



Enhancing Training Transfer with Generative AI: A Quasi-Experimental Approach

RESEARCH REPORT

Date: 06 Asar, 2082

By: Anup Bhurtel

**To: Evaluation Committee, Centre for
Research and Development**

 **+977 9860706101**

 **anup.bhurtel@nasc.org.np**

 **Centre for Research and
Development,**

Acknowledgements

The researcher expresses sincere gratitude to the Nepal Administrative Staff College, especially the Executive Director Dr. Rajan Khanal for granting permission to collect data at various points during the training program. This access was crucial for the successful execution of this research. Further, the researcher also extends heartfelt thanks to the course coordinators, Ms. Roshani Bhujel, Ms. Shital Moktan Tamang, and Ms. Shailaja Upadhyaya, for their invaluable assistance in facilitating data collection and for their support during the post-training intervention phase. Their cooperation was essential to the smooth progress of the study. Deep appreciation is expressed to the content experts, Mr. Binod Kumar Bista and Mr. Uttam Acharya, who generously provided insightful suggestions and valuable corrections to the researcher-developed instrument. Their expertise significantly contributed to the refinement and validity of the data collection tool.

The author is profoundly grateful to his mentor, Mr. Sagar Mani Neupane, whose expert guidance was instrumental throughout the instrument finalization process and the entire research journey. His extensive knowledge in data analysis, management, and interpretation proved immensely beneficial in shaping this paper. The author also wishes to acknowledge with sincere appreciation Mr. Neupane's consistent encouragement and unwavering availability to provide mentorship. The research would also like to acknowledge the research committee members: Mr. Bishnu Prasad Lamsal, Ms. Achala Dahal, Prof. Dr. Shree Krishna Shrestha, Prof. Dr. Prakash C. Bhattarai, Associate Prof. Dr. Hari Dhungana for entrusting with the responsibility of carrying this research. Lastly, the author would like to thank all the participants of the training program for their time and cooperation, without which this research would not have been possible.

(Researcher)
Anup Bhurtel

Table of Content

Acknowledgements.....	i
Abstract.....	1
Introduction.....	1
Training Transfer: Value to the Training.....	2
Training Design: A Determinant of Training Transfer.....	3
Role of Practice based Interventions in Training Transfer.....	4
Use of Artificial Intelligence in Training Design.....	5
Methods.....	5
Study Design and Participants.....	5
Data Collection.....	6
Instrument.....	7
Intervention.....	7
Reliability and Validity.....	7
Analysis.....	8
Ethics.....	8
Results.....	9
Gain in Knowledge.....	10
Assumptions.....	10
Transfer of Training.....	12
Factors influencing Training Transfer.....	13
Discussions.....	16
Post-training Intervention.....	16
Use of Generative AI.....	17
Conclusion.....	18
References.....	20
Annex.....	25
Annex I: Questionnaire.....	25
Annex II: Intervention Guideline.....	27

Annex III: Preliminary Questionnaire	28
Annex IV: Comment-Address Sheet for Internal Research Report, FY 2081/82.....	30

Enhancing Training Transfer with Generative AI: A Quasi-Experimental Approach

Anup Bhurtel

Abstract

This study investigates the effect of post-training intervention utilizing generative Artificial Intelligence (AI) on learning and training transfer among public sector employees in Nepal. The primary purposes were to assess learning differences between pre- and post-training phases and to determine if AI-assisted post-training intervention increases training transfer compared to traditional methods. This study employed a quasi-experimental design in which two groups (Control n=21, Experimental n=20) from a training program named Advanced Course on Management and Development program (ACMD) participated. Data on knowledge acquisition were collected using multiple-choice tests at pre-training phase (T1) and post-training phase (T2), while training transfer was measured after four month's post-training phase (T3) through individual inquires made to both participants and their subordinates independently at different time interval. The experimental group received a post-training intervention involving structured prompts for generative AI tools. Key findings indicate that participants made higher learning in the post-training phase, and incorporating post-training interventions, particularly with distributed practice and goal setting, significantly enhances training transfer, and that generative AI serves as an effective tool in facilitating this process.

Keywords: training transfer, post-training intervention, generative AI, quasi-experiment

Introduction

Training, taken as common intervention of filling the performance gap is strategy of human resource development and one of the important functions of human resource management. It has been linked with set of activities carried out for changes in knowledge, skill and attitude (KSA) in their definitions. Training is one of the commonly used planned interventions intended to enhance KSA of individuals (Salas et al., 2006) and consequently improve the factors that determine employee performance by bringing cognitive and behavioural changes that are permanent in nature and are reflected in action (Chiaburu and Marinova, 2005). Hence, while linking the strategies to develop competent human resources, the role of training has been extensively documented (Coultas et al., 2012; Salas & Stagl, 2009) from its roles in solving the issues of human performance (Dean et al., 1996) to fostering creativity and innovation (Dessie & Ademe, 2017). Despite the significance of training in employee and organizational performance, training programs fail to provide desired results in numerous occasions (Hausdorf, 2022). It is because training programs are affected by different reasons among which poor design accounts as of the key factors. The design of training programs matters more in the recent times due to the prevalence of information communication and technology which determine the extent to which training becomes effective and learning is transferred.

In the era of digital technology, one of the greatest challenges is to keep up with the market changes to maintain competitiveness. This challenge signifies the importance of training

from one lens (Park et al., 2016). Meanwhile, the rapidly changing global market also entails the challenges to update the training designs accordingly. In today's work environment, the training designs are also expected to maintain consistency with the current technology utilizing their features to bring effectiveness to the training. The issue on training programs of government sector is pervasive since their training programs are considered ineffective compared to the private training (Kim & Park, 2020). The training designs of government organizations are usually structured and inflexible. Besides, the need to cater wide variety of officials make it difficult to frequently change in design. Therefore, multi-fold reasons causing difficulty for government training programs in adapting to the rapidly changing market, citizens' aspirations and technology are likely to affect the training's effectiveness. Moreover, the advent of artificial intelligence (AI) and its blend in learning process has helped in overcoming limitations in public service (Wilson & Broomfield, 2022). AI, particularly, Generative AI (GenAI) has been widely used AI for daily and official uses for references and knowledge creation (Park, 2024). In this line of discussion, it becomes necessary to examine the effects of integrating technology, particularly GenAI in training design in learning process and training transfer. However, studies are much limited in training programs of government sector in countries like Nepal indicating a dire need for further research.

Training Transfer: Value to the Training

It is indisputable that the investments on training can only generate meaning if the changed behaviour is observed in organizations. Therefore, training transfer holds much importance as the training itself. Training transfer is understood as the application of knowledge, skills and attitude (KSA) back in the job for performance improvement (Salas et al., 2006; Nijman et al., 2006). For training transfer to occur, the acquired KSA must be generalized in that work context and should be retained over time which would then reflect on changed behaviour including improved performance which is expected to benefit the organization ultimately (Baldwin & Ford, 1988). The meaning of training transfer suggests that training transfer provides the true meaningfulness the investment in trainings. Hence, as much as research on significance of human capital (Bontis, 2001) and their development through training (Broad, 2005; Conger & Pearce, 2009) have been published, there have also been numerous studies conducted on the transfer of training and different factors affecting it (Blume et al., 2010; Cheng & Hampson, 2008; Grossman & Salas, 2011).

Studies on training transfer hold instrumentality for multi-fold reasons. While research works on transfer of training exhibit the overall effectiveness of the training, the rate of transfer also signifies various factors that promote or hinder in the transfer process. The problem of low transfer has led to massive body of studies identifying the determinants of training transfer. Baldwin and Ford (1988)'s review comprehended that the role of training inputs on training outputs and ultimately conditions of transfer viz. generalization and maintenance. The training inputs consisted of trainee characteristics, training design and work environment. This study served as a strong basis of practitioners and researchers for further investigations (Cheng & Hampson, 2008). Cheng and Hampson, meanwhile presented three frequently scrutinized

variables as the factors affecting transfer of training. They were individual characteristics (personality, mental and physical abilities, locus of control, post-training self-efficacy, conscientiousness, anxiety, goal orientation), job related variables (job involvement, organizational commitment, career focus), and situational variables (opportunity to perform, transfer climate, intervention strategies, social support). In a meta-analytic review, Tonhäuser & Bükér (2016) articulated initial three consolidated by Baldwin and Ford viz. trainee characteristics, training design and work environment. Among them, training design has greater role in determining training transfer because design involves the major intervention to impart KSA. Further, the effectiveness of training design entails all the activities before the training the training to identify the need, during the training where learning is centred and after the training that includes follow-ups.

Training Design: A Determinant of Training Transfer

Training design posits as another determinant of training transfer (Lim, 2000; Russ-Eft, 2002) and gained much research attention (Blume et al., 2010). Baldwin and Ford (1988) initially identified instructional design, identical elements, stimulus variability and teaching of general principles as the influential design issues under this construct. Later, other dimensions were also confirmed such as overlearning and practice (Arthur et al., 1998), setting objectives of the training (Lee & Pucel, 1998). Training delivery methods has also been substantiated across time (Arthur et al., 2003; Blume et al., 2010).

The components of the design factors have been presented in a different way by various scholars. While behavioural modelling, error management and realistic training environment have been highlighted as the contributors to the design factors by Grossman and Salas (2011), Srimannarayana (2011) argues traditional measures such as training costs, length of training period, participant number and training feedback as more popular among Indian training providers/ HR professionals. Further, Lim (2000) highlights inhibiting training design characters such as time to preview training content, need assessment for each trainee, adequacy of practice and exercise session, match between practice and content, grouping activities and such; and promoting characters viz. demonstration of specific examples, skill practice sessions, pre-distribution of learning materials use of audio-visual (A/V) aids in training sessions and such as applicable design factors.

In conjunction with *training design* which have been used in previous studies (Baldwin & Ford, 1988; Russ-Eft, 2002), there is much of the roles of what goes in the implementation part to which Ford et al. (2017) present this dimension as *training design, method, and delivery*. Studies have shown various elements of training design to affect the transfer of training. For instance, LTSI comprises of a few factors such as ‘perceived content validity’ and ‘transfer design’ (Holton et al., 2000). Transfer design develops the understanding about the training and illustrates ways with which it can be utilized in the workplace practically (Bhatti et al., 2014). It has been proved to support performance self-efficacy (Bhatti & Kaur, 2010) motivation to transfer (Kirwan & Birchall, 2006) and training transfer (Velada et al., 2007). For this, Velada et al. suggest that the transfer design should be such that training fits learner’s level of competency.

Within design, training objectives (Lee & Pucel, 1998) and goal setting strongly predicts the transfer (Machin & Fogarty, 2003). Perceived content validity which corresponds to content's relevance with their workplace also predicts training transfer (Holton et al., 2000), supports transfer motivation (Bhatti et al., 2014) as well as mediates the relationship between expected utility and transfer of training, and between learning motivation and transfer of training (Park et al., 2016).

Role of Practice based Interventions in Training Transfer

In the context of training design, the load of contents though is often ignored in studies, has shown to hinder the learning process (Burke & Hutchins, 2007). Besides, Tsai and Tai's (2003) work also suggest trainees to be given with pre-information that can predict motivation to transfer while later may facilitate training transfer. In the delivery part, unalleged role of trainer (Bhatti et al., 2014), the extent to which the training environment is realistic to the job place (Salas et al., 2006), careful selection and use of instructional media and methods (Nikandrou et al., 2009) and even error management that occurs throughout the training (Keith & Frese, 2008) were found to foster intention to learn and the transfer process.

When it comes to practice, overlearning also counts for when it comes to training transfer. Scholars (e.g. Ford et al., 2017; Holton, 1996) explain that, in spite of occurrence of cognitive learning, training transfer entail risks of failure if knowledge and skills are not imparted in the way to transfer it back to job. Overlearning ensures practice beyond one successful attempt while learning new skills (Machin & Fogarty, 2003) and is stated to enhance retention (Ford et al., 2017). Similarly, in a meta-analytic review, Taylor et al. (2005) found the support of behavioural modelling training, even higher when both negative and positive models were used. Besides, the post-training follow-up (Russ-Eft, 2002) and feedback have shown to help improve performance and maintain consistency with behaviourism (Russ-Eft, 2002).

The two commonly used post-training interventions are i.) relapse prevention and ii) goal setting (Rahyuda et al., 2014). According to Marx (1986), relapse prevention can be structured through a seven-step process. First, clearly pinpoint the specific skills intended for transfer to the workplace. Next, anticipate potential threats or challenges that might impede the successful application of these skills. Following this, it's crucial to weigh the advantages and disadvantages associated with utilizing the learned skills on the job. The framework then emphasizes the need to learn specific RP strategies, such as understanding the nuances between the training and work contexts and establishing a supportive network. A key step involves predicting the first potential slip or instance where the skill transfer might falter. Subsequently, a threat coping strategy should be developed to address these predicted setbacks. Finally, the process concludes with the need to monitor and evaluate the progress of skill transfer over time. There is an instrumental role of relapse prevention-based efforts in the learning and learning transfer process (Velada et al., 2007) and practice-based interventions significantly contribute in the relapse prevention. Scholars (e.g. Milne et al. 2007; Pattni et al., 2007) show that relapse prevention contributes to training transfer more than the control group.

Post-training interventions using goal setting emphasizes the use of specific, challenging and difficult goals for motivating strategy development and enhancing performance (Latham & Locke, 2007). Specific and challenging goals lead to positive transfer of training (Brown & Warren, 2009). Among the various types of goal settings such as assigned, learning, outcome, distal, and proximal plus distal goal setting (Brown & Latham, 2002), it has been found that trainees who are able to set distal and proximal goals simultaneously are able achieve training transfer (Seijts & Latham, 2001). Goal setting has also been linked with the performance satisfaction as well as self-efficacy of the trainees (Latham and Brown, 2006).

The design and delivery part of the training has substantial and multi-dimensional effect on learning and the transfer and therefore, during training and post-training interventions through sufficient practices can greatly augment the trainees with learning characteristics in the transfer of learning. However, there are studies which suggest external forces to be influential. In several studies, (e.g. Gaudine and Saks, 2004; Hutchins, 2004) exhibit that training transfer was not influenced by relapse prevention, suggesting further research in specific contexts.

Use of Artificial Intelligence in Training Design

In recent times, use of artificial intelligence (AI) has been gradually increasing in training programs, mostly in design and delivery to bring transformation in the learning process. Use of AI in education has begun demonstrating promising results in learning (Ni et al., 2024) as well as in training programs. Further, use of AI in training design has shown to improve learner experiences which fosters training transfer experience (Hehir, 2023). Evidences (e.g. Hatzius et al., 2023) have shown the use of generative AI (GenAI) in the training interventions have been transforming the way training programs are designed by making course development faster and more effective. The use of GenAI has been found to streamline the process and create a more flexible and responsive learning environment. With features like natural language processing, GenAI can provide immediate feedback on assessments, enriching the overall learning experience. However, less is known about the role of training design in training transfer. Though, AI automation has covered more than two third of the working environment directly and indirectly (Hatzius et al., 2023), knowledge on the use of GenAI in training for training transfer is in its primitive stage. There is a visible research gap in the roles of GenAI as the training intervention in learning and training transfer. In this context, this study aims to investigate the effect of post-training interventions (PTI) integrating GenAI on learning and learning transfer and compare with interventions without PTI as well as with PTI but without integrating generative GenAI. It was hypothesized that both learning and learning transfer increases when there is post-training intervention and the integration of GenAI further enhances both learning and learning transfer.

H₁: Knowledge in post-training phase is higher than that in the pre-training phase.

H₂: Training transfer with post-training interventions using GenAI is higher than training transfer without PTI.

Methods

Study Design and Participants

This study employed quantitative approach, particularly, quasi-experimental research design. It involved the training participants from two groups of Advanced Course on Management and Development (ACMD) programs in between June 2024 and December 2024. ACMD program is a 35-day training program designed as an in-service training for class II level under-secretaries or equivalent position holders in the government of Nepal. This study assessed the learning and learning transfer of one of the sessions named performance planning within the module named ‘Performance Efficacy and Leadership’.

For the examination, the first group i.e. ACMD1 was treated as the control group (CG) in which no post training intervention was made. The second group i.e. ACMD2 was the experimental group (EG) in which post-training intervention was made at the end of the training using generative AI tools. Since both the ACMD programs were conducted during the same period, treating one ACMD group as one independent study helped minimize the possible interactions between the groups. Overlearning/practice strategy was used as the post-training intervention. For this group, the intervention utilized generative AI (GenAI), particularly the free versions of chatGPT.com, Gemini and Perplexity.ai. There were 21 participants in ACMD1 and 20 participants in ACMD2 making a total of 41 participants who took part in both pre-and post-training phase. The study sample size derived by using G* power analysis software was 39 exceeding the minimum study sample size requirement. To determine the sample size, ‘ANOVA: Repeated measures, within-between interaction’ was selected as the statistical test, and ‘A prior: Compute required sample size – given alpha, power and effect size’ was selected as the type of power analysis. The sample size was computed with the p value as 0.05, statistical power as 95 percent, and effect size as 0.25, number of groups as 2 and the number of measurements as 5 (Faul et al., 2007).

Data Collection

There were three rounds of data collection for each group. The first round was at the pre-training phase (T_1). Pre-training knowledge was examined used multiple choice test item (MCTI). Similarly, the same MCTI was used at the end of the training. Precisely, the post-test was conducted right after the final presentation and one day before the certification (T_2). The third round of data collection was conducted to collect the data on transfer of training, which was carried out four months after the training completion (T_3). In T_3 , data were collected from the training graduates as well as their sub-ordinates of Section officer’s level. Data were first collected from the subordinates and then from the participants themselves (training graduates) to cross-check the facts on training transfer. Hence, in this study, four important data were collected which were: i.) socio-demographic information of the participants, ii.) MCTI scores, iii.) training transfer and iv.) subordinates’ details.

Table 1: *Groups and Tools used in the Study*

SN	Group	Tools used		
		T_1	T_2	T_3

1.	Control Group – ACMD 1	For Learning: Test	For Learning Retention: Test Items
2.	Experimental Group (GenAI) - ACMD 2	Items	For Learning Transfer: Individual inquiry: Subordinates and Participants independently

Instrument

In this study, the researcher-developed instrument was prepared and used to assess the pre-training and post-training knowledge. First, MCTI was developed and revised based on the contents of the session (Annex I). This instrument was the basis for analysis of learning before and after the training at knowledge level. To measure the transfer of training, subordinates of the training graduates were simply asked “Did your supervisor provide with a KRA, KPA and KPI format for your job roles?”. Similarly, the training graduates were separately asked “Did you provide with a KRA, KPA and KPI format for their job roles?”. They were inquired independently at different time and positive answers from both subordinates and participants (i.e. if they both said ‘yes’) were considered essential to confirm the transfer of the training. Further, they were also asked to provide the format of the output upon need.

Intervention

Among the two study groups, the ACMD2 which was the treatment group, was approached again at T₂. Participants were requested to bring their laptops one day ahead with one of the generative AI tools installed or made available. The post training intervention commenced right after the post-test. There were asked to conduct the same exercise which they did and presented as the part of the group-work beforehand, during their regular session. However, in this intervention, they were given the researcher-developed artificial intelligence (AI) based prompts. As the participants recalled the contents while taking the post-test, they were given a guideline with a series of steps (Annex II). There were nine steps in the guideline in which they were asked to select a key result area of one of their subordinates and finalize with the researcher. They were then asked to copy the prompt provided to them through hard and e0-copy and paste in on their respective generative AI tool (e.g. ChatGPT) to create KPAs and then to customize as per their job contexts. After finalizing both KRA and KPA, they were again asked to command another prompt to generative AI to generate required KPIs followed by customized as per the job context. They were finally requested to save a copy of their output in a word file to apply back on their job to their subordinates, as well as to share with the researcher for reference. Meanwhile, the control group only had the output generated in the regular training session.

Reliability and Validity

In this study, reliability was ensured through test-retest approach. To assess the gain in knowledge, same instrument was used in the pre-training phase and post-training phase. Similarly, the same instrument was used across the control and treatment group. In this study, post-test was conducted after over a month. With several contents covered in the training afterwards and substantial time gap, it was likely that training participants had nearly forgotten the question items, thereby minimizing the biasness of pre-remembrance. The tests were

conducted by the researcher with clear instructions and support whenever needed. Researcher clearly communicated that the test was conducted for assessing the effectiveness of the session rather than to evaluate the participants. Further, the researcher also informed that if there was any confusion in the wordings of the questions, the confusion would be clarified. The researcher also clarified a few questions during the pre-tests.

Validity was one of the key concerns of this study. Since researcher prepared instrument was used which was in the form of MCTI, content validity was given central attention. For this, the prepared preliminary MCTI was reviewed by two content experts and one process expert independently (Annex III). The MCTI was then revised based on their feedback and used in this study. Content experts were selected on the grounds of their knowledge and experiences in delivering contents of performance management at both national and international level. Similarly, process expert was selected considering their competence and expertise in using MCTIs and conducting quasi-experimental research (Gaskin, 2017).

Analysis

Descriptive statistical tools were used to present socio-demographic variables. To examine the gain in knowledge, the difference between the mean score of the post-test and that of pretest were compared using paired sample *t*-test. Similarly, chi-square test of independence was employed to determine if there is a statistically significant association between two categorical variables which were i. training transfer (transferred vs. not transferred) and ii. ACMD group (ACMD1 vs. ACMD2). The statistical significance of the difference in these proportions was evaluated at an alpha level of $\alpha = .05$. On the other hand, discriminant analysis was used to identify the level of effectiveness of the predictor in distinguishing between the different groups of ACMD for training transfer.

Ethics

This study holds ethical challenges for two-fold reasons. First, despite the effort of researchers, the participants are likely to take the researcher as the member of NASC. Second, participants might not feel comfortable during the data collection following the post-training interventions. Therefore, clear communication was made at the beginning that the research was an individual work being carried out independently without the influence of NASC. This was necessary to be communicated to clear their doubts. Second, participants' comfort was assured being an independent researcher disconnecting from NASC's training and other affairs. Therefore, participation was made voluntary and informed consent was taken, and confidentiality was maintained in the research process.

Results

In this study, there were two cohorts: ACMD1 which was the control group and ACMD2 which was the treatment group. In both the groups, there were significantly higher number of male participants in both the groups. Of the 41 participants, nearly 83 percent were male and nearly 83 percent belonged to Brahmin/Chhetri community. There were minimal observations of Janajati and Madhesi ethnic background. Nearly 91 percent responded that they have job descriptions in their organizations but less than 50 percent only responded that the job descriptions are fully used. Nearly 40 percent informed that their job descriptions were only partially used.

Table 2: *Background of the participants*

Headings	Frequency	Percent
Gender		
<i>Male</i>	34	82.9
<i>Female</i>	7	17.1
Ethnicity		
<i>Brahmin/Chhetri</i>	34	82.9
<i>Janajati</i>	4	9.8
<i>Madhesi</i>	3	7.3
Availability of Job Description		
<i>No</i>	4	9.8
<i>Yes</i>	37	90.2
Use of Job Description		
<i>No</i>	5	12.2
<i>Partially</i>	16	39.0
<i>Yes</i>	20	48.8
Total	41	100

The participants were also inquired about their experiences and team numbers. On an average, the participants had around 19 years of experience in government while seven years of experience as the under-secretary. They have been leading a team around 25 employees on an average, in which five were section officers (or equivalent) and around nine were assistants. Since the standard deviation of subordinates is higher than the average values, it shows that there were participants which much higher number of subordinates which they must lead as the supervisor.

Table 3: *Profession related information*

Variables	Mean	Std Dev
Experience in government service	18.78	6.803
Experience as Under-secretary	7.02	2.688
No. of subordinates - officers	4.85	6.865
No. of subordinates - assistants	8.68	12.250
No. of subordinates - non-class	11.61	29.933
No. of total subordinates	24.71	38.300

Table 3 presents the profession-related information of the study participants. On average, participants had a substantial amount of experience in government service (Mean = 18.78 years, SD = 6.803) and had served as Under-secretaries for approximately seven years (Mean = 7.02 years, SD = 2.688). Regarding their current roles, the mean number of subordinates they supervised included around five officers (Mean = 4.85, SD = 6.865), approximately nine assistants (Mean = 8.68, SD = 12.250), and about twelve non-class employees (Mean = 11.61, SD = 29.933), resulting in an average total of nearly 25 subordinates (Mean = 24.71, SD = 38.300). The standard deviations indicate a considerable variation in the number of subordinates, particularly for assistants and non-class staff, suggesting heterogeneity in the participants' supervisory responsibilities.

Gain in Knowledge

The gain in knowledge among the participants was assessed using paired sample *t*-test.

Assumptions

Prior to conducting the test, three key assumptions were checked. First, to conduct the quasi-experiment, the base line data of both the groups should be similar. In this study, the pre-test knowledge of the participants was taken as the baseline data. For this independent samples *t*-test was conducted to measure if there is statistically significant difference in the average pre-training knowledge between the first and second group. Table 4 shows that though the average value of pre-training knowledge of ACMD1 was slightly higher than, it was only by chance. The average value of pretraining knowledge was the same across the groups.

Table 4: *Pre-training knowledge*

ACMD Group	N	Mean	Std. Dev	t value	'p' value Sig. (2- tailed)
ACMD1	21	42.8571	14.50856	.894 ^a	.377
ACMD2	20	38.8455	14.22283		

a. Equal variances assumed

Table 4 presents the pre-training knowledge scores for the control group (ACMD1) and the treatment group (ACMD2). The control group (n=21) had a mean score of 42.86 with a standard deviation of 14.51, while the treatment group (n=20) had a slightly lower mean score of 38.85 with a standard deviation of 14.22. An independent samples *t*-test was conducted to assess if this

difference in means was statistically significant. The resulting t-value was .894 (with 39 degrees of freedom), and the corresponding p-value (Sig. 2-tailed) was .377. Since the p-value of .377 is greater than the conventional significance level of .05, we fail to reject the null hypothesis. Therefore, we can conclude that there was no statistically significant difference in the pre-training knowledge between the control group (ACMD1) and the treatment group (ACMD2). This finding supports the assumption that the two groups were comparable in their baseline knowledge before the intervention.

Table 5: *Mean difference of pre- and post-test knowledge*

ACMD Group	Mean	Std. Dev	Correlation	Sig.	t value	'p' value Sig. (2- tailed)
Post-training knowledge	59.85	15.91	.278	.078	6.663	.000
Pre-training knowledge	40.90	14.33				

N = 41

Table 5 presents a comparison of the pre-training and post-training knowledge scores for the entire sample of participants (N = 41). The mean post-training knowledge score (59.85, SD = 15.91) was notably higher than the mean pre-training knowledge score (40.90, SD = 14.33). The correlation between the pre-training and post-training scores was .278, which was not statistically significant (Sig. = .078). However, the paired samples t-test revealed a highly statistically significant difference between the pre-training and post-training knowledge scores ($t = 6.663$, $p = .000$). This indicates a significant gain in knowledge from the pre-training phase to the post-training phase across the entire sample.

Further to the confirmation that the learning has enhanced after taking the training, Cohen's d was also calculated as shown below. It is a widely used standardized effect size that measures the magnitude of the difference between two groups' means in terms of their standard deviation. It was used to quantify the size of the average change observed between the two time-points (pre-training and post-training) relative to the variability of that change.

$$\text{Cohen's } d = \frac{\text{difference of means}}{\text{pooled Standard Deviation}} = \frac{18.95}{15.14} = 1.25$$

The obtained Cohen's d value of 1.25 suggests that the training intervention had a substantial and noticeable impact on training transfer within the ACMD2 group. The average participant's training transfer status changed by a large degree relative to the variability of those changes. This value therefore provides strong evidence for the practical significance of the training intervention on training transfer, indicating a very large effect. Despite the lack of a strong linear pattern in how individuals' training transfer changed from the initial to the later

measurement (indicated by the non-significant correlation), the substantial Cohen's d reveals that, on average, the group experienced a considerable shift in training transfer status.

Transfer of Training

The central focus of this study was to examine if the training transfer increases in treatment group (with the intervention with a goal-based exercise employing generative AI as the post) as compared to the control group with no intervention. To make examinations on training transfer, chi-square and discriminant analysis was carried out.

Table 6: *Descriptive statistics of transfer of training*

Group	Transfer of Training		Total
	Not transferred	Transferred	
ACMD1	20	1	21
ACMD2	13	7	20
Total	33	8	41

Table 6 shows that the status of training transferred and non-transferred. Among the 41 graduates, the descriptive data showed that the number of training transfer cases in the control was non-existent (only 1) whereas that of the treatment group was also limited. This shows that the frequency of training transfer was minimal in both the groups.

Table 7: *Observation of transfer of training*

Tests	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	5.964 ^a	1	.015		
Continuity Correction ^b	4.194	1	.041		
Likelihood Ratio	6.534	1	.011		
Fisher's Exact Test				.020	.018
Linear-by-Linear Association	5.819	1	.016		

N = 41

a. 2 cells (50.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3.90.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table 7 shows the observations of training transfer comparing the results between control and treatment group. The table shows that Pearson Chi-Square result statistically significant value ($p < .05$). The result shows that higher training transfer was observed in the treatment group as compared to the control group.

Factors influencing Training Transfer

Further to the observations of training transfers using Chi-square test, this study also examined the factors that make impact on the training transfer process. For this, discriminant analysis was used. This study used all the major predictor variables such as gain in knowledge, use of job description, ethnicity of the participants, no. of subordinates – assistants, experience as under-secretary, availability of job description and number of total subordinates.

Table 8: *Wilks' Lambda*

Test of Function(s)	Wilks' Lambda	Chi-square	df	Sig.
1	.500	24.585	7	.001

Table 8 shows Wilk's Lambda test conduct to examine whether there are statistically significant differences among the group means for the variables on each discriminant function. A smaller Wilks' Lambda value indicates greater separation between groups. Here, a Wilks' Lambda value of .500 indicates that 50% of the total variance in the discriminant function is explained by the differences between the groups. Further, a significant p-value ($p < 0.05$) suggests that the discriminant function significantly contributes to differentiating the groups. In this table, the statistically significant result ($p < .01$) suggests that there is a statistically significant difference between the group means on the discriminant function.

Table 9: *Eigenvalues and canonical correlation*

Function	Eigenvalue	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Canonical Correlation
1	.999 ^a	100.0	100.0	.707

a. First 1 canonical discriminant functions were used in the analysis.

Table 9 shows the eigen values of the discriminant analysis. It yielded a single significant discriminant function, as indicated by an eigenvalue of .999. This function accounted for 100% of the variance distinguishing the groups based on training transfer. The strong canonical correlation of .707 further supports the function's ability to effectively separate the groups, demonstrating a substantial relationship between the linear combination of the predictor variables and the group membership.

Table 10: *Standardized canonical discriminant function coefficients*

Independent Variable	Function 1
Difference (%) between Pre-training Intervention & Post-training Intervention	.956
No. of subordinates - officers	.007
No. of total subordinates	-.081
Is there a job description?	-.488
Gender of the participants	-.075

Table 10 presents the standardized canonical discriminant function coefficients for the single discriminant function derived in this analysis. The table reveals that the "Difference (%) between Pre-training Intervention & Post-training Intervention," which represents the gain in knowledge, exhibits the strongly positive coefficient loading of .956 on the single dominant discriminant function (eigenvalue = .999). This indicates that the extent of knowledge gained during the training is the most influential factor in distinguishing the groups based on training transfer. The remaining variables, including the number of subordinates (officers and total), the presence of a job description, and the gender of the participants, display substantially smaller coefficients, suggesting their comparatively minor direct impact on this discriminant function in this model. This alignment between the univariate tests and the discriminant function coefficients reinforces the conclusion that the amount of knowledge gained during the training is the primary factor that significantly differentiates the groups based on their levels of training transfer.

Table 11: *Tests of equality of group means*

Variables	Wilks' Lambda	F	df1	df2	Sig.
Gain in Knowledge	.686	17.856	1	39	.000
Use of job description	.932	2.854	1	39	.099
Ethnicity of the participants	.956	1.778	1	39	.190
No. of subordinates - assistants	.976	.964	1	39	.332
Experience as Under-secretary	.992	.306	1	39	.583
Availability of Job description	.936	2.666	1	39	.111
No. of total subordinates	1.000	.003	1	39	.954

Table 11 shows the tests of equality of group means in which all the independent variables have been tested. The table shows that only 'gain in knowledge' has a highly statistically significant effect on training transfer. This indicates that the amount of knowledge participants gained during the training is a strong predictor of whether they demonstrated training transfer. Higher gains in knowledge are significantly associated with higher training transfer. Meanwhile, all other variables such as number of subordinates, availability of job description and use of job description and such do not appear to be a statistically significant independent predictor of training transfer when the gain in knowledge was accounted for.

Discussions

This study aimed to assess whether learning differs across pre-training and post-training phase or not; and whether post-training intervention using generative AI leads to increased training transfer processes compared to conventional training. The primary purpose of any training is ideally to enhance the knowledge and skills needed to excel the performance of the training participants back on the job. To ensure that the training participants gain knowledge and skills, training providers make significant efforts in training design and implementation. However, despite the acknowledgements of the pre-training and post-training efforts, these steps are often ignored in the training design which leads to undesired results in the evaluation phase. This study not only explored the pertinent roles of post-training intervention but also showed that the intervention should not be insolation but should be embedded with suitable strategy and technology.

Post-training Intervention

There has been a gradual rise in scholarly interest in the post-training interventions within the training transfer literature. Studies have shown positive results of post-training interventions, after the training, to foster the transfer of learning from training back to the job (Rahyuda et al., 2014). Including post-training intervention has been shown to promote training transfer in this study. The study found post-training intervention to make a statistically significant impact on their learning transfer process. ACMD is a long-term training course of 35 working days which extends to nearly one and a half months. As a result, participants are likely to forget the knowledge and skills acquired from sessions conducted in the first few weeks. Therefore, post-training intervention carried out through simple and challenging goal setting helped them refresh the learning and plan to implement the learned skills. In this study, specific exercise was conducted using distributed practice and goal setting technique.

Researchers (e.g. Nakata et al., 2017) claim that distributed practice skills acquisition is carried out in multiple sessions at certain intervals, is therefore effective for learning and learning transfer. Distributed practice is carried out further to skill demonstration, guided practice and independent practice should be followed by distributed practices. It allows the participants to recall their learning after a certain interval, re-practice to allow the learning to transfer from short term to long term memory, and consequently to promote training transfer (Soderstrom & Bjork, 2016). This study utilized both distributed practices and goal setting. The researcher requested all the participants to apply the KRA, KPA and KPI framework on their subordinates after it was developed. The goal given to the participants was simple and challenging, which was to provide them with the printed copy of the framework and ask them follow it. Participants were also requested to do a follow-up randomly. First, distributed practice has been identified as one of the promising techniques for enhancing the enhancing transfer of training and improving individual and organizational performances (Baldwin et al., 2017). Second, simple and achievable goals provided them with directions to apply the learning to which literature suggests that having multiple learning goals enhance training transfer more than

having no goal (Johnson et al., 2012). Both these factors used in the post-training interventions positively contributed to the transfer of training.

Use of Generative AI

This research utilized post-training intervention with a ready-to-use researcher-developed prompt to use in generative Artificial Intelligence (AI) platforms in the planned exercise to make use of AI to generate the output (KRA, KPA and KPI framework). This post-training intervention using generative AI explains that generative AI can be an effective means to promote the transfer of training. Using well-structured prompts in AI not only makes output generation efficient but also makes it complete and comprehensive which can be customized as per the context of the participants. In this study, participants received the output of KPA and KPI instantly with the given prompts and were able to prepare a complete output within a few minutes with a better understanding of the subject matter. It lessened their mental burden and prompted them to apply the learning. In line with this discussion, generative AI tools are considered useful for answering common questions and improving work efficiency. Further, for pre- and post-training efforts, frequent training evaluations and AI mentoring have been suggested (Park, 2024). This research attempted to evaluate the learning at two different points. Further, the researcher suggested practical ways of commanding AI tools with effective, yet simple prompts in the future discourse to AI as their mentor. The study therefore exhibited that when learning becomes effective with minimal time and effort using AI, it allows them time and effort to think of the ways to apply the training.

Further the future directions provided by the Ford et al. (2018) to prepare for the unknown in an innovative way, recent studies (e.g. Trenerry et al., 2021) have established artificial intelligence (AI) as a significant and dynamic driver of digital transformation, significantly altering work methods. The use of AI in training and education has drawn central attention of the scholars (Bhatt & Muduli, 2023; Ni et al., 2024) since AI has proven to provide multi-fold benefits from fostering learning to facilitating in the learning evaluation process. It has also been argued that nearly two-thirds of the jobs in global contexts have been exposed the AI in automation directly or indirectly (Hatzius et al., 2023). Therefore, training should involve upskilling and reskilling training providers in the discourse of digital transformation. Even though post-training interventions (both goal setting and relapse prevention) had contradicting results when it comes to transfer of training going beyond the training led learning (Rahyuda et al., 2017), the use of generative AI in this process can have better results. Use of AI merely may not bring expected result in the training transfer. However, as suggested by Park (2024), if suitable strategies are embedded using AI, training effectiveness perceptions and ultimately transfer of training can be promoted leading to the meaningful change in the individual and organizational performance.

Conclusion

This study demonstrates that integrating post-training interventions, particularly those employing distributed practice and goal-setting strategies, significantly enhances the transfer of learning. Furthermore, the application of generative AI as a tool within these interventions has demonstrated its effectiveness in improving understanding and facilitating the practical application of acquired knowledge and skills. These findings underscore the value of strategically incorporating post-training efforts, facilitated by technology such as generative AI, to reinforce learning and enhance training transfer by effectively bridging the gap between instructional settings and workplace applications.

These outcomes provide practical ways forward for the design and implementation of training programs, suggesting that embedding well-designed post-training interventions that leverage the capabilities of generative AI can significantly improve the effectiveness and long-term impact of training initiatives. Future research could further investigate the nuanced effects of diverse AI prompting methodologies and the sustained influence of AI-facilitated training transfer across various organizational contexts.

Limitations and Future Research

This study's design, which included a control and a treatment group with a sample size of 41, allowed for necessary statistical tests with adequate power. However, this sample size precluded the use of bootstrapping. For future research, employing Monte-Carlo simulation for bootstrapping would yield more robust results, necessitating a larger sample of 150 to 200 participants across multiple control and treatment groups. A significant limitation impacting the generalizability of our findings is that the study was confined to observing only one session of a single module, rather than encompassing the entire training program. This focused scope poses a threat to generalizing that the entire training program itself was not transferred, as our observations were limited to a specific part of it. Building on this, our study focused on a single training topic delivered over two 200-minute sessions. Future investigations could broaden this scope to include multiple sessions covering both practical and theoretical aspects of long-term training programs. Exploring short-term training programs would also facilitate a comparative analysis of post-training interventions across diverse training formats. Our current work was limited to basic socio-demographic variables, learning, and training transfer variables. Subsequent research should incorporate moderating factors within the work environment and additional control variables, as these elements are known to significantly impact training transfer processes.

A critical limitation of this study also lies in its scope, as it did not explicitly delve into how the work environment or personal character might influence the application of learned skills. Future research should address this by examining the specific impact of workplace policies, supervisory support, and individual characteristics such as motivation or resilience on training effectiveness. The observed low training transfer in this study necessitates further in-depth investigation. A significant research implication here is the adoption of an explanatory

sequential mixed methods design. This approach would involve a qualitative follow-up phase, perhaps through interviews or focus groups, to understand participants' perceptions of the barriers to transfer. This qualitative data would shed light on whether issues stem from training design, the work environment, or personal characteristics—and could clarify if excuses like employee transfers are valid or indicative of deeper systemic issues. The insights gained from this qualitative exploration would then serve to explain the quantitative findings, offering a more nuanced and comprehensive understanding of the factors influencing training transfer. Ultimately, a subsequent follow-up study is crucial to confirm whether the primary issue lies in the training design, the work environment, or personal characteristics, and to more comprehensively explore trainee characteristics and other factors that influence training transfer.

References

- Arthur Jr., W., Bennett Jr., W., Stanush, P. L., & McNelly, T. L. (1998). Factors that influence skill decay and retention: A quantitative review and analysis. *Human Performance*, 11(1), 57–101. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327043hup1101_3
- Baldwin, T. T., & Ford, J. K. (1988). Transfer of training: A review and directions for future research. *Personnel Psychology*, 41(1), 63-105. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.1988.tb00632.x>
- Baldwin, T. T., & Magjuka, R. J. (1991). Organizational training and signals of importance: Linking pretraining perceptions to intentions to transfer. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 2(1), 25-36. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hrdq.3920020106>
- Baldwin, T. T., Ford, J. K. & Blume, B. D. (2017). The state of transfer of training research: Moving toward more consumer-centric inquiry. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 28(1), 17-28.
- Bates, R., Holton III, E. F., & Hatala, J. P. (2012). A revised learning transfer system inventory: Factorial replication and validation. *Human Resource Development International*, 15(5), 549-569. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13678868.2012.726872>
- Bhatti, M. A., & Kaur, S. (2010). The role of individual and training design factors on training transfer. *Journal of European Industrial Training*, 34(7), 656-672. <https://doi.org/10.1108/03090591011070770>
- Bhatti, M. A., Ali, S., Isa, M. F. M., & Battour, M. M. (2014). Training transfer and transfer motivation: The influence of individual, environmental, situational, training design, and affective reaction factors. *Performance Improvement Quarterly*, 27(1), 51-82. <https://doi.org/10.1002/piq.21165>
- Blume, B. D., Ford, J. K., Baldwin, T. T., & Huang, J. L. (2010). Transfer of training: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of Management*, 36(4), 1065-1105. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206309352880>
- Bontis, N. (2001). Assessing knowledge assets: A review of the models used to measure intellectual capital. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 3(1), 41-60. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2370.00053>
- Broad, M. L. (2005). *Beyond transfer of training: Engaging systems to improve performance*. San Francisco, CA: John Wiley & Sons
- Brown, T. C., & Latham, G. P. (2002). The effects of behavioral outcome goals, learning goals, urging people to do their best on teamwork behavior on a group problem-solving task. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science*, 34, 276-285.
- Brown, T. C., & Warren, A. M. (2009). Distal goal and proximal goal transfer of training interventions in an executive education program. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 20, 265-284.

- Burke, L. A., & Hutchins, H. M. (2007). Training transfer: An integrative literature review. *Human Resource Development Review*, 6(3), 263-296. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1534484307303035>
- Cheng, E. W., & Hampson, I. (2008). Transfer of training: A review and new insights. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 10(4), 327-341. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2370.2007.00230.x>
- Chiaburu, D. S., & Marinova, S. V. (2005). What predicts skill transfer? An exploratory study of goal orientation, training self-efficacy and organizational supports. *International journal of training and development*, 9(2), 110-123. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2419.2005.00225.x>
- Conger, J. A., & Pearce, C. L. (2009). Using empowerment to motivate people to engage in effective self-and shared leadership. In E. A. Locke (Ed.), *Handbook of principles of organizational behavior: Indispensable knowledge for evidence-based management*, 2nd ed. (pp. 201-216). West Sussex, United Kingdom: John Wiley & Sons.
- Coultas, C. W., Grossman, R., & Salas, E. (2012). Design, delivery, evaluation, and transfer of training systems. In G. Salvendy (Ed.) *Handbook of human factors and ergonomics*, 4th ed. (pp. 490-533). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.
- Dean, P. J., Dean, M. R., & Rebalsky, R. M. (1996). Employee perceptions of workplace factors that will most improve their performance. *Performance Improvement Quarterly*, 9(2), 75-89. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1937-8327.1996.tb00721.x>
- Dessie, W. M., & Ademe, A. S. (2017). Training for creativity and innovation in small enterprises in Ethiopia. *International Journal of Training and Development*, 21(3), 224-234. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ijtd.12107>
- Faul, F., Erdfelder, E., Lang, A.-G., & Buchner, A. (2007). G*Power 3: A flexible statistical power analysis program for the social, behavioral, and biomedical sciences. *Behavior Research Methods*, 39(2), 175–191. <https://doi.org/10.3758/BF03193146>
- Ford, J. K., Baldwin, T. T., & Prasad, J. (2018). Transfer of training: The known and the unknown. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 5(1), 201e225
- Ford, J. K., Baldwin, T. T., & Prasad, J. (2018). Transfer of training: The known and the unknown. *Annual review of organizational psychology and organizational behavior*, 5(1), 201-225. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-032117-104443>
- Gaudine, A. P., & Saks, A. M. (2004). A longitudinal quasi-experiment on the effects of posttraining transfer interventions. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 15, 57-76.
- Grossman, R., & Salas, E. (2011). The transfer of training: what really matters. *International Journal of Training and Development*, 15(2), 103-120. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2419.2011.00373.x>
- Hatzius, J., Briggs, J., Kodnani, D., & Pierdomenico, G. (2023, March 26). The potentially large effects of artificial intelligence on economic growth. Goldman Sachs.

- <https://www.gspublishing.com/content/research/en/reports/2023/03/27/d64e052b-0f6e-45d7-967b-d7be35fabd16.html>
- Hausdorf, P. A. (2022). *The Training Failure Problem: Diagnosis and Solutions*. SAGE Publications: SAGE Business Cases Originals.
- Hehir, D. (2023, Oct 31). *How AI Is transforming training, development, and the learner experience*. <https://shorturl.at/gCrNA>
- Holton III, E. F. (1996). The flawed four-level evaluation model. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 7(1), 5-21. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hrdq.3920070103>
- Holton III, E. F., Bates, R. A., & Ruona, W. E. A. (2000). Development of a generalized learning transfer system inventory. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 11(4), 333–360. [https://doi.org/10.1002/1532-1096\(200024\)11:4<333::aid-hrdq2>3.0.co;2-p](https://doi.org/10.1002/1532-1096(200024)11:4<333::aid-hrdq2>3.0.co;2-p)
- Johnson, S. K., Garrison, L. L., Hernez-Broome, G., Fleenor, J. W., & Steed, J. L. (2012). Go for the goal(s): Relationship between goal setting and transfer of training following leadership development. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 11, 555-569.
- Keith, N., & Frese, M. (2008). Effectiveness of error management training: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93(1), 59-69. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.93.1.59>
- Kirwan, C., & Birchall, D. (2006). Transfer of learning from management development programmes: Testing the Holton model. *International Journal of Training and Development*, 10(4), 252–268. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2419.2006.00259.x>
- Latham, G. P., & Brown, T. C. (2006). The effect of learning vs. outcome goals on self-efficacy, satisfaction and performance in an MBA program. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 55, 606-623.
- Latham, G. P., & Locke, E. A. (2007). New developments in and directions for goal-setting research. *European Psychologist*, 12, 290-300.
- Lee, K., & Pucel, D. J. (1998). The perceived impacts of supervisor reinforcement and learning objective importance on transfer of training. *Performance Improvement Quarterly*, 11(4), 51-61. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1937-8327.1998.tb00106.x>
- Lee, K., & Pucel, D. J. (1998). The perceived impacts of supervisor reinforcement and learning objective importance on transfer of training. *Performance Improvement Quarterly*, 11(4), 51-61. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1937-8327.1998.tb00106.x>
- Lim, D. H. (2000). Training design factors influencing transfer of training to the workplace within an international context. *Journal of Vocational Education and Training*, 52(2), 243-258. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13636820000200118>
- Machin, M. A., & Fogarty, G. J. (2003). Perceptions of training-related factors and personal variables as predictors of transfer implementation intentions. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 18(1), 51-71. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1025082920860>
- Marx, R. D. (1982). Relapse prevention for managerial training: A model for maintenance of behavioural change. *Academy of Management Review*, 7, 433-441.
- Milne, D., Westerman, C., & Hanner, S. (2002). Can a “relapse prevention” module facilitate the transfer of training? *Behavioural and Cognitive Psychotherapy*, 30, 361-364.

- Nakata, B. N., Cavalini, W., Bonin, E. A., Salvalaggio, P. R., & Loureiro, M. P. (2017). Impact of continuous training through distributed practice for acquisition of minimally invasive surgical skills. *Surgical Endoscopy*, 31, 4051-4057. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00464-017-5451-y>
- Nijman, D. J. J., Nijhof, W. J., Wognum, A. A. M., & Veldkamp, B. P. (2006). Exploring differential effects of supervisor support on transfer of training. *Journal of European Industrial Training*, 30(7), 529-549. <https://doi.org/10.1108/03090590610704394>
- Nikandrou, I., Brinia, V., & Bereri, E. (2009). Trainee perceptions of training transfer: An empirical analysis. *Journal of European Industrial Training*, 33(3), 255-270. <https://doi.org/10.1108/03090590910950604>
- Park, J. J. (2024). Unlocking training transfer in the age of artificial intelligence. *Business Horizons*, 67(3), 263-269.
- Park, Y., Lim, D. H., & Chang, J. (2016). Trainee versus supervisor assessment of training transfer: Mediation analysis of transfer variables. *Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources*, 55(2), 192-212. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1744-7941.12116>
- Pattni, I., Soutar, G. N., & Klobas, J. E. (2007). The impact of a short self-management training intervention in a retail banking environment. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 18, 159-178.
- Rahyuda, A., Syed, J., & Soltani, E. (2014). The role of relapse prevention and goal setting in training transfer enhancement. *Human Resource Development Review*, 13(4), 413-436. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1534484314533337>
- Russ-Eft, D. (2002). A typology of training design and work environment factors affecting workplace learning and transfer. *Human Resource Development Review*, 1(1), 45-65. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1534484302011003>
- Salas, E., & Stagl, K. C. (2009). Design training systematically and follow the science of training. In E. A. Locke (Ed.), *Handbook of principles of organizational behavior: Indispensable knowledge for evidence-based management*, 2nd ed. (pp. 59-84). West Sussex, United Kingdom: John Wiley & Sons. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119206422.ch4>
- Salas, E., Wilson, K. A., Priest, H. A., & Guthrie, J. W. (2006). Design, delivery, and evaluation of training systems. In G. Salvendy (Ed.), *Handbook of human factors and ergonomics*, 3rd ed. (pp. 472-512). Hoboken, New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons. <https://doi.org/10.1002/0470048204.ch18>
- Seijts, G. H., & Latham, G. P. (2001). The effect of distal learning, outcome, and proximal goals on a moderately complex task. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 22, 291-302.
- Soderstrom, N. C., & Bjork, R. A. (2015). Learning versus performance: An integrative review. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 10(2), 176-199. <https://doi.org/10.1177/17456916155569000>
- Srimannarayana, M. (2011). Measuring training & development. *Indian Journal of Industrial Relations*, 47(1), 117-125.

- Tonhäuser, C., & Büker, L. (2016). Determinants of transfer of training: A comprehensive literature review. *International Journal for Research in Vocational Education and Training*, 3(2), 127-165. <https://doi.org/10.13152/IJRVET.3.2.4>
- Tsai, W. C., & Tai, W. T. (2003). Perceived importance as a mediator of the relationship between training assignment and training motivation. *Personnel Review*, 32(2), 151 – 163. <https://doi.org/10.1108/00483480310460199>
- Velada, R., Caetano, A., Michel, J. W., Lyons, B. D., & Kavanagh, M. J. (2007). The effects of training design, individual characteristics and work environment on transfer of training. *International Journal of Training and Development*, 11(4), 282-294. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2419.2007.00286.x>
- Wilson, C., & Broomfield, H. (2022). Learning how to do AI: Managing organizational boundaries in an intergovernmental learning forum. *Public Management Review*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14719037.2022.2055119>

Annex

Annex I: Questionnaire

Nepal Administrative Staff College
ACMD: Questionnaire of Learning: POST TRAINING PHASE

आदरणीय सर/ म्याडम, नमस्ते तथा अभिवादन!

यो प्रश्नावली ACMD बाट अपेक्षित सिकाइ र सिकाइको कार्यस्थलमा स्थानान्तरण (Training Transfer) सम्बन्धी अध्ययन गर्ने उद्देश्यले यहाँलाई भर्न दिइएको हो। यो सर्वेक्षण नेपाल प्रशासनिक प्रशिक्षण प्रतिष्ठानको आन्तरिक अनुसन्धान मध्ये एक हो। तपाईंको उत्तरले Training Transfer सम्बन्धी वास्तविक अवस्था पत्ता लगाउन, साथै थप सुधारको लागि पहल गर्नको निमित्त महत्वपूर्ण हुने विश्वास गरिएको छ।

तपाईंको उत्तर गोप्य रहने छ र केवल अनुसन्धान प्रयोजनको लागि मात्र प्रयोग गरिनेछ। यस सर्वेक्षणमा उत्तरदाताको परिचय खुल्ने कुनै पनि प्रकारको सूचना राखिने छैन। कृपया तल दिएका सबै प्रश्नहरूको उत्तर दिनुहोला। तपाईंको सहभागिता प्रति हामी आभारी रहनेछौं। धन्यवाद!

फारम भर्न सहमत छु [] Signature: _____

अनुप भुर्तेल

नेपाल प्रशासनिक प्रशिक्षण प्रतिष्ठान,

जावलाखेल, ललितपुर, नेपाल।

Socio-Demographic Information (Please tick on the appropriate answer)

Name: _____ Position: _____ Organization: _____

Years of experience in government: _____ Years of experience in undersecretary/Class II level: _____

Number of subordinates (under you): Officers: _____ Assistants: _____ Non-class employees: _____ Total: _____

Do you have Job Descriptions in your organization? Yes: ☐ No: ☐ I don't know: ☐

If yes, is it in use? Yes: ☐ Partially: ☐ No: ☐ Gender: Male: ☐ Female: ☐ Others: ☐

Ethnicity: Brahmin/Chhetri: ☐ Janajati: ☐ Madhesi: ☐ Dalit: ☐ Others (Specify): ☐ _____

1. Which of the following best defines a Key Result Area (KRA)?

- i. A detailed list of daily tasks assigned to an employee
- ii. The broad areas in which an employee is expected to deliver results
- iii. A specific action plan with deadlines for a project
- iv. A numerical target set for evaluating performance

2. What is the primary purpose of a Key Performance Indicator (KPI) in performance planning?

- i. To track employee attendance and punctuality
- ii. To measure and evaluate progress toward specific objectives
- iii. To assign daily tasks to employees
- iv. To define the organizational hierarchy

3. Which of the following BEST describes the relationship between KRAs, KPAs, and KPIs?

- i. KPIs define the broad areas of responsibility, which are measured by KPAs.
- ii. KRAs are broad areas of responsibility, achieved through specific KPAs, which are measured by KPIs.
- iii. KPAs are broad areas of responsibility, achieved through specific KRAs, which are measured by KPIs.
- iv. KPIs define the specific actions (KPAs) needed to achieve the overall goals (KRAs).

4. 'The officer translates 15 pages from English to Nepali in one hour.' If time is a pre-set standard, which part of Quantity-Time-Quality-Cost (QTQC) does the KPI statement represent?

- i. Quantity
- ii. Time
- iii. Quality
- iv. Cost

5. In the context of KPIs, what does "SMART" stand for?

- i. Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant, Time-bound
- ii. Simple, Manageable, Accurate, Realistic, Timely
- iii. Strategic, Meaningful, Actionable, Reliable, Tangible
- iv. Systematic, Motivational, Adaptable, Relevant, Targeted

6. Which of the following KPIs is poorly constructed in terms of QTQC technique?

- i. Citizen satisfaction is increased with online services by 20%.
- ii. The efficiency of permit processing is improved.
- iii. 95% of permit applications are processed within 10 working days.
- iv. Reviews of inter-agency agreements are conducted at the at first week of each quarter.

7. Which of the following best represents a characteristic of a well-defined KRA?

- i. Broad and strategic
- ii. Focused and measurable
- iii. Focused on activities rather than outcomes
- iv. Standards of work

8. How does using the QTQC technique improve the effectiveness of KPIs?

- i. It ensures that KPIs are broad and flexible for different roles.
- ii. It guarantees that KPIs align with personal interests of employees.
- iii. It makes KPIs more structured, measurable, and relevant to performance evaluation.
- iv. It eliminates the need for reviewing and updating KPIs over time.

9. Which of the following is NOT a typical type of feedback?

- i. Punitive feedback
- ii. Positive feedback
- iii. Developmental feedback

- iv. Constructive feedback

10. The COILED framework for feedback emphasizes:

- i. Criticizing, Ordering, Insulting, Laughing, Exaggerating, and Dismissing.
- ii. Context, Observation, Impact, Listening, Exploring, and Deciding.
- iii. Complimenting, Offering, Integrating, Listening, Evaluating, and Decoding.
- iv. Clarifying, Observing, Inferring, Listening, Evaluating, and Deciding

11. The "sandwich" method of feedback involves:

- i. Delivering constructive feedback between two positive comments.
- ii. Delivering punitive feedback between two positive comments.
- iii. Providing feedback during lunchtime.
- iv. Providing feedback to one employee by two supervisors.

12. Which of the following is an example of a question in the "Reality" stage of the GROW model?

- i. "What is the sales target that you want to achieve?"
- ii. "What challenges did you encounter while working on this project?"
- iii. "What are the available options for employee development?"
- iv. "When would it be the appropriate to organize a training?"

13. Which statement BEST differentiates coaching from mentoring?

- i. Coaching is always formal, while mentoring is informal.
- ii. Coaching focuses on current performance goals, while mentoring has a longer-term developmental focus.
- iii. Coaching requires specialized certifications, while mentoring does not.
- iv. Coaching is directive, while mentoring is non-directive

Thank you for your time and contribution!

Annex II: Intervention Guideline

Treatment Group (Using Generative AI)

Steps:

1. Select one of your Key Result Areas that you want to apply at your workplace.
2. Finalize it with your facilitator(s).
3. Command the AI your position and your task to prepare KPAs.

Sample: I am an undersecretary working for the government of Nepal. One of my key result areas (KRA) is preparation for the employee transfer. Prepare all the required Key Performance Areas using appropriate action verb following the SMART goal principle.

4. Edit the KPAs as per your context.
5. Finalize them with your facilitator(s).
6. Command the AI to prepare KPIs for each KPA using the technique of QTQC

Sample: Prepare 3 to 5 (more, if required) Key Performance Indicators (KPI) for each KPA above. The KPI statement should be in present perfect tense and should follow the technique of Quantity-Time-Quality-Cost (QTQC), applying either of them as required for each KPI statement. Also, List which technique among QTQC was followed in each KPI of each KPA.

7. Edit the KPIs as per your context.
8. Finalize them with your facilitator(s).
9. Write down remarks if needed.

Annex III: Preliminary Questionnaire

Nepal Administrative Staff College

ACMD: Questionnaire of Learning

आदरणीय सर/ म्याडम, नमस्ते तथा अभिभादन!

यो प्रश्नावली ACMD बाट अपेक्षित सिकाई र सिकाईको कार्यस्थलमा स्थानान्तरण (Training Transfer) सम्बन्धि अध्ययन गर्ने उद्देश्यले यहाँलाई दिइएको हो। यो सर्वेक्षण नेपाल प्रशासनिक प्रशिक्षण प्रतिष्ठानको आन्तरिक अनुसन्धान मध्ये एक हो। तपाईंको उत्तरले Training Transfer सम्बन्धि अवस्था पत्ता लगाउन, साथै थप सुधारको लागि पहल गर्नको लागि महत्त्वपूर्ण हुनेछ।

तपाईंको उत्तर गोप्य राखिनेछ र केवल अनुसन्धान प्रयोजनको लागि मात्र प्रयोग गरिनेछ। यस सर्वेक्षणमा उत्तरदाताको परिचय खुल्ने कुनै पनि प्रकारको सूचना राखिनेछैन। कृपया तल दिएका सबै प्रश्नहरूको उत्तर दिनुहोला। तपाईं प्रति हामी आभारी रहनेछौं। धन्यवाद!

अनुप भुर्तेल

नेपाल प्रशासनिक प्रशिक्षण प्रतिष्ठान,

जावलाखेल, ललितपुर, नेपाल।

Socio-Demographic Information (Please tick on the appropriate answer)

Years of experience in government: _____ Years of experience in undersecretary/Class II level: _____

Number of subordinates (under you): Officers: _____ Assistants: _____ Non-class employees: _____ Total: _____

Do you have Job Descriptions in your organization? Yes: ☐ No: ☐ I don't know: ☐

If yes, is it in use? Yes: ☐ Partially: ☐ No: ☐ Gender: Male: ☐ Female: ☐ Others: ☐

Ethnicity: Brahmin/Chhetri: ☐ Janajati: ☐ Madhesi: ☐ Dalit: ☐ Others (Specify): ☐ _____

True or False:

SN	Statements	Answers	
1.	KPA is broader than KRA.	True: ☐	False: ☐
2.	One KRA can have multiple KPAs	True: ☐	False: ☐
3.	KPA is a measurable metric that demonstrates how well an organization performs against its key objectives.	True: ☐	False: ☐
4.	You can use two or more action verbs in one KPA statement.	True: ☐	False: ☐
5.	A KPA of an under-secretary can be a KRA for a section officer.	True: ☐	False: ☐
6.	One KPA can have two or more KPI statements.	True: ☐	False: ☐

Select the right answer:

SN	Statements	Answers							
7.	The technique of QTQC is best applied in _____.	KRA	☐	KPA	☐	KPI	☐	All	☐
8.	'The training is organized as per the annual calendar.' Which part of QTQC does the KPI statement represent?	Quantity	☐	Time	☐	Quality	☐	Cost	☐
9.	'The decision of procurement is taken as per the organization's guideline.' Which part of QTQC does it best represent?	Quantity	☐	Time	☐	Quality	☐	Cost	☐
10.	'The officer translates 15 pages from English to Nepali in an hour.' If time is a pre-set standard, which part of QTQC does the KPI statement best represent?	Quantity	☐	Time	☐	Quality	☐	Cost	☐

Please circle on the best option that defines your Past Competency before taking ACMD, and Current Competency after taking ACMD on the given knowledge and skills.

5 = Highly Competent, 4 = Competent, 3 = Moderately Competent, 2 = Slightly Competent, 1 = Not Competent, NA = Not Applicable/Applied

SN	Personal Efficacy and Leadership	Before the Training						After the Training					
1.	Applying self-awareness and managing self	1	2	3	4	5	NA	1	2	3	4	5	NA
2.	Applying Integrity in Personal and Professional Life	1	2	3	4	5	NA	1	2	3	4	5	NA
3.	Managing interpersonal relationships	1	2	3	4	5	NA	1	2	3	4	5	NA
4.	Building Performing Teams and Fostering Team Spirit	1	2	3	4	5	NA	1	2	3	4	5	NA
5.	Managing (Plan, monitor & Appraisal) Performance Effectively	1	2	3	4	5	NA	1	2	3	4	5	NA
6.	Negotiating Effectively	1	2	3	4	5	NA	1	2	3	4	5	NA

Thank you for your time and contribution!

Annex IV: Comment-Address Sheet for Internal Research Report, FY 2081/82

Research Title:	Enhancing Training Transfer with Generative AI: A Quasi-Experimental Approach
Research Team Member(s):	Anup Bhurtel
Date of Evaluation:	29 Jestha 2082

Evaluator's name: Shree Krishna Shrestha		
SN	Comments	Actions taken
1.	Better not to say 'longitudinal' in the title.	The term 'longitudinal' has been removed as per the evaluator's comment.
2.	More explanation is needed to make the concept of training transfer clear, and to present how KSA has been portrayed.	Further elaborations have been added in the literature review to conceptualize training transfer.
3.	It is argued that the reinforcement to use the learning and then post-training follow-up may increase training transfer. But is it good to reinforce? (may-be we can convince them to apply the learning)	The applied strategy has been further explained in the data collection process within the method's chapter.

Evaluator's name: Hari Prasad Dhungana		
SN	Comments	Actions taken
1.	Title – innovating for tomorrow lai high emphasis Nadine	The title has been changed, removing the notion of innovation as per the suggestion.

Evaluator's name: Prakash C. Bhattarai		
SN	Comments	Actions taken
1.	It is clear. We need more research like this at NASC.	Comment acknowledged.
2.	Threat control: Can it be looked at by controlling the Work environment; and by controlling personal character?	Elaboration has been made in the research implications section.
3.	Follow up can be through qualitative approach to delve into why the training transfer was low.	The comment has been addressed in research implications, connecting to mixed methods or separate qualitative studies.

Evaluator's name: Dr. Rajan Khanal		
SN	Comments	Actions taken
1.	This study requires a follow to confirm if the issue is in training design, or work environment or personal characters (e.g. if they have given employee transfer as the excuse). We can explore further part of the factors influencing training transfer including trainee characteristics	Detailed explanation has been made in the research implications, citing the necessity of future research.

Evaluator's name: Bishnu Prasad Lamsal		
SN	Comments	Actions taken
1.	The study limitations should be clearly communicated.	Limitations, followed by implications have been expanded the readers about the scope and shortcomings of the study.
2.		