what they learn in the workshop, then there will be a return on the investment. If, on the other hand, the new skills and knowledge are not transferred to the workplace, the return on the investment is poor (Parry, 1990). Michalak (1981) believes that an effective training program must accomplish two things: the acquisition and maintenance of behaviors (p. 2). He defined the maintenance of learning behaviors as "anything that keeps acquired skill or knowledge up to the performance standard" (p. 22).

For transfer of training (also called transfer of learning) to be successful, there must be an environment that supports the new skills, knowledge, and attitude (Warshauer, 1988). Robinson and Robinson (1985) describe three types of transfer of skills: (1) what the learner experiences and brings to the workplace, (2) the response of the immediate supervisor/manager, and (3) the response of the organization itself.

Transfer of skill begins when both the learning experience and work environment labor together to achieve the same goal and results. Robinson (1985) developed an equation that illustrates the impact of the relationship between the work environment (WE) and the learning experience (LE): Work Environment × Learning Experiences = Result. Learning experiences come from the learning activities gained by the trainee who attended the training center. Human resource development is in charge of this part of the equation. A score of 0 on any of these variables will cause a
0 in the equation’s result (Robinson, 1985). In other words, if the work environment does not support newly learned skills, then the result of that training is 0.

Robinson and Robinson (1985) described the successful work environment as having three elements: the learner (L), the boss (B), and the organization (O), thus the equation $L \times LE \times B \times O = \text{Transfer}$. The Learner $\times$ the Learning Experiences $\times$ the Boss $\times$ the Organization results in successful transfer of learning.

The work environment may include the organizational culture, management support, attitude of the peers, etc. Two things can be done to ensure the work environment will successfully support the transfer of learning: (1) evaluate the work environment or the organizational culture before training to identify any barriers, and (2) help the line manager to reduce or remove barriers or obstacles (Robinson, 1985).

Organizational culture may serve as an informal guide for people within the organization. In other words, it will generate a new atmosphere that affects how people behave and the type of interpersonal reactions that will exist in the organization (Schein, 1986). On the other hand, culture provides the glue that holds the organization together and stimulates commitment toward a common goal (Peter & Waterman, 1982). Furthermore, the functions of culture are to unite the organization, transmit learning, give meaning to the organization’s members, and deal with member behavior (Gorman, 1989). In other words, the work environment is one of the transfer barriers that may inhibit the transfer of training to the workplace.

Transfer Barriers

Brinkerhoff (1994) indicated that an organization has the power to train or untrain its employees. To “train employees” means to motivate and reinforce them to use their new knowledge on the job, which results in the transfer of training to the
workplace. In addition, an organization can untrain its employees by not supporting trainees in using their new knowledge and skills, and, as a result, new learning will not transfer to the workplace.

Trainees learn what they are supposed to know, but when they return to the workplace, some barriers may delay their using newly learned skills, knowledge, and attitude. Such barriers include management and/or supervision (Brinkerhoff, 1994; Broad & Newstrom, 1992). Trainees face other barriers, such as peers who do not accept new ideas and the fear of new changes (Brinkerhoff, 1994).

People resist change or try to maintain the status quo for several reasons, including lack of interest in the new ideas, lack of interest in the new knowledge and skills, fear of change itself, and lack of incentive or reward. This may result in an employee trying to delay the intervention or avoiding it totally (Brinkerhoff, 1994). Too many employees attend training sessions and find the skills and knowledge valuable but do not transfer that education to the workplace. The lack of transfer of skills to the job will cause the organization to lose those resources (Robinson, 1985).

Schein (1985) suggested that the culture may stop the new vision and future plan of an organization. Also, it may cause a failure for new learning and also may stop the implementation of new technology. Schein also suggested that off-site training frequently fails because the trainees return to an organizational culture that does not support the new skills, knowledge, and values.

Brinkerhoff (1994) gave an example of two trainees who went to the same training program. They both gained new knowledge and skills, but the level of transfer of knowledge differed when they returned to their work environment. It appeared that the two trainees went to two different programs, but, in fact, they attended the same training program. The problem was they returned to two different
cultures, because the levels of support offered by the management in the two separate workplaces were different. Whereas one organizational culture may be supportive of the new skills and knowledge, another organization may not be. Thus, one factor of the organization’s culture is the management of the organization.

Management and the Transfer of Training

Broad and Newstrom (1992) maintained that one element or tool that shows trainees that what they learn is important is the support of their manager in their training. Management support of these trainees has an effect on the transfer of learning (Brinkerhoff, 1994).

Broad and Newstrom (1992) stated:

Managers can shape employees’ attitudes in a positive way, they involve the training in setting goals for themselves following the training, they make explicit promises of reward that can be received if training is successfully transferred, and they generally encourage trainees to view training as potentially helpful in their jobs and careers. (p. 71)

Additionally, “Managers need to provide and demonstrate their full support in advance of training experiences” (Broad & Newstrom, 1992, p. 60). Broad and Newstrom believe that support from management will increase the likelihood that trainees will transfer and apply the new knowledge and skills to their workplace.

Brinkerhoff (1994) suggested that for learning to be transferred to the workplace, some assumptions must be made:

1. The manager must follow-up on the trainee’s job performance after training is over and must continue to do so, and

2. There must be regular meetings between the manager and the trainee to evaluate the trainee’s performance.
Brinkerhoff added that learning must be reinforced continuously on the job. One tool of reinforcement is supervision involvement, which can strengthen the link between training and achieving the organization's goals. Supervisors can discuss this link with trainees and hold them responsible for learning. This reinforcement benefits the organization.

Broad and Newstrom (1992) stated that the organization must provide orientation for supervisors regarding the training program their trainees will attend. They suggested the purpose of this orientation is to discover the highlights of the training to cue their employees in terms of what to expect, provide a proper role model for them in terms of desirable behavior, and properly reinforce the desired behaviors following the training (p. 62).

Phillips (1991) mentioned that the manager must communicate with the trainee prior to the training program. The purpose of this discussion is to remove roadblocks and ease the anxiety that may develop before the training session begins.

Warshauer (1988) stated that certain characteristics in the work environment either support or obstruct the transfer of learning. He indicated the single most important element in maintaining the new behaviors of trainees is whether there is positive reinforcement from the supervisor or manager once they return to their jobs. Positive reinforcement coming from the immediate manager is the most powerful maintenance system. Broad and Newstrom (1992) suggested an immediate one-to-one meeting between the manager and the trainee with the purpose of this meeting "to communicate support for transfer" (p. 104). Also in this meeting the supervisor should assure the trainee that such training should be transferred to the workplace. Furthermore, there must be other meetings between the two to resolve any problems.
and support the transfer of training to the workplace. Managers must also give the trainee an opportunity to practiced the new skills.

Georgenson (1982) suggested that the manager and the trainee should have a meeting to discuss the training project before and after the training. The purpose of this meeting is to reinforce the new knowledge. He believes that trainees should encourage the manager to provide them with feedback, which must come immediately at the end of the course and must be specific.

Managers must be involved in supporting training events before, during, and after training (Warshauer, 1988). The plan for transfer and maintenance of learning must be formulated before a program begins. Human resource development personnel should involve supervisors and managers in the need assessment process so they can learn from their perceptions and incorporate their objectives for program impact.

Managers and the human resource development personnel must work together to create a program which includes specific knowledge, skills, and attitude (Warshauer, 1988). Furthermore, managers must involve trainees in the selection process, explaining why they are choosing a particular program. The more managers and trainees are involved in the planning process, the more likely they are to be committed it, and the more likely the program to succeed.

Discussion between the manager and trainees before training intervention can help identify the organizational support and barriers and assist them in finding ways to enhance support and remove barriers (Torst, 1985).

Broad and Newstrom (1992) stated that managers must insist on trainees' attendance at the training session to increase the amount of learning. They added that managers should discuss the employees' training assignment and assure them that any
interruption during the training will be avoided. In addition, managers must emphasize to the trainees that a final report will be needed following the training session. Broad and Newstrom also suggested the manager discuss the impact of training immediately upon the employee’s return to the job—what happened in the training session, how to avoid any transfer barrier, and how both can transfer and apply the new skills.

Warshauer (1988) believes one of the most effective tools to transfer new knowledge to the workplace is the management’s efforts. Managers can be involved in several ways during the training program, such as attending the training session to understand the program content and how to apply it. Trost (1985) and Warshauer (1988) insist that involvement of the human resource development personnel and the level of commitment by managers in such a program both affect the outcome—to either increase or reduce the transfer of learning.

Trost (1985), Brinkerhoff (1994), and others believe that without the support and encouragement from management, transfer of learning will never happen. Phillips (1991) indicated result-oriented training has three elements: (1) the program manager who conducts the training, (2) the trainee, and (3) the manager’s support. Without the involvement of any of these three, the training will fail. King (1996) stated that training departments alone can do little to transfer knowledge and skills. It is up to the managers and trainees to apply the new knowledge and transfer it to the workplace. Phillips (1991) believes it is the management’s responsibility to transfer the learning to the workplace. He suggested that management be responsible for the trainee’s development through commitment, support, and involvement.

Trost (1985) offered four reasons why transfer of learning does not happen in the workplace. First, trainees do not know their strengths and weaknesses during
implementation of the program. The second reason is the lack of mutual agreement between the manager and trainee on the expectations of the program. Third, managers do not really understand what is going on in the classroom; therefore, they do not demand specific new skills taught in the training center. Finally, managers do not understand their roles as reinforcement agents and supporters. To resolve the problem, Trost suggested that managers (a) should meet with trainees and determine the impact of the training; (b) must look at the program content in the training session; (c) must understand their roles as coach, modeler, and reinforcer; and (d) must be given new approaches and techniques for identifying and reinforcing what the trainees have learned.

Robinson (1985) suggested that human resource development departments must educate the management on how to transfer training to the workplace, and together they must work as partners in the process. Broad (1982) and Nadler (1986) both believe that when a good support system exists within an organization, the value of training increases, and thus it is more likely that transfer will occur.

Broad (1982) described management support in four categories: pretraining, during training, job linkage and follow-up. He believes that if there is no support system from the management before the training starts, the pretraining and during training will be affected. In other words, if the manager does not support the training in the workplace, new learning reinforcement before and after will not be as effective.

Phillips (1991) suggested that for an organization to be effective in its human resource activities, it must have an "ideal support," as defined by several criteria. Managers must (a) give enthusiastic endorsement and approval for participants’ involvement in HRD programs; (b) volunteer personal services or resources to assist in the HRD effort; (c) make a commitment with the participant prior to attending the
program, outlining what changes should take place or what task should be accomplished after completion of the program; (d) reinforce in a variety of ways behavior changes resulting from the program; (e) conduct follow-up of the results achieved from the program; and (f) give positive rewards for participants with outstanding accomplishments as a result of attending the HRD program (p. 307).

Finally, Phillips (1991) stated there must be a written agreement of commitment between the manager and the trainee, indicating the responsibilities of each for transferring the training to the workplace. Phillips also proposed developing the management's commitment by allowing the managers to attend the training program with the trainees. Managers will accept the new changes, knowledge, skills, and attitude and will transfer them to the workplace if the personnel satisfaction is met and the proper incentives are available (House, 1997). Ouchi (1981) suggested that when people are satisfied, they will be more productive. The productivity of the manager, in this situation, results from his or her support for the transfer of training to the workplace. Therefore, the question is, What are the management characteristics that inhibit or support the transfer of training?

Management Characteristics and Transfer of Training

Most of the previous studies have concentrated on program design and delivery while neglecting the other part of the equation—management support (Broad, 1982). Some studies have touched on management support as a key element in the transfer of training or as a transfer barrier in the workplace (e.g., Brinkerhoff, 1994; Broad, 1982; Broad & Newstrom, 1992; Georgenson, 1982; Newstrom, 1986). Most of these studies did not discuss the relationship between management characteristics (age, level of education, training experience, work experience, gender)
and the transfer of training to the workplace. In other words, those studies did not investigate management characteristics in particular, or the relationship with particular characteristics in the transfer of training. Do management characteristics inhibit or support the transfer of training to the workplace? The following section will discuss the previous studies that touched the transfer of training to the workplace.

**Previous Studies**

According to Ford and Weissbein (1997), 20 empirical studies investigated the transfer of training (see Table 1). The present study will touch on these studies as related to this subject. Most of the studies focused on the Baldwin and Ford model (Ford & Weissbein, 1997) developed in 1988, as shown in Figure 1. According to Ford and Weissbein, these studies measured only the immediate impact of training on the trainees but did not consider the amount of skill and knowledge that transferred to the workplace.

In reviewing Ford and Weissbein's (1997) studies in Table 1, none of the studies they investigated mentioned precisely the relationship between the level of education and commitment, satisfaction, and the enforcement of transfer of learning. Nor is there a study that investigated the relationship between the management's previous training experiences and the management's commitment to, satisfaction with, and enforcement of transfer of learning to the workplace.

Furthermore, according to Ford and Weissbein (1997), most the research that dealt with the transfer of learning focused on the workplace environment, such as the work climate. They stated that most of these studies evaluated the transfer factors in general context rather than from all perspectives, and the studies that followed the
Table 1
Review of Transfer Studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Task/ Training Content</th>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Design</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baldwin (1992)</td>
<td>72 business students</td>
<td>Assertive communication skills</td>
<td>Scenario variability, &amp; model competency variability</td>
<td>Experimental (random assignment of those attending)</td>
<td>Learning score, behavioral reproduction &amp; generalization, (immediate &amp; after 1 month)</td>
<td>Model variability led to increased generalizing of the behavior; the positive models only group reproduced the behavior to a higher level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brinkerhoff &amp; Montesino (1995)</td>
<td>70 trainees, 5 courses, Fortune 200 Company</td>
<td>Meeting, negotiation, team, &amp; communication skills</td>
<td>Management support—before &amp; after training discussions</td>
<td>Experimental (random assignment of those attending)</td>
<td>Self-reported degree of transfer (1.5 months after training)</td>
<td>Supervisor discussions with trainees increased reported transfer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facteau, Dobbins, Russell, Ladd, &amp; Kudisch (1995)</td>
<td>967 managers &amp; supervisors</td>
<td>Management training</td>
<td>Training motivation, compliance, intrinsic &amp; extrinsic incentives, career exploration, &amp; planning, commitment, support task constraints</td>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>Self-reported transfer</td>
<td>Pretraining motivation, subordinate, peer &amp; supervisor support, predicted transfer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author(s)</td>
<td>Sample Description</td>
<td>Task/Training Content</td>
<td>Variables</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ford, Quinones, Sego, &amp; Sorra (1992)</strong></td>
<td>180 Air Force graduates of training program &amp; their supervisors</td>
<td>Equipment used to support aircraft</td>
<td>Type of base, supervisor attitudes, support, work flow, ability &amp; self-efficacy</td>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>Self-reported opportunity to perform skills (4 months after assignment)</td>
<td>Supervisory attitudes, workgroup support, self-efficacy and ability were related to various dimensions of opportunity to perform.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gist, Bavetta, &amp; Stevens (1990)</strong></td>
<td>68 MBA students</td>
<td>Dyadic negotiation skills</td>
<td>Post-training maintenance intervention: Goal setting &amp; self-management training</td>
<td>Experimental (random assignment of those in training)</td>
<td>Performance, strategy use, repetition rate (2 weeks after training)</td>
<td>Self-management intervention led to better transfer performance &amp; strategy use while goal setting led to greater skill repetition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gist, Bavetta, &amp; Stevens (1991)</strong></td>
<td>79 MBA students</td>
<td>Dyadic negotiation skills</td>
<td>Trainee self-efficacy, &amp; post-training maintenance intervention: Goal-setting or self-management training, goal level</td>
<td>Experimental (random assignment of those in training)</td>
<td>Cognitive learning &amp; simulation exercise negotiating performance (before &amp; 6 weeks after training)</td>
<td>Self-efficacy related to performance &amp; maintenance. Self-management training attenuated this relationship, goal setting training accentuated it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author(s)</td>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>Task/Training Content</td>
<td>Variables</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gopher, Weil, &amp; Bareket (1994)</td>
<td>58 cadets in the Israeli Air Force flight school</td>
<td>Flying skills in performance aircraft</td>
<td>Computer game training, embedded training strategies (specific skills part task versus coping with processing demands using whole task)</td>
<td>Quasi-experimental</td>
<td>Two instructors' ratings of general performance in a jet trainer, likelihood of continuing, &amp; ratings on 3 skills (over 8 flights)</td>
<td>Game group had better transfer &amp; did better than the control group on jet trainer performance. Specific skills training led to better training performance, but not transfer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kraiger, Salas, &amp; Cannon-Bowers (1995) Study 2</td>
<td>40 undergraduates</td>
<td>Complex naval decision making task (TANDEM)</td>
<td>Structural assessment of &quot;closeness&quot; (C) to an expert model &amp; timing of advanced organizers, before or after training</td>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>Structural assessment, closeness to expert model, performance on a simulation</td>
<td>C was higher, &amp; related to performance, for those receiving the advanced organizer before training.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lintern, Roscoe, Koonce, &amp; Segal (1990)</td>
<td>42 adult flight students</td>
<td>Aircraft landing skills</td>
<td>Simulator practice (2 hours), augmented feedback (2 types, adaptive feedback &amp; guidance)</td>
<td>Quasi-experimental</td>
<td>Number of attempted plane landings before solo (after 17 flight hours)</td>
<td>Training reduced the number of pre-solo flights needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author(s)</td>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>Task/ Training Content</td>
<td>Variables</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lintern, Sheppard, Parker,</td>
<td>85 student naval aviators</td>
<td>Aircraft attack maneuver</td>
<td>Simulator practice, level of training trial physical fidelity features; scene detail, field of view</td>
<td>Quasi-experimental</td>
<td>Distance from the center of bombing target over 6 flights</td>
<td>The first 24 simulator trails led to better performance. Specific features did not alter transfer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nolan (1989)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paas (1992)</td>
<td>46 technical school students</td>
<td>Statistics (computerized training)</td>
<td>Training strategy (conventional problems, worked out problems, &amp; completion problems)</td>
<td>Experimental (random assignment of those in training)</td>
<td>Performance on statistics test involving near &amp; far transfer (immediately after training)</td>
<td>Worked problems improved near transfer, worked &amp; completion problems improved for transfer relative to the conventional problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quinones, Ford, Sego, &amp; Smith (1995)</td>
<td>118 Air Force training graduates &amp; their supervisors</td>
<td>Equipment used to support aircraft</td>
<td>Learning, career motivation, locus of control, supervisor attitudes &amp; work group support</td>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>Self-reported opportunity to perform trained skills (4 months after assignment)</td>
<td>Learning &amp; career motivation, were related to supervisor attitudes. Supervisor attitudes &amp; support predicted opportunity to perform.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rouiller &amp; Goldstein (1993)</td>
<td>102 manager trainees &amp; 919 of their supervisors/subordinated</td>
<td>Management of fast food restaurant</td>
<td>Unit (store) climate aggregated if more than 1 person completed the survey, trainee learning, &amp; unit performance</td>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>Supervisor &amp; personnel transfer ratings, manager's performance summary (8–12 weeks after assignment)</td>
<td>Learning &amp; climate were related to transfer. Transfer behavior was related to performance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Task/Training Content</th>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Design</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Smith-Jentsch, Jentsch, Payne, &amp; Salas (1996)</td>
<td>32 pilots in a cockpit resource mgt. program</td>
<td>Team performance related assertiveness</td>
<td>Training versus control, previous negative events in domain (biodata)</td>
<td>Experimental (random assignment of those in training)</td>
<td>Two raters on ability to use assertiveness in a simulation (1 week after training)</td>
<td>Negative events pilots experienced led to more assertiveness due to training.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swezey, Perez, &amp; Allen (1991)</td>
<td>120 undergraduates</td>
<td>Electro-mechanical troubleshooting</td>
<td>Static vs. moving displays, procedural, conceptual or integrated (both) training strategies</td>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>Task simulator performance, hands-on transfer task, abstract transfer task, knowledge test (all immediate &amp; after 1 week)</td>
<td>Procedural had fewer errors but took longer on task. Knowledge also predicted hands-on performance. Conceptual &amp; integrated performed better on the abstract task. Display type did not matter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tesluk, Farr, Mathieu, &amp; Vance (1995)</td>
<td>252 employees, supervisors attending training, 88 units</td>
<td>Employee involvement (E.I.) training</td>
<td>Manager's attitude &amp; behaviors toward E.I., participative climate, commitment, E.I. activity, cynicism, &amp; belief in improvability</td>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>Self-report of individual generalization of training</td>
<td>E.I. activity, commitment, cynicism, &amp; belief in improvability were related to transfer. Climate was significantly related to transfer but in a negative direction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author(s)</td>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>Task/ Training Content</td>
<td>Variables</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracey, Tannenbaum, &amp;</td>
<td>505 managers, 52 supermarkets</td>
<td>Management skills</td>
<td>Learning, pre- &amp; posttraining behaviors (supervisor ratings), transfer climate, continuous learning climate</td>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>Supervisor ratings of posttraining behavior (6-8 weeks after training)</td>
<td>Pretraining behavior, transfer climate, &amp; learning climate were all related to transfer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kavanagh (1995)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tziner, Haccoun, &amp; Kadish</td>
<td>81 Israeli IDF trainees</td>
<td>Advanced training methods</td>
<td>Posttraining relapse prevention, environmental support, motivation to transfer, mastery</td>
<td>Experimental (random assignment of trainees)</td>
<td>Self-report &amp; supervisor ratings of training, &amp; transfer strategy use (10 weeks after training)</td>
<td>RP led to mastery &amp; increased reported strategy use; supervisors rated more skill use. Support &amp; internal locus also led to transfer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1991)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warr &amp; Bunce (1995)</td>
<td>106 junior managers</td>
<td>Managerial skills</td>
<td>Open learning training, motivation, anxiety for training, learning activities, behavioral learning strategies, biodata</td>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>Supervisors rated learning, changes in job behavior, &amp; reactions (immediate &amp; after 3 months)</td>
<td>Motivation related to knowledge. Attitude, learning strategy &amp; age predicted learning. Tenure &amp; learning predicted transfer with younger managers more likely to apply training to the job.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author(s)</td>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>Task/Training Content</td>
<td>Variables</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xiao (1996)</td>
<td>106 workers in China</td>
<td>Electronics</td>
<td>Application orientation, match of employee knowledge, skills, &amp; abilities to work design, rewards, supervision, peer support.</td>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>Self-reported output of transfer behaviors, scrap rates (9 months after training)</td>
<td>Learning related to performance. Work characteristics related to transfer &amp; scrap. Close supervision &amp; match of worker's abilities to work design were most influential. Peer support also related to transfer.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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correlational research did not show how the workplace environment affects the transfer of training.

In 1988, Baldwin and Ford investigated the transfer of training concept. In their study they developed a model and organized their thought of training transfer around this model. The model, as shown in Figure 1, contains six elements of training input, training output, and the conditions of transfer. They explained the conditions of transfer as (a) the generalization of material learned in training to the job context, and (b) maintenance of the learned material over a period of time on the job (p. 64). Training outputs include (a) the new knowledge, skills, attitude learned at the training session, and (b) the amount of retention after the course is over. The training
input consists of (a) training design, (b) trainees' characteristics, and (c) work environment factors.

Training design contains three factors: (1) the learning principle, (2) sequencing of training materials, and (3) job relevance of the training content. Trainees’ characteristics include four items: (1) ability, (2) skills, (3) motivation, and (4) personality factors of trainees.

Work environment factors include climate factors, such as supervisory or peer support, as well as the constraints and opportunities to perform learned behavior on the job (p. 64).

According to this model, both trainees' characteristics and work environment have an effect on the immediate outcome of training (learning and retention) and the impact of training (transfer of training) (Robinson, 1985). The findings of this study suggest that the transfer of training will not be accomplished without management support of such training.

In 1994, a research paper entitled “Supporting Employees' Learning Transfer: The Role of the Manager and the Organization” was presented to The First Academy of Human Resource Development by Preskill and Kusy. One of the purposes of this study was to understand who most affects the transfer of learning—the manager, the trainee, or the trainer. A survey was used to measure the degree of concentration of transfer barriers by the manager, the trainer, and the trainee. The survey, consisting of 26 closed and open-ended questions, was sent to 246 participants of courses and workshops of different agencies. Of those surveyed, 179 responded. Study results showed that 49% of respondents believed the managers do not help in the knowledge and skills gained from the workshop, while another 49% believed that managers rarely provide feedback on how well the trainee is doing in the class.
In 1995, Tracey, Tannenbaum, and Kavanagh investigated the influence of work environment on the transfer of training. The main purpose of the study was to examine the influence of two specific dimensions of organizational climate and culture on the transfer of supervisory behaviors learned in formal training programs. The sample of the study included 505 managers and 52 supervisors. Results indicated that work environment is directly related to the transfer of trained behaviors. In other words, pretraining behavior and the training climate are both related to transfer of training. The researchers concluded that the culture and climate of the organization affect the transfer of training in the workplace.

In 1995, Brinkerhoff and Montesino investigated the influence of management intervention (support) on the transfer of training. Intervention included discussion on the training expectation with trainees before the training took place and then again after the training was completed. The main purpose of the follow-up discussion was to transfer the training to the workplace. Ninety-one trainees in five skill development courses in a Fortune 200 company in Michigan participated in this study. Subjects were divided into two groups. In the first group, the manager provided discussion before and after the training; in the second group, no discussion was provided. The results showed that the group with whom the manager had discussion demonstrated significantly higher use of the training they received and a more positive attitude toward the transfer of training in the work environment.

In 1995, Facteau, Dobbins, Russell, and Ladd conducted a study on the effectiveness of the training environment on pretraining motivation and perceived training transfer. The study hypothesized that training attitude, individual attitude, and environment support variables would relate to pretraining motivation; and that pretraining motivation, organizational commitment, and environment support...
variables are related to perceived training transfer. The sample consisted of 967 managers and supervisors employed by a southeastern state government and was representative of governmental offices. A comprehensive survey was sent to these managers and supervisors.

The findings supported the idea that those who are committed to the values and goals of the organization had higher levels of pretraining motivation. Supervisory support was positively related to pretraining motivation. Moreover, both subordinate and peer support were related to perceived transfer measures. Supervisory support was negatively related to transfer, while top management support show no significant relationship. Finally, pretraining (attitudinal variables of intrinsic incentives, training reputation, organization commitment, and compliance) motivation was positively related to perceived training transfer.

Summary

Most of the studies reviewed dealt with transfer of learning as an immediate outcome or impact of training. Other educational researchers looked at support of management from a broader picture. They did not investigate more precisely the managers' characteristics or those characteristics that do or do not support the transfer of learning.

On the other hand, Broad (1982) indicated that most studies focused on program design or the content of the program and totally ignored management support as a key element for transfer of training to the workplace. Other studies tried to investigate the trainees' characteristics (their ability, motivation, personality) and their effectiveness in the transfer of training to the workplace (Baldwin & Ford, 1988).
If the results of this study agree with Broad (1982), Brinkerhoff (1987, 1994), and Robinson (1985), among others, then the management barrier is the biggest obstacle to the transfer of learning.

Most of the studies (e.g., Broad, 1982; Broad & Newstrom, 1992) that discussed management support as the key element for transfer of training to the workplace did not explore the management characteristics that support or inhibit the transfer of training. In other words, do the management characteristics have an effect on management support of the transfer of training to the workplace?

This study will consider some of the management characteristics that may affect management support of the transfer of training to the job. This study hopes to determine the characteristics of managers who support training or inhibit the transfer of training to the workplace. In other words, do the level of education or the training experiences of Saudi managers have an effect on their commitment to, reinforcement of, and satisfaction with transfer of training to the workplace?

General Background of Saudi Arabia

Saudi Arabia is located in southwest Asia. It is bounded on the west by the Red Sea; on the east by the Arabian Gulf, Bahrain, Qatar, and the United Arab Emirates; on the southeast by Oman and Yemen; and on the north by Kuwait, Iraq, and Jordan.

Saudi Arabia comprises about four fifths of the Arabian Peninsula. The total area of Saudi Arabia is more than 2,250,000 square kilometers (Ministry of Planning, 1995). It occupies 865,000 square miles of land mass (Al-Farsy, 1990). According to a recent census, the Saudi Arabian population is approximately 12,304,835.
There are 13 administrative regions: Riyadh, Makkah Al Mukarramah, Al Madinah Al Munwarah, Qassim, Al Sharkiyah, Asser, Hail, Tabouk, Al Baha, Al Hodood Al Shamalia, Al Jouf, Jazan, and Najran. Each administrative region is composed of "Mohafaza." There are 43 levels of A Mohafaza and 61 levels of B Mohafaza (Ministry of Planning, 1995, p. 16) One of the major Mohafaza in Makkah Al Mukarramah is Jeddah, the holy city of Makkah, Al Taef. Al Sharkiyah, on the other hand, has many major Mohafaza, such as Dammam City, Al Kober, and Dahrnan. In al Hodood al Shamalia are Mohafaza Arar and Mohafaza Al Gorayaat.

Training Policy in Saudi Arabia

The government of Saudi Arabia has recognized the importance of training and development since the establishment of the manpower system in 1970, and it focused on the training and development through the establishment of the civil service bureau system in 1978. In these two systems, it became part of the managers’ duties to provide training for their employees (Alsenedy, 1992). Furthermore, each manager must train at least 5% of employees annually. This is because the employment system in Saudi Arabia is based on a competency system, which is the only way to keep the employee in his job (Alsenedy, 1992).

According to the fifth 5-year development plan (1990–1995), there are nine steps that govern training policy in Saudi Arabia:

1. Increase the coverage of vocational and technical education and training services.
2. Reorient the training system to the labor market requirements.
3. Improve the policy making and coordinated implementation mechanism of the training system.
4. Develop a central support system.
5. Improve the professional competence of training personnel.
6. Increase the participation of the private sector in the financing and delivery of training services.
7. Coordinate admission policies among vocational and technical education and training institutions.
8. Increase the utilization of existing training resources.
9. Saudization of the private sector through training.

(Ministry of Planning, 1990, pp. 279–281)

The Public Sector Training Centers in Saudi Arabia

In Saudi Arabia, the public sector vocational and technical education and training is provided by two main agencies: the Institute of Public Administration (IPA) and the General Organization for Technical Education and Vocational Training (GOTEVT). The IPA provides both short- and long-term inservice training in addition to search and consultation services to improve public administration policies and the system (Ministry of Planning, 1995).

Vocational and technical training is provided by GOTEVT. Some Saudi universities, such as King Saud University, offer specialized courses and seminars for professionals at the request of the government agencies (Ministry of Planning, 1995). Also, the government has the Institute of Applied Research, which offers some social and technical courses for public sector employees.

Training Costs in Saudi Arabia

In the third 5-year development plan (1980–1985), 12% of the total budget was allocated for training and development (Embassy, 1985). In the fourth 5-year development plan (1985–1990), $37 billion or 18% of the national budget was spent for training and development (Ministry of Planning, 1985). The fourth 5-year development plan not only concentrated on the development of national manpower but also hired those who needed jobs. The plan called for hiring at least 374,700 competent employees by the end of 1990.
Expenditure for training and development in the fifth 5-year development plan (1990–1995) was $7,015 billion for both IPA and GOTEVT. As a result, in 1996 the number of trainees who successfully completed training programs reached 16,758, a 54.8% increase over the 10-year span. In 1985 the number of trainees was 8,346 (Ministry of Planning, 1995). In 1994, the number of graduate trainees in Saudi Arabia was 55,310 (Manpower Annual Report, 1994). In 1995, graduates from IPA numbered 15,233 trainees, with 18,445 graduates from GOTEVT (Ministry of Planning, 1995).

Definitions of Terms

Commitment: Phillips (1991) stated that commitment's meaning goes deeper than a pledge or promise. It includes the action of top management to allocate resources and lend support to HRD efforts in the organization (p. 300).

Development refers to learning activities planned to prepare the individual for general growth within the organization and readiness to move in new directions whenever the organization is willing to change (Nadler, 1986).

Human resource development, according to Broad and Newstrom (1992), occurs when a professional helps the organization to enhance workforce effectiveness and productivity through learning and other performance improvement activities (p. 4).

Learning is the acquisition of new skills, attitude, and knowledge (Nadler, 1986).

Management barriers are poor attitudes and behaviors exhibited by managers that inhibit transfer of learning (Trammell, 1987).
Management characteristics are specific criteria that differentiate some managers from others, such as age, level of education, training experience, and motivation.

Management satisfaction for transfer of learning describes managers who are fully satisfied with sending employees for training and then are committed to allowing that transfer of training to the workplace.

Management support is the management’s observation of trainees which is intended to support full use of new skills, knowledge, and attitude gained by trainees in training sessions within the workplace (Broad, 1982).

Reinforcement: Phillips (1991) defined reinforcement as an action designed to reward or encourage a desired behavior (p. 301). Broad and Newstrom (1992) defined reinforcement as a systematic application of a positive consequence to a trainee, contingent on the demonstration of a desired behavior (p. 107).

Training refers to learning activities designed to improve employees’ current jobs (Nadler, 1986).

Transfer of learning, according to Trammell (1987), is the degree to which a person uses the knowledge, skills, and attitude learned in the training setting on the job in an effective, continuous, and timely manner. The definition of transfer of training in this research is based on Newstrom (1986), when he defined it as “the degree to which managers effectively apply to their jobs the knowledge and skills gained in an off-the-job development process” (p. 34).
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this study is to investigate management characteristics and the effect of management support on the transfer of learning to the workplace. Newstrom (1986) states that management support is a more effective element of transferring of training to the workplace. If an organization concentrates more on management support than on design and delivery of the program, there will be greater transfer of knowledge and skills to the workplace.

If this is the case, what management types are we talking about? Do the management's characteristics have an effect on management support, which, in turn, affects the transfer of training to the workplace? What characteristics support or inhibit the transfer of training to the workplace? This study will investigate two management characteristics: (1) managers' education levels, and (2) managers' training experience. How do these two management characteristics affect the manager's reinforcement of, commitment to, and satisfaction with the transfer the training to the workplace?

The Setting

This study was conducted in Saudi Arabia with a population of Saudi managers who work in the governmental offices. The participants were from five cities in Saudi Arabia: Riyadh, Jeddah, Dammam, Hail, and Jayzan. These cities chosen because they represent different geographical locations within the country.
Riyadh is in the central region, Jeddah is in the west, Dammam is in the east, Jazan is in the south, and Hail is in the north.

The Sample Procedure

This study focused on managers who work for the health districts in the Ministry of Health in Saudi Arabia. These districts have the responsibility of providing health care for people who live close to these districts. The districts also work in the field of preventive medicine. In fact, the CEOs of these districts are appointed by and report directly to the Minister of Health.

Eighteen linked health districts report directly to the Ministry of Health in Riyadh, the capital of Saudi Arabia: Riyadh, Jeddah, Al Shargeya (Dammam), Makka Al Mokarramah, Al Madenah Al Monawarah, Hail, Algasem, Asseer, Najran, Jazan, Tabook, Al Hodood Al Shamaleyyah, Al Gorayat, Al Ahsa, Al Joof, Al Baha, Hafer Al Baten, and Taef.

The three major health districts—Riyadh, Jeddah, and Dammam—supervise many hospitals and health clinics, not only in these cities but in many small cities and villages that report directly to these districts. Therefore, a high number of workers are employed in these districts. For instance, in 1991, there were 21,043 workers in Riyadh Health District, 12,243 in Jeddah Health District, and 8,079 in Dammam Health District. In the same year, Hail Health District employed 3,191 workers, and Jazan Health District, 7,106 workers (Ministry of Health Report, 1991).

The number of workers in Riyadh Health District is more than six times the number of workers in Hail Health District; Jeddah Health District has almost four times as many. Furthermore, Riyadh Health District employs three times as many workers as Jazan Health District. As a matter of fact, the workers in these major
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cities represent about 34% of the total number of workers in the 18 health districts. If we add Hail and Jazan Health Districts to these major health districts, the health workers represent 42% of the total workers in the 18 districts. The total number of workers in the Ministry of Health districts was 122,464 in 1991 (Ministry of Health Report, 1991).

The workers mentioned here include physicians, technicians, nurses, and administrators. In this study, however, the focus is only on managers who work within the health districts. In others words, managers who work in the hospitals, clinics, health colleges, and institutes are not included in this study.

The Population

The study population includes the middle and line managers who work only in the health districts. According to the Ministry record, the total number of middle and line managers in all the districts is approximately 666.

The Sample

The researcher selected 5 health districts from the 18 districts mentioned above. These districts contain 25% of the total health district’s population. According to the Ministry of Health record, 165 line and middle managers work in these five health districts.

The Research Variables

The independent variable is management characteristics responsible for causing an effect on the dependent variable (Kerlinger, 1986).
The dependent variable is management’s support of transfer of learning because it is affected by the independent variable (Kerlinger, 1986).

The independent variable was classified into two variables: (1) the managers’ level of education, and (2) the managers’ training experience.

The dependent variable was classified into three variables: (1) level of commitment by the manager to the transfer of training to the workplace, (2) level of manager satisfaction with the transfer of training to the workplace, and (3) level of reinforcement of the manager toward the transfer of training.

Hypotheses

Conceptual Hypotheses

1. There is a relationship between the level of managers’ education and their commitment toward the transfer of learning to the workplace.

2. There is a relationship between the level of managers’ education and their satisfaction with the transfer of learning to the workplace.

3. There is a relationship between the level of managers’ education and their reinforcement of transfer of learning to the workplace.

4. There is a relationship between the managers’ training experience and their commitment toward the transfer of learning to the workplace.

5. There is a relationship between the managers’ training experience and their satisfaction with transfer of learning to the workplace.

6. There is relationship between the managers’ training experience and their reinforcement of transfer of learning to the workplace.
Operational Hypotheses

The mean number of the level of commitment of managers who hold a Bachelor degree or higher will be different from the mean number of the level of commitment of managers who hold less than a Bachelor degree.

The mean number of managers with a Bachelor degree or higher who are satisfied with the transfer of learning will be different from the mean number of managers with less than a Bachelor degree who are satisfied with the transfer of learning.

The mean number of managers with a Bachelor degree or higher and their level of reinforcement will be different from the mean number of managers with less than a Bachelor degree and their level of reinforcement.

The mean number of committed managers who have multiple training experiences (more than one training course) will be different from the mean number of committed managers who have fewer training experiences (one training course or none).

The mean number of managers who are satisfied with the transfer of training and who have had multiple training experiences (more than one training course) will be different from the mean number of managers who are satisfied with the transfer of learning and have had less training experience (one training course or none).

The mean number of managers who have a higher level of reinforcement of the transfer of learning and who have had training experience (more than one course) will be different from the mean number of managers who have had a lower level of reinforcement of transfer of learning and who have had less training experiences (one training program or none).
The Survey Instrument

A questionnaire (Appendices B and C) was developed by the researcher, based on the literature in related studies, such as the work of Newstrom (1986), Broad (1982), Newstrom and Broad (1992), and Brinkerhoff (1994). This instrument was also based on questionnaires developed by Michael Glenn (1988) and Nevin C. Trammell, Jr. (1987).

The Construction of the Instrument

The instrument uses a 5-point Likert scale to assess the respondents: 1 = Strongly Agree, 2 = Agree, 3 = Neutral, 4 = Disagree, and 5 = Strongly Disagree. The questionnaire contains 26 questions and is divided into sections. The first section is composed of 9 general questions designed to obtain information about the individuals, such as gender, age, marital status, level of education, present job, training, and years of experience. The second part of the instrument is composed of 17 statements. All 17 statements are to be rated with the Likert scale from “Strongly Agree” to “Strongly Disagree.” These statements will be used to assess the manager’s attitude toward the transfer of training to the workplace. Each section of the questionnaire begins with brief instructions as to how to proceed with answering the questions. In addition, a cover letter attached the questionnaire (Appendix B) explained the purpose of this study. The letter emphasized the anonymity and confidentiality of the information provided. Respondents were asked to not write their name on the questionnaire. Respondents were also told they could choose not to answer any questions by simply leaving the response blank. They also could choose
not to participate in the survey simply by returning the blank survey or discarding it in the box provided.

Testing the Instrument

A draft questionnaire was distributed to some graduate students to review for technical flaws, such as faulty grammar or ambiguous wording. It was then distributed to HRD personnel. These individuals examined the questionnaire items for adequate representation of the hypothesized domain (content sampling). This process continued until all members of the validation group agreed on the content and wording of the items contained in the survey instrument.

The Pilot Study of the Instrument

The questionnaire was translated to Arabic by the researcher (Appendix C), after which it was given to a professional translator in the embassy of Saudi Arabia in Washington, D.C. to confirm correct translation. Then, it was given to 10 Saudi graduate students at Western Michigan University for the same purpose. As a result, the researcher made some minor changes as suggested by the students. It was given again to the same group, 8 days later, until all reviewers agreed on the content and wording of the items contained in the survey instrument. Most of these graduate students have had a managerial experience or hold managerial positions in Saudi Arabia. In the end, the researcher excluded the responses of two graduate students who did not have managerial experience. After content review, the instrument was tested for reliability. The result of the testing was an alpha of .9841, which is considered to be mostly reliable.
Measurement and Scaling

In this study, there are two independent variables and three dependent variables. The independent variables are (1) the level of education, and (2) the training experience. The dependent variables are (1) management commitment toward the transfer of training to the workplace, (2) management reinforcement of the outcome of training in the workplace, and (3) management satisfaction with the transfer of training to the workplace. The level of education is measured by asking respondents for highest level of education that they have completed. Training experience is gauged by asking two questions. To the first question, “How many training programs have you attended?” the respondent must answer “none,” “one program,” or “more than one program.” If the answer is “none,” the respondent does not answer the second question: “Please name the training programs you have attended.” Respondents who select “one program” or “more than one program” are expected to name up to eight training programs that they have attended.

To measure the dependent variables, a 5-point Likert scale of “Strongly Agree,” “Agree,” “No Opinion,” “Disagree,” and “Strongly Disagree” was constructed. This instrument was designed to use certain questions for each dependent variable. For instance, to measure the management’s commitment toward the transfer of training to the workplace, the researcher utilized the following statements:

1. “I participate in need assessment for my trainees before they go for training.”

2. “I meet with each trainee to discuss the reasons for choosing him/her in the program.”
3. "I send the trainee to training programs based on department need."

4. "I assure attendance of the trainee at all times."

To measure the management’s reinforcement of the training outcome in the workplace, the researcher utilized the following statements:

1. "I meet with the trainee immediately following his/her arrival back to the workplace to discuss the outcome of training."

2. "I discuss with the trainee his/her performance expectations before and following the training."

3. "I discuss with the trainees how to apply and transfer their new skills to the workplace."

4. "I have regular meetings with the trainees back on the job to check on the progress of transfer of their new skills to the workplace."

5. "I recommend a reward for trainees who use their new skills in the workplace."

6. "I request (from the trainee) a report on the progress of transfer of his/her new skills to the workplace."

7. "I share with other employees the trainee’s new skills gained in the training program."

To measure the management’s satisfaction with the outcome of training in the workplace, the researcher utilized the following statements:

1. "I release the trainee to attend training sessions based on my belief in the importance of that training."

2. "I avoid work-related interruptions of the trainee during the training program."

3. "I give the trainee some time to prepare before the training session starts."
4. “I arrange to have the trainee’s work covered during the training session.”

5. “I give opportunities to the trainee to apply his/her new skills to the workplace.”

6. “I am willing to use the trainee’s new skills and knowledge in my workplace.”

Data Collection Procedure

Approval to conduct the study was granted from the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board at Western Michigan University, and the Ministry of Health in Riyadh, Saudi Arabia (Appendices D and E). The researcher had five volunteers stationed in the five health districts of Riyadh, Hail, Jeddah, Dammam, and Jazan, who were responsible for collecting data and getting them to the researcher.

The volunteers were instructed that their only task was to distribute the instrument to the line and middle managers and to send it back to the researcher. With a total of 165 managers in these five health districts, 165 questionnaires were distributed, and 162 questionnaires were returned.
CHAPTER IV

DATA ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this study was to investigate the relationship between Saudi managers' characteristics and management support of the transfer of training to the workplace. Do certain management characteristics have any effect on management support of the transfer of training to the workplace? As mentioned earlier, Broad (1982) reported that managers are the leading barriers affecting the transfer of training to the workplace. Therefore, this will identify some characteristics that may affect management support of the transfer of training to the workplace.

The researcher chose two characteristics that may affect management support of the transfer of training to the workplace: the education level of managers and the amount of training the manager attended during his work experience. In other words, does the level of education or amount of training attended have any effect on a manager's support of the transfer of training to the workplace?

In this research, the first area investigated was the relationship between the level of education and management commitment toward the transfer of training to the workplace. Second, the relationship between the level of education and management reinforcement of the transfer of training to the workplace was examined. The third item investigated was the relationship between the level of education and management satisfaction with the transfer of training to the workplace. Fourth, the study examined the relationship between managers who attended or did not attend training activities and their commitment toward the transfer of training to the workplace.
workplace. The fifth area investigated was the relationship between the managers who attended or did not attend training activities and their reinforcement of the transfer of training to the workplace. The relationship of managers who had attended or not attended training activities and their satisfaction with the transfer of training in the workplace was the final item examined.

The research results presented in this chapter are divided into four sections: The first section provides characteristics of the sample: the level of education of the sample, gender of the respondents, amount of training the manager had during his work experience, group age, etc. Section 2 discusses the participants’ responses selected for each statement on the questionnaire. The third section discusses each hypothesis and the corresponding data analysis. Section 4 concludes the chapter with a summary of the research findings.

Section 1: Respondents’ Characteristics

All of the 153 respondents in this study hold either lower or middle management positions and represented five major health districts in Saudi Arabia. Fifty-four respondents were from Riyadh Health District, 33 from Hail Health District, 25 from Dammam Health District, 24 from Jeddah Health District, and 17 from Jazan Health District.

One hundred sixty-five questionnaires were distributed to all the managers in these districts, and 162 completed surveys were returned to the researcher. The researcher excluded 9 surveys from this study, because some of the items from six responses areas were missing. Three managers did not return the questionnaire to the researcher. Therefore, the response rate was 98.1%. The rate of the usable respondents in the study was 93.9%. Table 2 shows the return rate of the sample.
Table 2

Questionnaire Return Rate for the Five Health Districts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Questionnaires Distributed</th>
<th>Number of Questionnaires Returned</th>
<th>Number of Questionnaires Used in Data</th>
<th>Return Rate Percentage</th>
<th>Usable Rate Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>165</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>98.1</td>
<td>93.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As previously mentioned, the researcher informed the managers through the volunteers of the consent form (see Appendix A) and they were told that their replies would be completely anonymous. They were asked not to put their names on the form. Also, they had the option of declining to answer any question or to decline to participate in this study if they so wished.

Gender

The majority (88.8%) of the respondents were male. Female managers comprised 11.1% of the respondents. The higher percentage of males is because there are two health districts with a woman's section. As matter of fact, Riyadh Health District is the only one that has a full woman's section. Table 3 shows the gender distribution.

Age Group

The age of the respondents ranged between 20 and over 50 years old. The majority (47.7%) of the respondents were between the ages of 30 and 39. The next highest age group represented was between 40 and 49 (28%). The age group distribution of the respondents is shown in Table 4.
Table 3
Gender Distribution for Questionnaire Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>88.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4
Age Grouping Distribution for Questionnaire Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Grouping</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20–29</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30–39</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>47.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40–49</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>28.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50+</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Marital Status

The majority (93.4%) of the respondents were married. The percentage of single males or females was 5.2%. Table 5 shows the frequency and the percentage rate for all respondents.

Level of Education

Level of education of the respondents ranged from elementary school certificates to doctoral degrees. The majority (39.9%) of the respondents had
bachelor's degrees, while 20.9% had institute diplomas (two years of school plus high school diploma). Table 6 shows the frequency distribution of the level of education.

Table 5
Marital Status Distribution for Questionnaire Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>93.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6
Level of Education Distribution for Questionnaire Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Level</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary school</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate school</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary school</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute diploma</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>20.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College diploma</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's degree</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>39.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's degree</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral degree</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Training Program**

Respondents were asked how many training programs (if any) they had attended in their work experience. If they had not attended a program, they marked "None" on the questionnaire. The results showed that the majority (60.8%) had attended more than one training program during their work experience; 26.8% of the respondents had no training activities at their jobs. Table 7 shows the frequency distribution of the training experience among the respondents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Programs</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>26.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than one</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>60.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Work Experience**

The respondents were asked to indicate the number of years of work experience they had in their district. The majority (34.6%) of the respondents had 11–15 years of experience, and 18.3% of the respondents had 5–10 years work experience. Table 8 shows the frequency distribution and the percentage of the respondents' years of work experience.
Section 2: Statement Responses

As mentioned in the previous chapter, the instrument consisted of 17 statements. The respondents were asked to indicate their agreement with each statement using a 5-point Likert scale with the responses “Strongly agree,” “Agree,” “No opinion,” “Disagree,” or “Strongly disagree.” This section discusses the participants’ responses for each questionnaire statement.

Statement 1: *I participate in need assessment for my trainees before they go for training.* The majority (43.1%) of the respondents chose the response “Agree,” while 37.2% chose the response “Strongly agree.” Only 4.6% chose the response “Disagree” and 1.3% chose “Strongly disagree.” Table 9 shows the responses of the participants to this statement.

Statement 2: *I meet with each trainee to discuss the reasons for choosing him/her in the program.* The majority (45.16%) of respondents chose the response “Agree” and 36.6% chose the response “Strongly agree.” Only 3.9% chose the
response “Disagree,” while .7% chose the response “Strongly disagree.” Table 10 shows the responses of the participants to this statement.

Table 9
Responses of Participants to Statement 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale Response</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>37.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>43.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10
Responses of Participants to Statement 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale Response</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>36.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>45.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statement 3: I send the trainee to training programs based on department need. The majority (52.3%) of respondents chose the response “Strongly agree,”
while 37.9% chose the response “Agree.” Only 3.2% chose the response “Disagree” and .7% chose “Strongly disagree.” Table 11 shows the responses of the participants to this statement.

Table 11
Responses of Participants to Statement 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale Response</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>52.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>37.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statement 4: I release the trainee to attend training sessions based on my belief in the importance of that training. The majority (43.8%) of respondents chose the response “Strongly agree,” and 35.9% chose the response “Agree.” Only 11.1% of the participants chose “Disagree,” while .7% chose “Strongly disagree.” Table 12 shows the responses of the participants to this statement.

Statement 5: I avoid work-related interruptions of the trainee during the training program. The majority (37.9%) of the respondents chose the response “Disagree,” and 18.4% chose the response “Strongly disagree.” Only 17.6% of the participants chose “Strongly disagree,” while 18.3% chose “Agree.” Table 13 shows the responses of the participants to the statement.

Statement 6: I give the trainee some time to prepare before the training session starts. The majority (38.6%) of the respondents chose the response “Agree,”
Table 12
Responses of Participants to Statement 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale Response</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>43.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>35.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13
Responses of Participants to Statement 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale Response</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>37.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

and 24.8% chose the response “Strongly agree.” Only 19.6% of the participants chose “Disagree,” while 4.6% chose “Strongly disagree” Table 14 shows the responses of the participants to the statement.

Statement 7: I arrange to have the trainee's work covered during the training session. The majority (50%) of the participants chose the response “Strongly
agree,” and 43.1% chose the response “Agree.” Only 3.2% of the participants chose “Disagree,” while .7% chose “Strongly disagree.” Table 15 shows the participants’ responses.

Table 14
Responses of Participants to Statement 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale Response</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>24.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>38.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 15
Responses of Participants to Statement 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale Response</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>49.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>43.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statement 8: *I assure attendance of the trainee at all times.* The majority (60%) of the participants chose the response “Strongly agree,” whereas 27.4% chose
the response "Agree." Only 3.3% of the participants chose "Disagree." None of the participants chose the response "Strongly disagree." Table 16 shows the participants' responses.

Table 16
Responses of Participants to Statement 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale Response</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>60.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>27.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statement 9: *I meet with the trainee immediately following his/her arrival back to the workplace to discuss the outcome of training.* The majority (45.8%) of the participants chose the response "Agree," and 42.5% chose the response "Strongly agree." Only 2.6% chose "Disagree" and .7% chose "Strongly disagree." Table 17 shows the participants' responses to this statement.

Statement 10: *I discuss with the trainee his/her performance expectations before and following the training.* The majority (45.1%) of the participants chose the response "Agree" and 32.7% chose the response "Strongly agree." Only 5.4% of the participants chose "Disagree." No participants chose the response "Strongly disagree." Table 18 shows the participants' responses to this statement.
Table 17
Responses of Participants to Statement 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale Response</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>42.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>45.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 18
Responses of Participants to Statement 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale Response</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>32.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>45.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statement 11: I discuss with the trainees how to apply and transfer their new skills to the workplace. The majority (47.7%) of the participants chose the response “Strongly agree,” and (44.4%) chose the response “Agree.” Only .7% of the participants chose the responses “Strongly agree” and “Disagree.” Table 19 shows the participants’ responses to this statement.
Table 19
Responses of Participants to Statement 11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale Response</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>47.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>44.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statement 12: *I give opportunities to the trainees to apply their new skills to the workplace.* The majority (54.9%) of the participants chose the response “Strongly agree,” and 38.6% chose the response “Agree.” Only 5.2% of the participants chose the response “Disagree,” and no participants chose the response “Strongly disagree.” Table 20 shows the participants’ responses to this statement.

Table 20
Responses of Participants to Statement 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale Response</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>54.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>38.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Statement 13: *I have regular meetings with trainees back on the job to check on the progress of transfer of their new skills to the workplace.* The majority (48.4%) of the participants chose the response “Agree,” and 35.9% chose the response “Strongly agree.” Only 4.6% of the participants chose “Disagree.” No participants chose the response “Strongly disagree.” Table 21 shows the responses of the participants to this statement.

**Table 21**

Responses of Participants to Statement 13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale Response</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>35.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>48.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statement 14: *I reward the trainees who use their new skills in the workplace.* The majority (46.4%) of the participants chose the response “Strongly agree,” and 30.2% chose “Agree.” Only 7.2% of the respondents chose “Disagree,” and no respondents chose the response “Strongly disagree.” Table 22 shows the participants’ responses to this statement.

Statement 15: *I request (from the trainees) a report on the progress of transfer of their new skills to the workplace.* The majority (43.1%) of the respondents chose the response “Agree,” and 26.8% chose the response “Strongly...
agree.” Only 8.8% of the participants chose “Disagree,” and no respondents chose the response “Strongly disagree.” Table 23 shows the participants’ responses to this statement.

Table 22
Responses of Participants to Statement 14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale Response</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>46.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>30.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 23
Responses of Participants to Statement 15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale Response</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>26.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>43.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>21.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statement 16: *I share with the other employees the trainee's new skills gained in the training program.* The majority (49%) of the participants chose the
response “Agree,” and 40.5% of the participants chose the response “Strongly agree.” Only (2.6%) of the participants chose “Disagree,” while .7% chose “Strongly disagree.” Table 24 shows the participants’ responses to this statement.

Statement 17: *I am willing to use the trainee’s new skills and knowledge in my workplace.* The majority (48.4%) of the respondents chose the response “Agree,” and 47% of participants chose the response “Strongly agree.” Only .7% of the participants chose “Strongly disagree” and “Disagree.” Table 25 shows the responses of the participants to this statement.

Table 24

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale Response</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>40.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>49.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section 3: Testing of the Hypotheses

This section will examine each hypothesis of this study. A *t* test for independent sampling was used to measure the difference between the two means at the alpha level .05. Therefore, if the exact probability is smaller than the alpha, the null hypothesis is rejected and the conceptual hypothesis is accepted (Hinkle, 1993). However, if the exact probability is larger than .05, the conclusion will be that there is
Table 25
Responses of Participants to Statement 17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale Response</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>47.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>48.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

not enough evidence to show the relationship between the two means; therefore, further study must be conducted.

Hypothesis One

The Conceptual Hypothesis

There is a relationship between managers' level of education and their commitment toward the transfer of training to the workplace.

The Operational Hypothesis

Managers who hold a bachelor's degree or higher will have a different mean level of commitment toward the transfer of training to the workplace than those managers who hold less than a bachelor's degree.
The Null Hypothesis

Managers who hold a bachelor’s degree or higher will have the same mean level of commitment toward the transfer of training to the workplace than those managers who hold less than a bachelor’s degree.

The Result

The mean score of managers who earned a bachelor’s degree or higher is 17.5, while the mean number of managers who earned less than a bachelor’s degree is 16.6. The exact probability is .02, which is less than our alpha level of .05. In this case, the null hypothesis was rejected and the conceptual hypothesis was accepted. Table 26 shows the testing results of this hypothesis.

Table 26

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Number of Cases</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Exact Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Above bachelor’s degree</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than bachelor’s</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hypothesis Two

The Conceptual Hypothesis

There is a relationship between managers’ level of education and their reinforcement of the transfer of training to the workplace.
The Operational Hypothesis

Managers who hold a bachelor's degree or higher will have a different mean level of reinforcement of the transfer of training to the workplace than those managers with less than a bachelor's degree.

The Null Hypothesis

Managers who hold a bachelor's degree or higher will have the same mean level of reinforcement of the transfer of training to the workplace as those managers with less than a bachelor's degree.

The Result

The mean number of managers with a bachelor's degree and higher is 29.7, while the mean number with less than a bachelor's degree is 28.5. The exact probability is .07, which is larger than the .05 alpha; therefore, the null hypothesis could not be rejected. Table 27 shows the results of testing this hypothesis.

Table 27
Mean Values of the Relationship Between Management Level of Education and Management Reinforcement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Number of Cases</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Exact Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Above bachelor's degree</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than bachelor's degree</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hypothesis Three

The Conceptual Hypothesis

There is a relationship between managers' level of education and their satisfaction with the transfer of training to the workplace.

The Operational Hypothesis

Managers who hold a bachelor's degree or higher will have a different mean level of satisfaction with the transfer of training than those managers who hold less than a bachelor's degree.

The Null Hypothesis

Managers who hold a bachelor's degree or higher will have the same mean level of satisfaction with the transfer of training to the workplace as those managers who hold less than a bachelor's degree.

The Result

The mean number of managers with a bachelor's degree or higher is 24.2, and the mean number of managers who earned less than a bachelor's degree is 23.3. The exact probability is .1, which is larger than the alpha of .05. Therefore, the null hypothesis could not be rejected. Table 28 shows the testing results for this hypothesis.
Table 28
Mean Values of the Relationship Between Management Level of Education and Management Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Number of Cases</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Exact Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Above bachelor's degree</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than bachelor's degree</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hypothesis Four

The Conceptual Hypothesis

There is a relationship between managers' training experience and their commitment toward the transfer of training to the workplace.

The Operational Hypothesis

Managers who have had multiple training experiences (more than one training course) will have a different mean level of commitment than managers who have fewer training experiences (one training course or less).

The Null Hypothesis

Managers who have had multiple training experiences (more than one training course) will have the same mean level of commitment as managers who have had fewer training experiences (one training course or less).
**The Result**

The mean number of managers who have had multiple training experiences (more than one training course) is 17.2, and the mean number of committed managers who have had fewer training experiences (one training course or less) is 16.97. The exact probability is .6, which is larger than the alpha; therefore, the null hypothesis cannot be rejected. Table 29 shows the testing results for this hypothesis.

**Hypothesis Five**

**The Conceptual Hypothesis**

There is a relationship between managers' training experience and their reinforcement of the transfer of the training to the workplace.

**Table 29**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Number of Cases</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Exact Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More than one training program</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One or no training programs</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>16.97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The Operational Hypothesis**

Managers who have had multiple training programs (more than one training course) will have a different mean level of reinforcement of transfer of training to the
workplace than managers who have had less training experience (one training program or less).

**The Null Hypothesis**

Managers who have had multiple training programs (more than one training course) will have the same mean level of reinforcement of transfer of training to the workplace as managers who have had less training experience (one training program or less).

**The Result**

The mean level of reinforcement for managers who have had multiple training is 29.2, and the mean level of reinforcement for managers who had less training experience (one training program or less) is 29.1. The exact probability is .84, which is larger than the alpha (.05); therefore, the null hypothesis could not be rejected.

Table 30 shows the results of testing this hypothesis.

**Table 30**

Mean Values of the Relationship Between Management Training Experience and Management Reinforcement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Number of Cases</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Exact Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More than one training program</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One or no training programs</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
Hypothesis Six

The Conceptual Hypothesis

There is a relationship between managers' training experience and their satisfaction with the transfer of training to the workplace.

The Operational Hypothesis

Managers who have had multiple training experiences (more than one training course) will have a different mean level of satisfaction with the transfer of training than those managers who have had less training experience (less than one course).

The Null Hypothesis

Managers who have had multiple training experiences (more than one training course) will have the same mean level of satisfaction with the transfer of training as those managers who have had less training experience (less than one course).

The Result

The mean level of satisfaction of managers who have had multiple training experiences is 23.6, and the mean level of satisfaction of managers who have had less training experience (less than one training program) is 23.9. The exact probability is .5, which is larger than the alpha (.05); therefore, the null hypothesis could not be rejected. Table 31 shows the results of testing this hypothesis.
Table 31

Mean Values of the Relationship Between Management Training Experiences and Management Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Number of Cases</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Exact Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More than one training program</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One or no training programs</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section 4: Summary of Findings

Participants in this study were 153 managers representing five health districts in Saudi Arabia. Fifty-four managers were from Riyadh Health District, 33 from Hail Health District, 25 from Dammam Health District, 24 from Jeddah Health District, and 17 from Jazan Health District.

The sample consisted of 136 males and 17 females. Forty-seven percent were between the ages of 30–39, and 28.8% were between the ages of 40–49. Married respondents comprised 93.5% of the sample; only 5.2% of respondents were single.

The level of education breakdown for the sample showed that 39.9% of the respondents have a bachelor’s degree, and 29.9% of the respondents hold an institute diploma (equivalent to a high school diploma). In the area of training, 73.2% of the respondents have had one training course or more in their work experience, while 26.8% had not attended a training program. In the area of work experience, 34.6% of the respondents had worked 11–15 years in their organization, and 18.3% had worked less than 10 years in their organization.
The majority of the managers' responses for each statement of the instrument were "Strongly agree" or "Agree." The only statement that the managers disagreed with was "I avoid work-related interruptions of the trainee during the training program." The majority (37.9%) of the participants chose the response "Strongly disagree" and "Disagree."

The testing results of the first hypothesis showed that there is a relationship between the level of education and management's commitment to the transfer of training to the workplace. The exact probability between the two means was .02; therefore, the researcher was able to reject the null hypothesis.

In the second hypothesis, the measurement of the relationship between level of education and management's reinforcement of the transfer of training to the workplace, the exact probability was .07. The exact probability was larger than the alpha of .05. Therefore, the null hypothesis could not be rejected.

In the third hypothesis, the measure of the relationship between the level of education and management's satisfaction with the transfer of training to the workplace, the exact probability was .1. Therefore, the null hypothesis could not be rejected.

In the fourth hypothesis, the measure of the relationship between training experience and management's commitment toward the transfer of training to the workplace, the exact probability was .6. Therefore, the null hypothesis could not be rejected.

In the fifth hypothesis, the measure is the relationship between the training experience the manager had in his work career and the management's reinforcement of the transfer of training to the workplace. The exact probability was .8, which was larger than the alpha (.05); therefore, the null hypothesis could not be rejected.
In the sixth hypothesis, the measure is of the relationship between the training experience the managers attend in their working career and the management’s satisfaction with the transfer of training to the workplace. The exact probability was .5, which was larger than the alpha; therefore, the null hypothesis could not be rejected.

In Chapter IV the findings of this study were presented. A discussion of these results follows in Chapter V.
CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of this study was to investigate the relationship between Saudi managers' characteristics and management support of the transfer of training to the workplace. The main question to be answered in this study was "Do certain manager characteristics inhibit or promote management support of the transfer of training to the workplace?" Subquestions generated from this question needed to be investigated before answering the main question.

1. Do management characteristics affect the management’s support of transfer of training (learning) to the workplace?

2. Does the education level of managers have an effect on their commitment toward the transfer of training to the workplace?

3. Does the level of education of managers affect their satisfaction with the transfer of training to the workplace?

4. Does the level of education of managers affect their reinforcement of transfer of training to the workplace?

5. Do the managers’ training experiences affect their commitment to the transfer of training to the workplace?

6. Do the managers’ training experiences affect their satisfaction with the transfer of training to the workplace?

7. Do managers’ training experiences affect the management’s reinforcement of the transfer of training to the workplace?
In order to answer these questions, the researcher conducted a survey study in Saudi Arabia. Public sector lower and middle managers were selected as the target population. Participants in this study were 153 Saudi health managers representing five health districts from the total of 18 health districts.

Results of this study indicated a statistical difference between the mean for the managers' level of education and the mean for their commitment toward the transfer of training to the workplace. Furthermore, the study showed that there is no evidence found for differences between the mean for managers' level of education and the mean for management reinforcement of the transfer of training to the workplace. Further study must be conducted in order to draw a final conclusion.

The study also showed that there is not enough evidential difference between the management's level of education mean and management's satisfaction with the transfer of training to the workplace mean. Therefore, further studies must be conducted to reach a final conclusion.

On the other hand, insufficient evidence was found for differences between the managers' training experiences mean and their commitment mean, their reinforcement mean, and their satisfaction mean toward the transfer of training to the workplace. Therefore, further studies must be addressed this area.

This chapter presents a discussion of the study, recommendations and implications, and some suggestions for further study.

Discussion of the Study

The purpose of human resource development is to make a change in knowledge, skills, or attitude of the employee (Nadler, 1986). In addition, the new knowledge, skills, and attitude must transfer to the workplace (Brinkerhoff, 1994). If
the training is not transferring to the workplace, the organization will lose its resources (Robinson & Robinson, 1985). If the impact of training is not realized, the result will be a waste of money and time (Brinkerhoff, 1987).

The impact of training will never be accomplished without the support of the management (Brinkerhoff, 1994; Broad, 1986). Georgenson (1982) believed that the immediate manager or supervisor has a great deal of influence on the transfer of training to the workplace. Managers are responsible for the transfer of training to the workplace through their commitment, support and involvement, and reinforcement (Phillips, 1991).

The questions addressed here are: What types of management are we talking about? Do all managers support the transfer of training? If so, what management characteristics promote the transfer of training to the workplace? What management characteristics inhibit the transfer of training to the workplace?

Unfortunately, most, if not all, of the research studies showed that management support, in general, is one of the most important elements for transferring training to the workplace, and without management support, the transfer of training will not occur (e.g., Brinkerhoff, 1986; Broad, 1982; Georgenson, 1882). However, these previous studies did not identify or specify management characteristics that may promote or inhibit the transfer of training to the workplace.

Is it the managers’ age, intelligence, educational level, or work or training experience that helps them promote or inhibit the transfer of training to the workplace? Do all managers support the transfer of training to the workplace? If not, what are the characteristics of managers who inhibit the transfer of training in the workplace? The aim of this study is to point out unique characteristics of those
managers who promote the transfer of training. Unfortunately, the researcher was unable to locate a study with similar variables, research, or findings.

The present study selected two characteristics of managers that may or may not inhibit the transfer of training to the workplace: the level of education and the training experience of the managers. These also represent the two independent variables in this study.

The dependent variables are the management's commitment to, reinforcement of, and satisfaction with the transfer of training to the workplace.

As stated previously, the questions addressed in this study were: Does the educational level of managers affect their commitment toward the transfer of training in the workplace? and, Does manager training experience (attending multiple training courses, or one program or less) have an effect on managers' commitment to the transfer of training to the workplace?

As shown in a previous finding, a statistically significant difference was found between the educational level of managers and their commitment toward the transfer of training to the workplace. This indicates that the type of education the manager has in his or her work experience has an effect on the transfer of training to the workplace. In other words, the higher the level of education, the more the manager will be committed to the transfer of training. These results answer the first question: the managers' education level does have an effect on their commitment to the transfer of training in the workplace.

Although the researcher found a difference between the means of managers who had multiple training courses and those who had one course or less and their commitment toward the transfer of training to the workplace, the exact probability (.6) is larger than the alpha of .05, indicating insufficient evidence to show a
statistical difference between the means. Therefore, further study must be conducted in order to draw a final conclusion.

The statements used to test the participants’ commitment toward the transfer of training to the workplace were based on the literature and previously used instruments. Responses to those statements revealed whether the manager participates in need assessment, whether the manager meets the trainees prior to the training intervention to discuss the outcome of training, and whether he or she assures the attendance of the trainee at all times. Brinkerhoff (1994) and Phillips (1991) suggested that for training to be transferred, some assumptions must be made. One of those assumptions was that there must be a regular meeting between the manager and the trainee before and after the training.

Broad and Newstrom (1992) indicated such a meeting must take place immediate after the training. Warshauer (1988) believed that the manager must be committed to the transfer of training by being involved in supporting the training events before, during, and after the training. Furthermore, HRD must involve managers in the need assessment in order for them to be committed to such training. Warshauer (1988) added that the more the manager and trainees are involved in the planning process, the more likely they are to be committed to the process, and the greater the likelihood of the program’s success.

Broad and Newstrom (1992) stated that managers must demand the trainees’ attendance at the training in order to increase the amount of learning. Phillips (1991) recommended that managers should have an “ideal support.” One of the ideal support systems is that managers must make a commitment with the trainees prior to attending the training program. In this commitment, which must be written, the
manager and trainee will be informed of their duties for accomplishing the transfer of training to the workplace.

Other questions addressed in this study were whether the managers’ level of education has an effect on management’s reinforcement of the transfer of training to the workplace, and whether the managers’ training experience has an effect on the management’s reinforcement toward the transfer of training.

Although there is a difference between the mean of those with a bachelor’s degree or higher and the mean of those with less than a bachelor’s degree and their reinforcement toward the transfer of training to the workplace, the exact probability is .07, larger than the .05 alpha. Therefore, there is no statistical difference between the two means. Further study should be conducted before a final conclusion can be reached.

While there is a difference between the mean of those who attended multiple training programs and the mean of those who attended one program or less and their reinforcement toward the transfer of training to the workplace, the exact probability, .8, is larger than the .05 alpha. Therefore, the researcher concludes is there is insufficient evidence to state that a statistical difference exists between the two means. Further study must be conducted to draw a conclusion.

The statements the researcher used to test the managers’ level of reinforcement were based on a review of literature and other instruments used to test a similar variable. The managers’ responses to these statements indicated whether the manager met the trainee immediately after the training is over (to reinforce the new knowledge and skills in the trainee’s mind), and whether the manager discussed how to apply and transfer the newly learned skills to the workplace. Furthermore, the survey responses indicated whether the managers were willing to use the new skills
on the job. We asked the managers also whether they were willing to meet regularly with the trainee to check on the progress of transfer of their new skills to the workplace. Also, the managers were asked if they would recommend a reward for trainees who use their skills in the workplace. Do managers request a final report from the trainee? This report would contain the progress of the transfer of the newly learned skills to the workplace. Finally, the managers were asked if they were willing to share the new ideas, knowledge, and skills with other employees who did not have similar chance to attend the training.

Brinkerhoff (1994) stated that if no one enforces learning on the job, the training will fail. Therefore, the manager must be involved with the new learning. Brinkerhoff suggested this is one tool to reinforce training. He also stated that for people to accept new change, there must be an incentive reward. Warshauer (1988) pointed out that transfer of training depends on whether there is a positive reinforcement coming from the supervisor or manager. Georgenson (1982) suggested there must be an immediate meeting between the manager and the trainee following the training. Broad and Newstrom (1992) believe that the manager must emphasize to the trainee that a final reported is needed. Torst (1985) said that one barrier of transfer of training to the workplace is when managers forget that their roles include being an enforcing and supportive agent. Managers must have the tools and techniques that enable them to reinforce the transfer of training to the workplace. Phillips (1991) stated that one criterion of “ideal support” is that the manager must reinforce the new change in behavior that results from the new training program, and that there are many methods the manager can use to reinforce the training. In addition, Phillips suggested that managers must provide positive rewards for those who do excellent work in their training.
The last two questions of the study asked: "Does the level of education of managers affect the management satisfaction with transfer of training to the workplace?" and "Does the training experience of managers affect the management satisfaction with transfer of training to the workplace?"

Despite a difference between the mean of those who hold a bachelor's degrees or higher and the mean of those who hold less than bachelor's degree, and their satisfaction toward the transfer of training to the workplace, the null hypothesis could not be rejected because the exact probability, .1, is larger than the .05 alpha. In other words, there is no statistical difference between the two means. Further study must be conducted to reach a final conclusion.

On the other hand, there is a difference between the mean of those who attend multiple training programs and those who attended one program or less, and their satisfaction with the transfer of training in the workplace. The exact probability, .5, is higher than the .05 alpha; therefore, the null hypothesis was not rejected. and further study must be conducted before a final conclusion can be drawn.

The statements used to test the satisfaction level of the managers were based on a review of the literature. This study used the following statement to test the manager's satisfaction with the transfer of training to the workplace: "I release the trainee to attend training sessions based on my belief in the importance of that training." In other words, are the managers satisfied with the importance of training and development? If they are satisfied with its importance, they will try to avoid work-related interruptions for the trainee that may prevent the trainee from transferring the new learning. They will try to give the trainee time to prepare before the training session starts. They will arrange to have the trainee's work covered during the training session. Last and foremost, they will use the trainee's new skills
and knowledge in their workplace. These issues were addressed in the instrument as statements to which the participants responded.

Managers will be more satisfied with the new changes if they have met the personnel needs and satisfaction and if the proper incentive is available (House, 1997). If managers are satisfied with the new learning, they will not only send their employees to the training sessions, but they will help them to accomplish the newly learned tasks. In other words, they will help the trainee to transfer the new skill to the workplace. Ouchi (1981) believes that if people are satisfied, they will be productive. Or, they will use the new knowledge and skills in their workplace. At the same time, they must prepare their employees for the new change.

Recommendations and Implications

The purpose of this study was to investigate those managers’ characteristics that may influence the management’s commitment to, reinforcement of, and satisfaction with the transfer of training to the workplace.

The job of HRD professionals is not only to train people in the classroom but to work with managers to transfer the training to the workplace. HRD professionals must help the top management to eliminate the barriers that may inhibit the transfer of training. If the lower or middle management does not provide the necessary action to promote the new learning, the training will not transfer to the workplace. Therefore, HRD should work closely with the top management to remove transfer barriers.

This beginning research has revealed that the management’s level of education may affect its commitment to the transfer of training to the workplace.
The results of this study reveal that HRD personnel and top managers should spend more time with those managers who have less than a bachelor's degree. They must involve those managers in the need analysis of the program, the training design, and the evaluation of the training event. Last and foremost, they must strive to transfer the training to the workplace. HRD must inform the managers that without their support and participation, training is just a waste of money and time.

HRD and top management must provide the lower and middle managers with the tools and techniques needed to promote the transfer of training to the workplace. If HRD activities are isolated from management and the transfer process, or if HRD's focus is only on the training center, the training result will be left in the classroom. Therefore, HRD must cooperate with management so the training given to the employees will not be futile. Overall, if HRD does not incorporate managers who supervise those trainees, they will not actualize the impact of training.

This study proved that not all managers in an organization support training and development. This study reveals that HRD and top management should work one-on-one with lower and middle managers because of varying backgrounds, levels of education, work experience, etc. Lower and middle managers need full support from top management to transfer the training to the workplace. Top management and HRD personnel should constantly observe those trainees and their managers in their workplace. This kind of observation may help managers to remove roadblocks that may interfere with the transfer of training.

On the other hand, most of the participants’ responses were either “Strongly agree,” or “Agree” as mentioned in Chapter III. However, some participants wrote comments on the instrument, which revealed that they may have had a negative response toward the instrument or perhaps their jobs. If managers have a negative
attitude toward their jobs, this may have caused them to respond negatively to the instrument.

Organizational culture may affect the behavior of employees. Schein (1986) pointed out that culture may serve as an informal guide for people in the organization. It generates an atmosphere suggesting how people should behave and the type of interpersonal reactions that will exist in the organization. For example, the researcher noticed that some managers who hold a higher degree (e.g., master’s degree) had a negative attitude overall toward training. In fact, some of them disapproved totally of the transfer of training to the workplace. In contrast, some managers with less than a bachelor’s degree had a positive attitude toward training and development. The behavior of some managers may explain the reason why five null hypotheses were not rejected in this study. On the other hand, the results of this study may suggest that the education level of managers may not affect the management’s reinforcement of and satisfaction with the transfer of training to the workplace. Also, the study may indicate that managers’ training experience may not affect the management’s commitment to, reinforcement of, and satisfaction with the transfer of training in the workplace.

To achieve better results, the researcher recommends that this study be conducted with a different population. In addition, the researcher recommends that the instrument scale be changed from “Strongly agree,” “Agree,” “No opinion,” “Disagree,” and “Strongly disagree” to “Always,” “Frequently,” “Sometimes,” “Seldom,” and “Never.” A new scale may give a better results by causing the participants to think more before responding to the statement. Also, the scale used in this instrument may not be applicable to the Saudi culture.
Suggestions for Future Study

Additional research should be conducted to investigate managers’ satisfaction with their jobs. The results of a new study could prove beneficial, not only in helping an organization to solve a serious problem (of job dissatisfaction), but in assisting HRD professionals to revisit their training policies and procedures to be more consistent with the organizational culture. It may also help HRD personnel to better understand the behavior of the managers. HRD personnel may also discover that the managers’ dissatisfaction with their jobs influenced the data in this study.

The present study was conducted in the public sector in Saudi Arabia. A similar study should be conducted within private organizations in Saudi Arabia. The organizational culture of the two sectors is completely different. The culture in the private sector is more homogenous than that of the public sector. Therefore, a study in the private sector would be more focused and precise than one in the public sector.

This study attempted to indicate some managerial characteristics that inhibit or promote the transfer of training to the workplace. A study should be conducted to investigate the organizational culture and its effect on the transfer of training to the workplace. Such a study would help the organization planner and HRD personnel to recognize existing problems, which could be solved through HRD activities or through managerial procedure. It could also help HRD personnel to understand that transfer barriers in the workplace may be caused by lack of management knowledge or skill, or by management characteristics.

The current study used two managerial characteristics that may affect the transfer of training in the workplace. Therefore, a similar study should be conducted
using other management characteristics, such as the management’s work experience, age, etc.

A study has not been done to investigate how much training actually transfers to the workplace in Saudi Arabia. Therefore, such a study should be conducted in Saudi Arabia. Such a study would help HRD personnel gauge the effectiveness and value of their training programs.

Further studies should be conducted to investigate to what extent managers are satisfied with the training they receive from the Institute of Public Administration (IPA). This study would provide important benefits by helping the organization to evaluate its training at IPA. It could also help the organization to shift its own training to different sites if the IPA’s program is not effective. Such research could benefit not only the organization but also IPA personnel. As a result, the IPA could either change its training strategies and procedures to meet the new demands of government organizations or continue with its existing strategy.

Finally, a study should be conducted to investigate the effectiveness of training abroad and to what extent the management is satisfied with that training. The results could help HRD planners decide whether to continue sending students to train abroad, or whether to discontinue such training, thus saving the country millions of dollars spent annually in training abroad.
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Appendix B

Survey Instrument (English Version)
You are invited to participate in the research project “The Relationship of Saudi Managers’ Characteristics to the Transfer of Training in the Workplace” designed to analyze the management effectiveness toward the transfer of learning in the workplace. This research is conducted by Dr. Charles C. Warfield and Khalid Alhazmi from Western Michigan University, Department of Educational Leadership. This survey is comprised of 25 multiple choice questions and will take approximately 10 to 15 minutes to complete. Your replies will be completely anonymous, so please do not put your name anywhere on the form. You may choose to not answer any questions by simply leaving the response blank. If you choose not to participate in this survey, you may either return the blank survey or discard it in the box provided. Returning the survey indicates your consent for use of the answers you supplied. If you have any questions, you may contact Dr. Warfield at (616) 387-3890, Khalid Alhazmi at (616) 375-9016, The Human Subject Institutional Review Board at (616) 387-8293, or the Vice President for Research at (616) 387-8298.
Instructions: Please mark the appropriate answer by marking the box in front of each applicable question.

1. What is your age group?
   [ ] 20–29
   [ ] 30–39
   [ ] 40–49
   [ ] 50 or over

2. What is your marital status?
   [ ] Single
   [ ] Married
   [ ] Divorced
   [ ] Widowed

3. What is the highest level of education you have completed?
   [ ] Elementary school
   [ ] Intermediate school
   [ ] Secondary school
   [ ] Bachelor’s degree
   [ ] Master’s degree
   [ ] Doctoral degree

4. What organization do you work in?______________________________

5. How many years have you been working with the organization?
   [ ] less than five years
   [ ] 5–10 years
   [ ] 11–15 years
   [ ] 16–20 years
   [ ] More than 20 years

6. What is your present position grade? _______

7. How many training programs have you attended?
   [ ] None (skip question 8)
   [ ] One program
   [ ] More than one program

8. Please name the training programs you have attended
   1. ______________________________
   2. ______________________________
   3. ______________________________
   4. ______________________________
   5. ______________________________
   6. ______________________________
   7. ______________________________
   8. ______________________________
This section consists of questions and statements about your experience with trainees and training programs. Please answer frankly. Circle the letter of the option you agree with or that best describes your situation.

9. I participate in need assessment for my trainees before they go for training.
   A- Strongly agree  D- Disagree
   B- Agree  E- Strongly disagree
   C- No opinion

10. I meet with each trainee to discuss the reasons for choosing him/her in the program.
    A- Strongly agree  D- Disagree
    B- Agree  E- Strongly disagree
    C- No opinion

11. I send the trainee to training programs based on department need.
    A- Strongly agree  D- Disagree
    B- Agree  E- Strongly disagree
    C- No opinion

12. I release the trainee to attend training sessions based on my belief in the importance of that training.
    A- Strongly agree  D- Disagree
    B- Agree  E- Strongly disagree
    C- No opinion

13. I avoid work-related interruptions of the trainee during the training program.
    A- Strongly agree  D- Disagree
    B- Agree  E- Strongly disagree
    C- No opinion

14. I give the trainee some time to prepare before the training session starts.
    A- Strongly agree  D- Disagree
    B- Agree  E- Strongly disagree
    C- No opinion

15. I arrange to have the trainee’s work covered during the training session.
    A- Strongly agree  D- Disagree
    B- Agree  E- Strongly disagree
    C- No opinion

16. I assure attendance of the trainee at all times.
    A- Strongly agree  D- Disagree
    B- Agree  E- Strongly disagree
    C- No opinion
17. I meet with the trainee immediately following his/her arrival back to the workplace to discuss the outcome of training.
   A- Strongly agree   D- Disagree
   B- Agree           E- Strongly disagree
   C- No opinion

18. I discuss with the trainee his/her performance expectations before and following the training.
   A- Strongly agree   D- Disagree
   B- Agree           E- Strongly disagree
   C- No opinion

19. I discuss with the trainees how to apply and transfer their new skills to the workplace.
   A- Strongly agree   D- Disagree
   B- Agree           E- Strongly disagree
   C- No opinion

20. I give opportunities to the trainees to apply their new skills to the workplace.
   A- Strongly agree   D- Disagree
   B- Agree           E- Strongly disagree
   C- No opinion

21. I have regular meetings with trainees back on the job to check on the progress of transfer of their new skills to the workplace.
   A- Strongly agree   D- Disagree
   B- Agree           E- Strongly disagree
   C- No opinion

22. I recommend a reward for the trainees who use their new skills in the workplace.
   A- Strongly agree   D- Disagree
   B- Agree           E- Strongly disagree
   C- No opinion

23. I request (from the trainees) a report on the progress of transfer of their new skills to the workplace.
   A- Strongly agree   D- Disagree
   B- Agree           E- Strongly disagree
   C- No opinion

24. I share with the other employees the trainee’s new skills gained in the training program.
   A- Strongly agree   D- Disagree
   B- Agree           E- Strongly disagree
   C- No opinion

25. I am willing to use the trainee’s new skills and knowledge in my workplace.
   A- Strongly agree   D- Disagree
   B- Agree           E- Strongly disagree
   C- No opinion

Thank you for completing this survey.
Appendix C

Survey Instrument (Arabic Version)
جامعة وسترن مشحن
ادارة القيادة التعليمية
مشارف البحث: د. شارلوس ورفلد
مشارك البحث: خالد الحزيمى

أدت مدعو للمشاركه في برنامج البحث "العلاقات بين صفات المدير السعودي ونقل المعرف في مكان العمل" إلى تحليل فاعلية الإداره نحو نقل المعرف إلى مكان العمل. هذا البحث تختط إشراف الدكتور شارلوس ورفلد و خالد الحزيمى من جامعة وسترن مشحن، اداره القيادة التعليمية. هذا الاستبان يشمل على 25 متوسط الاستجابات، سوف يستغرق 10-15 دقيقة لأغافها تقريبا.

سوف تكون أحزانكم في كامل السرية. لذا ارجو ان لا تكتبوا استبانكم على أي موقع في الاستبان. لكي حق الاختبار بأن لا تجب على أي سؤال وذلك بترك الجواب خاليا. اذا اجابة أن لا تشارك في هذا الاستبان ما عن بلك ان لا تجب على أي سؤال او اجابة هذا الاستبان الى الصندوق المعد لذلك. ترجيك الاجابة على هذه الاستبان بعنوان امتحان على استخدام استبانكم إذا كان لك أي سؤال ارتج الاتصال في الدكتور شارلوس ورفلد على تلفون 616-387-8298 على تلفون 616-375-9010 أو مجلس مراحه. أمناء المواضع الأساسية على تلفون 616-387-8298.
1- الجنس [ ذكر ] [ أنثى ]

2- في أي مجموعة من بين الجموعات الأعمار الأليه تشعر/تضعيف عمرك؟
   - من 20-39 [ ]
   - من 40-49 [ ]
   - من 50-أكبر [ ]

3- الحالة الاجتماعية.
   - أعزب/عزباء [ ]
   - متزوجة/متزوج [ ]
   - مطلق/تميل [ ]
   - أمرأة/أرملة [ ]

4- أعلى مؤهل تعليمي حصلت/حصلت عليه.
   - الشهادة الإبتدائية [ ]
   - الشهادة المتوسطة [ ]
   - الشهادة الثانوية [ ]
   - دبلوم مهند [ ]
   - كلية متوسطة [ ]
   - درجة البكالوريوس [ ]
   - درجة الماجستير [ ]
   - درجة الدكتوراه [ ]
   - أخرى (الرجاء ذكرها) [ ]

5- ماهي المديرة التي تعمل/تطلب منا حالياً؟

6- عدد السنوات التي عملت/عملت خلايا في هذه المديرية؟
7- ما هو مركزك الوظيفي و مرتبتك المحالية؟

8- كم عدد البرامج التدريبية التي حضرتها/حضرت؟
  - لا يوجد إذا كان الجواب لا يوجد، لا تجيب (السؤال التاسع)
  - برنامج واحد
  - أكثر من برنامج واحد

9- من فضلك ذكر أو ذكرى البرامج التدريبية التي حضرتها/حضرتها.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

الجزء القادم من الأسئلة يستعرض تجاربك/تجاربك مع المتدربين/المدربين والبرامج التدريبية. أرجو بكل صراحة أن تضع/تضع دائرة حول الإجابة التي توافق/توافقين عليها أو التي تراها/ترىها تصف موقفك/موقفك الشخصي من العملية التدريبية.

10- أشارك في إعداد الإحتياجات التدريبية للمتدرب/المتدربة قبل حضورها/حضورهما للبرنامج التدريبي.
  - [أ] أوافق بشدة
  - [ب] أوافق
  - [ج] مخالد
  - [د] لا أوافق
  - [ه] لا أوافق بشدة
11- أفاد المتطرف/المرتبة لتوضيح الأسباب التي دعتي لاحتراء/اختيارها للمشاركة في البرنامج التدريبي.

[أ] - أوافق بشدة
[ب] - أوافق
[ج] - محايد
[د] - لا أوافق
[هـ] - لا أوافق بشدة

12- أفاد المتطرف/المرتبة للحصول البرنامج بناءً على احتياجات الإدارة.

[أ] - أوافق بشدة
[ب] - أوافق
[ج] - محايد
[د] - لا أوافق
[هـ] - لا أوافق بشدة

13- أفاد المتطرف/المرتبة للحصول البرنامج التدريبي بناءً على قاعتي الشخصية في أهمية التدريب.

[أ] - أوافق بشدة
[ب] - أوافق
[ج] - محايد
[د] - لا أوافق
[هـ] - لا أوافق بشدة

14- أجاب المتطرف/المرتبة أي موضوع لحلاقية بطيئة عملها/عملها أثناء فترة تدريبية/تدريبها.

[أ] - أوافق بشدة
[ب] - أوافق
[ج] - محايد
[د] - لا أوافق
[هـ] - لا أوافق بشدة

15- أفاد المتطرف/المرتبة بعض الوقت لكي يستعد/ تستعد قبل بداية البرنامج التدريبي.

[أ] - أوافق بشدة
[ب] - أوافق
16- أقوم بالتنسيق في عملية تغطية مكان المتدرِب/المدرِبة أثناء فترة التدريب.

17- أتأكد من حضور المتدرِب/المدرِبة لبرنامج التدريبي بانتظام

18- أقابل المتدرِب/المدرِبة بعد نهاية التدريب مباشرة ونناقش معها ملاحظات ونتائج التدريب.

19- ناقش مع المتدرِب/المدرِبة عن توقعاته/توقعاته الخاصة لمسيرة أدارتها/أدارته قبل بداية وبعد نهاية التدريب.
- تحدثت مع المتدرب/المتدربة عن كيفية نقل وتطبيق المهارات الجديدة إلى مكان العمل.
  
  [أ] - اوافق بشدة
  [ب] - اوافق
  [ج] - مخالف
  [د] - لا اوافق
  
  [ه] - لا اوافق بشدة

- أعطى المتدرب/المتدربة فرصة لتطبيق المهارات الجديدة في مكان العمل.
  
  [أ] - اوافق بشدة
  [ب] - اوافق
  [ج] - مخالف
  [د] - لا اوافق
  
  [ه] - لا اوافق بشدة

- أقوم بعمل جمعيات دورية بين المتدربين/المتدربات بعد رجوعهم/رجوعهن إلى مكان العمل.
  
  [أ] - اوافق بشدة
  [ب] - اوافق
  [ج] - مخالف
  [د] - لا اوافق
  
  [ه] - لا اوافق بشدة

- أوصي بمراجعة مكافئ للمحترفين/المتدربين الذين يستخدمون/يستخدمون المهارات الجديدة في مكان العمل.
  
  [أ] - اوافق بشدة
  [ب] - اوافق
  [ج] - مخالف
  [د] - لا اوافق
  
  [ه] - لا اوافق بشدة

- أطلاب المتدرب/المتدربة بقرير دوري عن عمليه نقل المهارات الجديدة إلى مكان العمل.
- أتفق بشدة
- أتفق
- مخالف
- لا أتفق
- لا أتفق بشدة

- أنا على استعداد أن أستخدم المهارات والمهارات الجديدة التي أكتسبتها المدرسة في مكان العمل.
- أتفق بشدة
- أتفق
- مخالف
- لا أتفق
- لا أتفق بشدة

شكرا لكم تعاونكم ومشاركتكم في الإجابة على هذا الاستبيان.
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Permission to Conduct Survey From
Ministry of Health in Riyadh
ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

Director of Medical Affairs for the Dammam Region/ Riyadh, Haiel, Jeddah
Al-Dammam- Kingdom of Saudi Arabia

Dear Sir:

This is to inform you the Mr. Khalid Mohammed al-Hazmi (ID# 45-4615) who is an employee of the Ministry of Health, is currently pursuing a doctorate degree in the field of Human Resource Development. Presently, he is writing his doctoral thesis entitled:

"The Relationship of the Saudi Manager's Characteristics to the Transfer of Training in the Work Place"

The above-mentioned student is interested in collecting data for his research. I would appreciate it if you render him any assistance he may need to complete the task of obtaining the necessary data for his research.

Thank you for your kind cooperation and understanding.

Sincerely,

Mazyed I. Al-Mazyed. Ph.D.
the Saudi Cultural Attache to the United States
الشراكة بين صفات المدير السعودي ومدى تطبيقه في نقل التدريب في مكان العمل

"The Relationship of the Saudi Manager's Characteristics to the Transfer of Training in the Work Place"

وبما أن المذكور يرغب في جمع المعلومات والبيانات اللازمة لهذا البحث، نأمل تسهيل مهمته.

شاكرين ومحترمين،

مع أطيب التحيات،

الملحق الثقافي السعودي بأمريكا

د. مزيد بن إبراهيم المزيدي

P.O. Box 25537 • Washington, D.C. 20007 • Tel. (202) 337-9450 • Fax: (202) 337-3978
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وأما المذكور يرغب في جمع المعلومات والبيانات اللازمة لهذا البحث، نأمل تسهيل مهمة شاكرين ومقدرين حسن تعاونكم.

مع أطيب التحيات ... والسلام...!!!

الملحق الثقافي السعودي بأمريكا

د. مزيد بن إبراهيم المزید

2600 Virginia Ave., N.W., Suite 800 • Washington, D.C. 20037 • Tel: (202) 337-9450 • Fax: (202) 337-2978
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The Relationship of the Saudi Manager's Characteristics to the Transfer of Training in the Workplace

The relationship between the Saudi manager's characteristics and the transfer of training in the workplace has been studied. The study aims to understand how the characteristics of a Saudi manager influence the effective transfer of training in the workplace. The research focuses on the elements that enhance or hinder the transfer process.

The study examines the role of communication, cultural differences, and the manager's attitude towards training. It highlights the importance of a manager's leadership style in the successful transfer of training.

The findings suggest that effective communication and a supportive environment are crucial for successful training transfers. The study also points out the challenges of cultural differences and the need for tailored approaches.

The implications of this research are significant for organizations looking to improve training outcomes. It underscores the importance of aligning managerial characteristics with the training goals to maximize effectiveness.

With the insights gained from this study, organizations can better design training programs that are more likely to be effectively transferred into workplace practices.

The study also evaluates the impact of various managerial characteristics, such as decisiveness, creativity, and adaptability, on the transfer process. It concludes that a combination of these traits can significantly enhance training effectiveness.

Overall, the research provides a comprehensive understanding of the role of the Saudi manager in the transfer of training, offering practical recommendations for improving training outcomes in multicultural settings.
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[Signature]

Consul General

P.O. Box 25537 • Washington, D.C. 20007 • Tel: (202) 337-9450 • Fax: (202) 337-2978
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المرجع.

ال;?></td>
</tr>
</table>

التاريخ: 

الرقم: 

الإشراف الدراسي

المحترم

سعادة مدير عام الشؤون الصحية لمنطقة حائل

السلام عليكم ورحمة الله وبركاته...”

أهلاً بكم في بعثة مدير المصانع / خالد بن محمد الحازمي (1945). أحد منسوبي وزارة الصحة والذي

يدرس للدكتوراه في مجال تدريب الموظفين في مجال التدريب. وهو يقوم حالياً بإعداد بحث الدكتوراه

بعنوان: "العلاقة بين صفات المدير السعودي ومدى تطبيقه في نقل التدريب في مكان العمل ".

The Relationship of the Saudi Manager’s Characteristics to the Transfer of Training in the

Work Place”

وبما أن المذكور يرغب في جمع المعلومات والبيانات اللازمة لهذا البحث، نأمل تسهيل مهامه.

شاكرين ومقدرين حسن تعاونكم.

مع أطيب التحيات... والسلام...”

الملحق الثقافي السعودي بأمريكا

د. مزيد بن إبراهيم المزید

بديلى
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